

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

May 5, 2021

Members Present: Laurie Lauzon Clabo, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Linda Beale, President, Academic Senate; Almufarrej Faisal; Leela Arava; Poonam Arya; Paul Beavers; Juliann Binienda; Timothy Bowman; Pynthia Caffee; Stephen Calkins; Susan Davis; Kelly Dormer; Paul Dubinsky; David Edelman; Brian Edwards; Tom Fischer; Jane Fitzgibbon; Samiran Ghosh; Wanda Gibson-Scipio; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Siobhan Gregory; Xiaoyan Han; Lance Heilbrun; Marisa Henderson; renée hoogland; Michael Horn; Arun Iyer; Barbara Jones; Thomas Karr; Satinder Kaur; Mahendra Kavdia; Fayette Keys; Thomas Killion; Christine Knapp; Manoj Kulchania; Jennifer Lewis; Wen Li; Karen MacDonell; Krishna Rao Maddipati; Georgia Michalopoulou; Carol Miller; Santanu Mitra; Ramzi Mohammed; Ekrem Alper Murat; Sandra Oliver McNeil; Nicole Pagan; Charles Parrish; Rachel Pawlowski; Thomas Pedroni; Shane Perrine; Sean Peters; Michele Porter; Richard Pineau; Avraham Raz; T.R Reddy; Shauna Reever; Stella Resko; Robert Reynolds; Joseph Roche; Noreen Rossi; Brad Roth; Krysta Ryzewski; Ali Salamey; Berhane Seyoum; Bo Shen; Naida Simon; Jennifer Stockdill; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Scott Tainsky; Neelima Thati; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Clayton Walker; Jennifer Wareham; Jeffrey Withey; Hossein Yarandi

Members Absent: Wei Chen; Richard Dogan; Alan Dombrowski; Justin Long

Guests: Louis Romano; Karin Tarpinning; Mary Paquette Abt

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE.

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of April 7, 2021. PASSED

II. REPORTS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Provost Clabo asked President Beale to call on the chairs to present their reports. President Beale reminded the chairs that their oral reports should be brief highlights of the committees' work since members can read the written reports for detail. There will be a one-minute notice and an end-of-time notice.

A. Budget Committee (Chair Paul Beavers)

The Budget Committee gained insight about and provided input into the impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the university's budget. At this point of year, the committee typically expects to meet one more time in June before the Board of Governors meeting. Last year there were five meetings in May and June, as well as the annual joint meeting with the school/college/division Budget Advisory Committee members in which information was provided on the rationale supporting a tuition increase and formulation of the fiscal year 2021 budget. The committee saw the volatility of state and federal assistance that makes it difficult to of the past year because the Board of Governors did not support layoffs. During the winter 2021 semester, the committee has

discussed the fiscal year 2022 budget, again focusing on tuition, state appropriations, and the various federal funding assistance for the COVID crisis. All the standing committees are considering issues in their areas that are important for the future of higher education post-COVID. The committee has decided to look at the potential value of badges, certificates, and similar credentials as means to increase revenues in support of research, graduate education and financial aid.

B. Curriculum & Instruction Committee (CIC) (Chair, Ewa Golebiowska)

CIC met seven times during this last year, including a joint meeting with the Student Affairs Committee which Naida Simon will address. Many of the issues CIC took up this year were informed by our experience with learning and teaching during the pandemic. Jennifer Wareham and Jennifer Hart joined CIC to report on general education assessment and the survey on COVID-19's effect on assessment. In October, we discussed the Phoenix Re-Entry Program. This program was initially developed in the 1980s to provide undergrads a second chance to return to the university after they had been gone for over five years if they had earned at least thirty credit hours, with the possibility of grade forgiveness to allow completion of a degree. Naida Simon had developed a new version of the program to provide additional support, with review of the program on a five-year basis by CIC and Student Affairs. The two committees voted to support this revision to the Phoenix program, and passed that information to Policy, which also supported the revision to the proposal. CIC also considered the question of how to best identify remote courses, given the distinction between synchronous and asynchronous components and whether it was possible in the course schedule to identify combinations of these

components that many of us have chosen to use in our teaching. This was ultimately resolved through the Academic Restart Committee to include hybrid, synchronous and asynchronous labels. Further, CIC considered the available software for monitoring remote exams, beginning with a report from Nathan Shaevas of C&IT on the Respondus lockdown browser and proctoring system that is software currently embedded in Canvas to proctor exams electronically. The committee filed a report with the Policy Committee delineating a number of concerns, and the Policy Committee has issued a recommendation that faculty refrain from using the exam proctoring software as much as possible. Another topic briefly discussed was scheduling of final exams in asynchronous classes. Asynchronous classes don't fit well into the final exam schedule, so CIC asked the Registrar to make some accommodations for these classes. An important topic for CIC has been the Student Code of Conduct because of the need to clarify the role of faculty in appeals processes for cases involving allegations of academic misconduct. This is an issue that both CIC and Policy have been urging action on for some time. The committee also learned about some of the challenges students face in the online learning environment from David Strauss, including particularly students with disabilities and the need to create a generally more inclusive classroom for online instruction. CIC has also started a discussion of the Policy Committee's charge regarding the post-pandemic future of higher education and to that end we have formed three working groups to continue discussing these issues over the next few months.

C. Election Committee (Chair, Naida Simon)

The Election Committee conducted a number of elections this year. In September, the Senate elected Paul Beavers to the three-year term on Policy and Jane Fitzgibbon, Brad Roth, Naida Simon and Ricardo Villarosa to one-year terms. In January, a second Policy election was necessary to elect a replacement for the remainder of David Kessel's term upon his retirement: Norine Rossi won that seat. The Member-at-Large election each year selects two at-large Senate members: this year Linda Beale and Naida Simon were elected. The hearing panel elections for faculty and academic staff were held somewhat later. The Election Committee also conducted the apportionment for the next Senate year. The School of Medicine lost four seats, and the School of Fine, Performing, and Communication Arts lost one seat. Business gained a seat and every other college and division kept the same representation. I'd like to thank the committee for its hard work and especially Manoj Kulchania, who is our timer today and has been a timer in previous elections.

D. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) (Chair, renée hoogland)

Early on in the fall, FAC discussed the interdisciplinary hiring program with Interim Provost Laurie Clabo and Associate Provost Boris Baltes. FAC had concerns about the program, because various departments and faculty felt that these hiring priorities were set from the outside rather than being based on the needs of departments as recognized by the faculty and chairs in those fields. There was a productive discussion in which Provost Clabo committed to sharing these concerns with the incoming Provost. The program is

on hold for this year, to allow improvements in the process to take account of faculty perspectives about teaching and research needs as well as innovative, interdisciplinary hires. FAC also discussed and supported the Phoenix 2.0 program mentioned by Ewa. FAC had ongoing conversations about how faculty and staff are dealing with the pandemic remote learning and teaching situation. A primary concern has been invisible students, students who remain hidden behind name tags and may not even be present in the Zoom room. Students too often do not respond to any outreach activities. At the same time, FAC was generally pleased with the way in which the university has dealt with the pandemic in terms of public health and safety, yet concerned about the lack of attention to faculty and academic staff well-being, as compared to measures undertaken on behalf of students. For example, on the so-called Mental Health Days where activities for students were organized, academic staff were nonetheless urged to be available to the students—as if staff mental health did not matter. FAC also addressed the renovation of State Hall. Finally, FAC considered it important that the Ombudsperson's office be revised and reformed to provide a place that also serves faculty. A member of FAC will participate in the committee established by the Provost to review the Ombudsperson office. FAC discussed a number of other issues, including emeritus status requirements, while also being distracted by the pandemic. Thanks to all the members of the committee for showing up and for doing the work during a busy year.

E. Faculty, Support Services and Technology Committee (FSST) (Chair, Jane Fitzgibbon)

The chair thanked committee members for their work during this very tough year. Like

other committees FSST spent considerable time discussing the future of higher ed at Wayne State. Our committee elected to focus on two areas, facilities issues and online education. Rather than meeting as a committee over the summer, we agreed to do a case study analysis of the issues that we feel impact our ability to deliver high quality education to the Wayne State community. The FSST also discussed various issues that will carry forward to next year. One of importance related to the “first day” text accessibility program is student data privacy. In a recent incident, one of the university’s partners emailed students to solicit certain business, without university consent: we believe that it is a long-term issue. The committee also invited various guests, including Rob Davenport. It is difficult to know what the facilities issues will be upon our return. Other guests included Nathan, Jody Young from the bookshop, Heather King, Len Wassaic, the registrar who discussed the course waitlist process, Darryl Pearson (Sustainability Office). Thank you all very much.

F. Research Committee (Chair, Noreen Rossi, taking over from David Kessel upon his retirement)

Thank you. I want to thank David for being so gracious in providing me guidance in the transition and the committee members who have been extremely supportive both before and during my transition into the chairmanship. During this last year, we had presentations from Steve Lanier, vice president for research, on the impact of COVID-19 protocols on ongoing research. This was followed by Dr. Linda Haslett, Associate Dean for Research at the School of Medicine, who reported on the changes in research practices at the school, the recruitment and hiring of research faculty, formal development of a program for

internal grant review, and the hopes of replacing aging and outdated equipment. Although we had scheduled a discussion with Dr. Larry Matherly (updates of the cancer grant) and Dr. Sokol Cody (new Associate Vice President for postdoctoral positions), those had to be cancelled. Finally, Dr. Phillip Cunningham presented on changes in research ethics safety and conflicts of interest, particularly when there is foreign influence on research. At our first meeting in February, we talked with Dr. Amanda Bryant-Friedrich, the new dean of the Graduate School regarding research graduate students and postdoctoral students in the professional studies lifecycle. Last month Rob Davenport reported on the issues in Scott Hall, providing a very detailed report on the changes in management.

G. Student Affairs Committee (SAC)
(Chair, Naida Simon)

SAC met nine times and covered 13 topics, each listed in the final report. The Phoenix update was critical, as Ewa noted. The key change was to shorten the time from a minimum of 5 years to 3 years out. We also strengthened the program so that the students must have thirty graded credits in order to graduate and five courses in those thirty graded credits have to be in the major or core fields. We can now also track Phoenix students because we created attributes in Banner to permit that. Another important topic was the Respondus exam software. SAC met with CIC jointly to discuss what recommendations we should make through Policy to the administration. As chair, Naida took the test twice to see how Respondus worked: one time she behaved honestly and the second time she cheated by using a cell phone conspicuously. Nonetheless, the software did not flag her for cheating. Policy also held an in-depth discussion and did not

support use of the proctoring software. Another topic at SAC was the First Year Seminar 1010. It's a one credit Wayne Experience course best taken in the first semester. Unfortunately, there have not been enough sections to cover all first-year students in the two years it's been offered. This is a problem since students are advantaged by taking it in the first semester: there should be sufficient seats in those courses. Another important topic was the new test-optional admissions process for first year undergraduates. It is a holistic approach that considers academic credentials, student experiences and attributes to assess potential for academic success. The committee thought it important that we code the students who are admitted test optional versus those who come in with ACT or SAT scores, so that we can look at their progress. We have used ACT and SAT scores to place students in the proper math and English courses. It will require diligence to ensure students are still placed correctly, and to confirm that they can succeed. Finally, we considered the Warrior VIP and Apex Scholars programming. Warrior VIP students are regularly admitted but receive comprehensive student support system through a learning community with peer mentors. They are generally first-generation students who are Pell eligible as well as students of color and other underrepresented minorities. The retention rate into second year was higher for those in the program than for a similar cohort who did not do Warrior VIP. Thanks to the committee members, who participated all through the year.

III. UPDATE ON FACILITIES
MANAGEMENT
RESTRUCTURING—Robert
Davenport, Associate Vice
President for Facilities
Management

Interim Provost Clabo introduced AVP Davenport to present an overview of the restructuring of facilities management. Davenport invited members to ask questions at any point and noted that the goal is to create a process whereby the university will have a proper preventative maintenance program. Much has taken place behind the scenes over the last eight months. The goal is to address deferred maintenance in a way that means the division is responding timely to basic requests and addressing the equipment needs behind the scenes so that we don't have unplanned failures.

The plan requires four supportive systems (the four “pillars” in the PowerPoint): a preventative maintenance culture, performance management, customer engagement, and of course expense management on the preventative maintenance piece. Setting up that culture requires six steps. The first step is to get all the mechanical, electrical, and plumbing equipment into our work-order system. That is just about done. Once that's done, we will have what we call a preventative maintenance (PM) record. That will allow us to achieve step two—creating a job plan attached to the PM record. That's important so that the work-order system will send a work-order automatically to remind us that it is time to go to a particular cooling tower or chiller or boiler to do a preventative maintenance activity on it. The third step of work-flow management is all about planning and scheduling. Many of you may know that our technicians operate largely autonomously right now: they do what they believe they should do at a time that they believe is right. The new process will change that, bringing methodical planning and scheduling to the organization. A planner will prepare information for technicians in connection with both PM

work-orders and reactive maintenance work-orders that add up to a week's worth of work for each technician. Those work plans will go to a scheduler who will direct each technician to specific tasks in an organized fashion. The fourth step is "wrench time": now that the technicians have everything they need to perform particular jobs, they go to the work site with their work orders, job plans, needed parts and supplies, PPE and do the work required. The fifth step is operating reviews and reporting to ensure that good information comes back from the job so that the division can analyze the operation and compare it to our KPI scorecard (which we'll discuss momentarily). The sixth step is continuous improvement and business innovation. The idea is to remove waste elements within a technician's day. When we do that, wrench time is automatically increased so productivity is increased. The technicians can take on more work and thus reduce reliance on subcontractors. (Right now, subcontractors come in to do work that our own staff can perform.)

Hoogland asked Davenport to explain wrench time. He noted that is an industry term meaning the time that a technician is actually working on a piece of equipment, using tools and doing something physically. Non-wrench time includes travel time, getting supplies and equipment together and similar activities that support the actual work to be done. Another asked about typical performance at the university under the existing systems and whether there had been good measurement of how time was spent. Davenport answered that the division essentially has to follow technicians around to see what is happening during the day. There is a plan to do that to determine the baseline before the new work-order program starts. Although we don't know exactly what

that number is, we're relatively confident it is in the 20% range

Davenport noted that customer engagement refers to the commitment to the campus. The KPI matrix serves to publicize our commitment to response times. As a work-order comes in, we will commit to acknowledging and assigning the workload immediately. The point here is that no work-order will have a life greater than 30 days, for any reason whatsoever. The division will become more predictable and more reliable, and the operation will become more sustainable. We expect that faculty, staff, and students will be much more satisfied, that we will be performing as we should. To help us be sure of that, the work order system currently generates surveys when work orders are closed, so we'll use that methodology to gain feedback. Also, we will be providing quarterly surveys to the business officers in the units. The BAOs, dean and chairs will get surveys every six months so that we have feedback from that group.

The division is currently highly centralized, resulting in a number of inefficiencies. The plan is to move to a regional configuration that divides the campus into two regions with about the same square footage and building complexity, with each region being further divided into four districts. The goal is to match the most skilled technicians with the most complex buildings, with careful determinations of the number of technicians, planners, schedulers, and other support and management staff needed for each team within those eight districts. These two elements of planning/scheduling and a region/district approach should greatly improve services.

This model will also help expense management. For example, fewer trucks for

the trades and engineering groups will be necessary, eliminating 20 of the current 35 vehicles. More importantly, the organization will be more efficient and more productive, reducing spending on subcontracts. As the program matures, it should become more reliable, operating as expected. This should be a transformative change, ready to go in a few months.

Brian Edwards asked whether the reorganization plan will lower the level at which decisions are made, noting that he had once asked a custodian what it took to replace a broken paper-towel dispenser. The answer described a process that took multiple levels of review before there would be approval to buy a replacement. Shouldn't every group of custodians have a budget for those kinds of items and ability to make decisions on a weekly or monthly basis, rather than running them up the chain of authority for approval? Davenport agreed that the current process is not efficient and that empowering folks to make decisions as well as holding them accountable to get the work done is part of the new program.

renée hoogland expressed appreciation for the infographics but questioned whether Davenport was confident that the desired outcomes would materialize. So often, these kinds of plans have gone wrong here.

Davenport responded that he has successfully managed such transformations with other organizations. Wayne has unique challenges, but there's nothing that would make him think this can't be done here. He does think it will likely take a year and a half before the campus realizes the full results of the paradigm shift.

Joseph Roche asked about elevator maintenance, noting the chronic problem in the Applebaum building of a cycle of repairs and breaks. The problem affects research

because patients who come in for physical therapy research cannot access the research facilities. It was discussed at the faculty meeting and needs to be made a high priority item. Davenport confirmed that the Applebaum elevator work is almost complete. The harm was done in a flood about two years ago; unfortunately, it has taken that entire time to complete the repair. Both should be running with a new controls package resulting in reliable elevator service in Applebaum within a month.

[Robert Davenport left the meeting.]

IV. RESOLUTION HONORING THE CAMPUS HEALTH CENTER PERSONNEL

Interim Provost Clabo introduced and welcomed two colleagues who are guests for the first resolution. Dr. Ramona Benkert is the interim dean of the College of Nursing and president of the Nursing Practice Corporation, which operates the Campus Health Center (CHC). Dr. Tony Grant is the Chief Nursing Officer for the Campus Health Center. Both joined the Senate for the next resolution.

Kelly Dormer introduced the resolution honoring the CHC personnel. She had the pleasure of serving on the public health restart committee this last year and note that it has been a wonderful opportunity to learn about the campus response to COVID and the work that the CHC has done to support our response to the pandemic as frontline workers on campus. The staff of the CHC has shifted to operate as our Wayne State Public Health Department in the past year. They have been a constant presence on campus, while the majority of us have been safe at home. They have conducted as many as 1300 COVID tests in a single week at the pandemic peak. They call people with

results; do contact tracing; educate about COVID transmission and quarantine guidelines; and handle case management of positive campus cases. They handle vaccine administration and education, review campus daily screeners, and reach out to people whose screeners require response. They have done all this on top of their regular workload in order to keep the campus community safe, healthy, and aware of options. Like faculty and academic staff who have shifted technologies, the CHC staff have also shifted to do telemedicine work: it has been a challenge for everyone this year. This resolution is to let them know that we understand this has been a difficult year for them. That “above and beyond” activity deserves recognition from the Senate, because we can’t reasonably talk about a safe return in any capacity for the fall without their excellent work and their commitment. We will continue to need them to get us back on campus giving students the best possible Wayne State experience that they can have. Dormer indicated that hopefully the group had read the resolution that was sent with the agenda and will support the resolution honoring Dr. Grant, Dean Benkert, and all of their team members. The resolution passed on a voice vote of unanimity, and Beale thanked Dr. Grant and Ramona Benkert for the wonderful work, saying that the Senate truly appreciates it.

Clabo added an expression of her personal thanks as chair of the Public Health Committee to the leadership of the CHC. The university’s experience during the pandemic has been very different than that of many of our peer universities. Wayne is the only major public university in Michigan not to have contributed to an outbreak in the wider community, almost solely due to the contact tracing and careful case investigation work of the CHC. Clabo also

thanked Kelly Dormer and the other members of the public health committee who have done so much to protect the campus during a very vulnerable year. She again thanked Tony Grant and Ramona Benkert for their leadership.

Parliamentarian Ricardo Villarosa suggested that in future the President should ask for any nays even with such a “thank you” resolution.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE STUDENT CODE OF CONDUCT

Brad Roth then introduced a resolution regarding the Student Code of Conduct. The Senate had appointed an ad hoc subcommittee to consider appropriate reforms of the student code of conduct to formally incorporate faculty participation in the process by which appeals from grade penalties occur under 10.1 A of the Code and disciplinary sanctions under 10.1 B. It has been a complicated process, involving many discussions with different stakeholders, including all the associate deans who handled these issues in the colleges. The subcommittee has reached firm conclusions yet about reforms to the Code, and those discussions are ongoing. The subcommittee has, however, developed preliminary recommendations that are before the Senate today, because these are recommendations that should be implemented as soon as possible for the fall.

There are three sets of recommendations. One addresses the problem of the university’s name being connected to promotion of materials that can be used for plagiarism and cheating. This has come up in the past, and there have been prior efforts to address it, but there are still weak points which this recommendation addresses. The

third recommendation concerns issues having to do with putting out information to various stakeholders about what's been happening with respect to both grade appeals and disciplinary sanctions, to make sure that all stakeholders are duly informed of what occurs. The crucial thing is the second recommendation—in particular, the part of the second recommendation regarding the incorporation into the Wayne experience courses of a module concerning academic misconduct. The subcommittee considers it important to get across to students a sense of the ethos of academia. Students do not seem to be made aware of the extent to which this is a breach of faith and a disruption of the fundamental relationships between instructors and students. That is an important concept that must be emphasized along with techniques for avoiding cheating and plagiarism. There are therefore a number of provisions in the second resolution and the second recommendation. There are a range of matters having to do with education more broadly, including how to inform faculty about the various kinds of practices, including information gathering by the Dean of Students Office about informal grade penalties. The most important for our purposes and driving our effort to have a vote on a resolution at this time is the idea of including a unit on ethics within the Wayne Experience course. Roth noted that he is bringing this resolution to the Senate on behalf of the Policy Committee.

With the motion before the Senate, President Beale called for any questions. Binienda asked whether the Senate was voting on the entire report and recommendations as a package. Beale responded that the Senate was voting on whether to support the preliminary report and the three recommendations included therein, covering

both cheating and training. The resolution passed without objection or abstentions.

VI. INCOMING PROVOST DR. MARK L. KORNBLUH.

Interim Provost Clabo introduced incoming Provost, Dr Mark Kornbluh, who joins Wayne State from the University of Kentucky. Dr Kornbluh comes with experience as a faculty member, a chair, a center director and a dean. He will take on the role officially on July first. Today, he has agreed to introduce himself and share with the Senate the values and vision he brings to the position.

After thanking Interim Provost Clabo and President Beale, Kornbluh stated that he was thrilled to be joining Wayne State. I had the good opportunity to talk with the Academic Senate Policy Committee during the search process, but unfortunately there was no way to meet with the full Senate. Rather than provide a summary of his CV, he wanted to talk about his values. He described himself as a true believer in the value of public research universities and the threefold mission of advancing knowledge, teaching a new generation, and impacting society. This is partially an intellectual commitment, as he is a modern American historian by training and thus appreciates the role institutions such as Wayne State have played in modern American history. The existence of a diverse public education has been essential to the advancement of the country's democracy, health, and prosperity. The national political battles of the last few years—which have echoed so loudly in Kentucky where he comes from and in Michigan to which he is coming back—only serve to deepen his commitment to the university's core mission. He added that his commitment also stems from experience, in that he has spent almost his entire career in public research

universities. He thus understands firsthand the need to try to move these institutions forward by being more entrepreneurial and innovative. It is nonetheless essential also to maintain our core values. An essential part of that is an understanding that the heart of the university is its people--its faculty, its staff and its students. The university has enormous expertise that it must draw upon to address the challenges that it faces today.

Kornbluh expressed his excitement about Wayne's commitment to a diverse student body. He has spent the last decade working to improve student success. His CV shows a background in constructive use of new technologies, so he wants to be part of a process that incorporates technology in a way that strengthens and supports what we do but doesn't undermine it. Everyone has been through the fire in this last year, and meetings are still taking place on Zoom. We have had experiences in the way technology works for us and the way it cuts against the grain of what we need to do. It's vital to engage students, to capture their hearts and minds. That's harder in today's culture: students carry their mothers and the world with them in their phones. We will have a challenge moving forward, because students have gone through a year of remote education and it will not be easy to return to the same type of focus as before, but that's essential.

Kornbluh also stated his commitment to the research mission of Wayne State. He has almost 20 years of administrative experience recruiting and maintaining excellent faculty and supporting their intellectual work. That is a central part of Wayne. He is also especially attracted to Wayne's engagement with Detroit having been deeply engaged with the local community in Lansing when I was at Michigan State for 15 years and in Lexington where he works with three

different mayors and two different superintendents of schools on a wide range of projects. The possibility of deep engagement with the city of Detroit is part of what attracted him to the position.

There is no doubt that the university faces significant challenges. All universities are facing budget challenges, and Wayne's budget issues are real. We also face challenges in a new world hopefully coming out of the COVID experience. Academic leaders must meet these challenges while remaining true to our core values. We need to innovate and try new things, but we also need to keep our values first and foremost. His goal, he said, is that when people look back 50 years from now, they'll look upon the coming decade as the golden age of public urban research universities and marvel at the value that Wayne provided for the well-being of Detroit, Michigan, the US and the world.

He takes this job on with a great deal of optimism and excitement to be joining the Wayne State Community.

Beale noted that there was time for a few questions. She explained to the Senate that Kornbluh would not address specifics of what he might do when he arrives, but members are free to ask questions about the educational values and importance of public urban research universities.

Jenn Stockdill asked how the Senate might count on Kornbluh to relay our interests and opinions and experiences to the president in decision making? Kornbluh responded that believing in universities includes believing in the structure of chairs, deans and Provost as chief academic officers with responsibility both up and down. He takes that seriously: part of the role of a provost is to represent the values of the faculty, the

academic staff, and the other staff that work for any part of the academic mission.

Kornbluh concluded by noting that he would be coming to the Senate's meetings but that he also would go to each of the schools and colleges to meet the faculty and academic staff. That is being arranged to take place as soon as he arrives. Beale noted that the Senate plenary sessions start in September, and Kornbluh will serve as chair of the Senate so that members will get to know him well. The Provost also meets with the Policy Committee on a weekly basis: that is one of the main ways that we are able to share with the administration the issues and concerns that have come to the fore. Often a Senate member or a faculty member that's not a member of the Senate or an academic staff member will email me or other members of policy to tell us about something that they're concerned about. That item will likely be put on the agenda for Policy, allowing us to have a good discussion about issues before they become too hardened as a problem. Regrettably, Beale said, many faculty and staff sense that a lot of the consultation is done in a pro forma way *after* decisions have already been made. It would be helpful if things were brought up earlier with a desire to hear what the faculty think. Some administrators aren't as good at listening as others. The Senate looks forward to working with Kornbluh in the future.

Beale also noted a special thanks to Laurie Clabo for her work as Interim Provost, even though she doesn't go off until Mark actually officially comes on. This is her last Senate plenary session. Interim Provost is not an easy position to move into, especially because there is so much complexity in Wayne State's Provost Office. Taking on that role as interim provost is a real challenge. Thank you, Laurie, for what

you've done. Senate members applauded as a thank you to Clabo.

VII. REPORT FROM THE SENATE
PRESIDENT

Beale began by thanking all of the Senate members for everything they have done this year. Although said at every meeting, she realizes that we are all working through incredible stress and strain and fatigue in dealing with all of the new things that the pandemic has thrown upon us, including the increased student need for faculty and staff advice and counseling and the extra work that it takes to prepare for each class session. We have all had to think about things that come up anew, not just keeping up with our materials as we normally do, and trying to do a little bit of research in the mix! The work of the Senate has been important, educationally for the university and in developing its policy. Beale also thanked Mark Kornbluh for letting the Senate get to know him a little bit today. Regrettably, other faculty did not have that opportunity since Policy was the only group of faculty, other than the search committee, who met the candidates during the search.

Beale then welcomed Amanda Powe, our new Academic Senate secretary, who has officially come on board for this meeting. She is from Madonna University, so she's familiar with the academic setting, which is a real advantage to have in the Senate secretary. Senators will be corresponding with Amanda in the future, asking questions and using her as a conduit to make sure that things are taken care of. Welcome Amanda.

The Policy proceedings are attached to the draft minutes for the April 7 plenary session, so hopefully members had or will have a chance to peruse them and read anything of interest. Beale selected a few key issues to

point out for which the detailed discussion in Policy may be interesting.

First was the concerns expressed about the centralization of the Information Technology (IT) function. Various faculty expressed concern that needs were not being met, and there were some poor communications from the central administration. Policy had an opportunity to talk to Interim Associate Vice President Rob Thompson and convey our concerns. Hopefully that will have a positive impact.

Another important issues addressed has been the need for a more responsive facilities approach. We invited Rob Davenport to report to Policy about his Facilities Planning and Management restructuring plans, and you have had a condensed presentation of that plan here. There is more detail in the proceedings, especially about the Scott Hall temperature crisis that affected researchers. Something similar occurred in other buildings as well. This brought attention to the need for a culture change in terms of communications internally within his own department. So hopefully that will also show a positive development over time. Beale noted her appreciation for Rob's response and his frankness and openness in talking about those things with Policy.

Policy has continued to hold discussions with Monica Brockmeyer, Dawn Medley and Ericka Jackson about Student Success data and the test-optional admissions process. Policy has requested longitudinal data on the Apex program for quite some time to try to evaluate how well that is working in terms of students moving into regular classes and continuing through to graduation. Regrettably, we were disappointed to see that the Admissions Office is treating their approach to use of "psychosocial factors" as proprietary to

admissions, claiming that they cannot share that information with Policy. Monica Brockmeyer agreed to provide a summary for us, but we have not received it. Policy members heartily disagree with treating this as unavailable to Policy, since it is clearly an important educational policy matter. Beale noted that Policy will continue to follow up on this in order to get a better picture of how admissions decisions are being made at this time.

Another matter that may be of interest to Senate members is the discussion of the course information matrix. The CLAS faculty has been significantly involved in responding to the Student Senate and moving the project forward. It is an attempt to provide voluntary information from faculty about courses *prior to* student registration so that they can use the information in selecting courses. We've asked that there be a statement about the voluntary nature of faculty participation, both on the website and in information to participating faculty.

There has been a continuing disregard for the Senate as the elected voice of faculty and academic staff. Beale had informed the Senate at the last plenary of President Wilson's unilateral withdrawal from his commitment to hold quarterly one-on-one meetings with the Senate President. He had also committed to holding two joint meetings of Policy and President's Cabinet, but only one of those two was held. The one held was disappointing, in that it was treated more as a "show and tell" than an opportunity for discussion of university issues. It is also disappointing that the President continues to claim a "right" to appoint the vast majority of members to university-wide committees, with a clear majority from university administration and only a small minority being representatives

selected by the Academic Senate. He considers it appropriate for him to choose at least one more faculty or staff than the number of Academic Senate representatives, which relegates the Senate representatives to a consistent minority position with little influence. Beale noted that she has served on several of those committees, not infrequently as the only faculty voice or one of very few. It is disappointing because there are so many issues for which it is important to have that ground-level view of the educational enterprise and the issues that faculty see in class in teaching and in their interactions with colleagues, students and the community. A further disappointment was the lack of a response from either President Wilson or Board of Governors Chair Kelly to the Senate resolution on diversity, equity and inclusion. Beale noted that she continues to hope that there will be referral of recommendations from the President's DEI Council to the Senate in the same way that the General Education Oversight Committee's recommendations come to the Senate. That is the way educational policy initiatives should work under the Board of Governors statutes establishing the Senate as the voice of the faculty and Academic Staff.

Beale noted that there is now also a strategic planning steering committee which will be undertaking most of its work over the summer. That will include some faculty focus groups and various subcommittees where the voice of faculty and academic staff will be particularly important. She expressed her hope that those asked will participate. The academic faculty and staff voice is important. That is also why the Senate charge to the standing committees to consider their priorities for the future of higher education post pandemic is so important. Beale encouraged any who have not yet signed up for a working group of

their Senate committee to do so. This will be the primary way that there is a faculty voice in strategic planning on educational policy for the next five years. She is aware that some describe these strategic plans as just fluff. They do have a PR aspect, but they are also a way that the university sets priorities. Those priorities ultimately will influence budgetary decisions, and budgetary decisions determine where the dollars go, so it's important that Senate members participate in this. It is one more "ask" over the summer, but she urged members to participate actively.

The Senate has been able to make a significant difference in spite of all the difficulties in bringing many issues of concern to the attention of key administrators. That is a critically important role that the Senate plays in ensuring that we have good policies. Beale again thanked members for all they do, including the emails they have sent to her and others members of the Policy Committee to bring things to our attention and for all the work done on Senate and university committees. Thank you.

VIII. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Interim Provost Clabo began her report with a quick overview of the health of the campus. Positivity rate remains incredibly low, at about 2% in our last reported data for the last seven days. There was also a low number of cases in our last seven-day reporting period, with only four cases on campus. Positivity rates in the city of Detroit, which were as high as 20% about 15 days ago, have dropped to about 15%. The current suspension of most on-campus activities is extended until we reliably fall below that trigger metric of 15%. President Wilson will likely have much more to say about COVID during his remarks in a few

moments, but Clabo indicated that she is aware that there is great interest around what will fall look like. She thinks there is every reason to believe life will look much different in the fall. The vaccines are now widely available, with both Moderna and Pfizer available at the Campus Health Center (CHC) over the course of the summer. There is ample supply, so those still in search of a vaccine should feel free to follow the directions to schedule an appointment at the Student Center or a location of your choice to receive a vaccine. She expects to have news shortly about the J&J vaccine for those who want to receive a one-dose vaccine: that will likely be administered in the CHC itself. Testing is still available. If members are interested in PCR (antibody testing), it is available, simply by calling the CHC to make an appointment. There are of course many questions about what fall will look like. We think that conditions will be vastly improved by fall. All the data is pointing in that direction. A town hall with a variety of folks talking about plans for fall is scheduled for May 18 at 3pm, and Clabo encouraged members to attend.

Today is commencement day. Clabo hoped this would be the last commencement held virtually. She thanked all who participated in virtual ceremonies and chatted along with students during those ceremonies. The presence of faculty and academic staff means a lot to students. She particularly thanked Brad Roth, who did a terrific job bringing greetings on behalf of the Academic Senate. This is also Academic Recognition Week, when we highlight our academic mission. A number of awards have been presented this week virtually, and you've had the opportunity to see those award recipients highlighted in daily emails, and in Today at Wayne. This week is about much more than the awardees. Thanks to all

of the folks who nominated people for awards, including faculty and academic staff colleagues, chairs, and deans. Thanks to the members of the many review committees who took time during this year to review those nominations, and to all of our faculty, academic staff, and graduate students, for everything that you've done during this exceptional year. Wayne State has been an outstanding example of what an urban-serving public research university does in the midst of a pandemic. Clabo note that she is proud to be a part of this community and of the work that all have done to support each other, to support our students to continue to develop, to provide a world class education and to continue scholarship during this incredibly challenging time. It is something that she will never forget, a highlight of her career to serve with the Senate this year. She is very, grateful for everything the faculty and staff have done. She looks forward to being back on campus in the fall.

IX. REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

President Wilson began by noting that it has been a long year. A lot of announcements have gone out over this past four or five months. He is glad that you got a chance to meet Mark Kornbluh today. The university is looking forward to his starting in a few months. Laurie Clabo has done a great job, and Wilson publicly thanked her for the work that she has done, not only as provost but also as head of the public health committee that was so instrumental in helping guide us through this pandemic.

The fall semester is on everybody's mind. We are planning to go back to majority in-person classes, but there will still be a number of remote and online classes. There will be remote/online classes than prior to

the pandemic. Some of that is by design. Some of that may be dictated by conditions on the ground at the time in terms of the pandemic, but it is also dictated by the fact that faculty are more comfortable delivering instruction in different ways than they were before. There's much more flexibility and much more innovation in delivering classroom instruction that will not go away even when we're fully back to pre-pandemic days from a health perspective. It will certainly be greater than 50% in-person, with a large percentage remote.

We will continue to be guided by our trigger metrics. The trigger metrics were developed in the spring, soon after the pandemic started. We wanted to predetermine what was going to make us closed down or have various levels of closure. We saw another university take a week to decide what to do when they already had an outbreak on their campus.. That week was chaotic. When you make a decision like closing the campus, there are different constituency groups that have varying opinions. They all start expressing their opinions, and it is hard to make the best decisions in those kinds of circumstances. We wanted to have something out in advance so that when conditions reached any of those triggers, we could automatically go into certain levels of closure. The most recent time of depopulating the campus was about a month or so ago when the percent positivity in the Detroit had reached over 20% at one point. When it was close to reaching 15%, we decided that once it reached 15 we would automatically depopulate. A few days later it did reach that 15% and we were prepared and able to depopulate the campus. The positivity rate is now 14.9. It has gone down a little bit. There are some people who are anxious for the Mort Harris Fitness Center to open up. We are going to make a decision soon based again on the triggers.

One of the things that is going to determine to what level we're able to open the campus up in the fall is what proportion of our faculty and staff and students are vaccinated. We are doing a survey that went out this morning. It takes only about 15 seconds to do the survey since it is only four or five questions. This by itself is not going to give us the information we need, but it will be a good baseline with another survey closer to the fall. The validity of the information will be based in great part on how many people submit the survey. The less we have to extrapolate, the more accurate the survey will be. We encourage everyone to fill that out.

Some, especially faculty, have asked why we don't just mandate vaccination. Wilson indicated that he fully expects that there will be a mandate but is not ready to do it now. It is important to exhaust other mechanisms to try to get people vaccinated before going to a mandate. So, for students there is a GrubHub incentive for a free lunch. That highlights the fact that we're trying to do everything we can short of a mandate to try to get people vaccinated. I think that if we do go to a mandate, it'll make it easier from an acceptance standpoint if you've exhausted all other mechanisms. The other aspect is what the legislature does. Right now, there are a number of states that have passed legislation that prohibits state universities from having mandates and punishes those who go ahead with mandates. That is under consideration in a bill before our legislature here in Michigan. It will punish those universities that move toward or announce a mandate. One might argue that what the University of Michigan is doing is not a mandate, because they're saying that if a student wants to live on campus, the student has to get a vaccination. It depends on how the legislation is written, but there's no

urgency in Wayne State making that decision though we will have to make it at some point soon.

Of course, the AAUP-AFT negotiations are going on now. Thus far, the university and the association teams have met 14 times and reached tentative agreement on about two thirds of the articles. Typically, what happens is that those things that are easier to agree on are settled first, but those things that are more difficult and have financial implications are not settled till the end. Both teams are working hard and the tone of the meetings has been very professional, which is important. We all want the same thing. We all want to make sure that we're able to move forward and benefit both the faculty and the university writ large. We have extended the current contract to May 20.

There are a number of leadership changes at the university. As you know, a new provost will arrive soon. We have a new dean, Brian Cummings, in the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences. He's from Detroit and will be a great asset for both Wayne State and for Detroit.

Our General Counsel Lou Lessem has been threatening to retire for a while. He postponed it with the pandemic but he's now ready to act on his retirement. Beginning in mid-June, he will go to 60% through the end of November. He'll continue to do on a transactional basis some of the lawsuits that he's involved with and the legal transaction that has been ongoing for 20 years—the disposal of the Kresge building. That contract has been really bad for us and is now terminating but it is a difficult unwind. During the time between now and the end of November, Laura Johnson will pick up more of the responsibilities, with the two of them acting as Co-General Counsels. In November, we'll start a search for a new

general counsel, with the goal of having someone in place for the next academic year.

We have also made progress on the VP for finance and business operations. The search committee should have a recommendation of three names to me by June 16. We have also announced that Matt Seeger is stepping down after 11 years as Dean of the College of Fine, Performing and Communication Arts. He's graciously agreed to stay on until a new dean for the school is found, so we'll be starting a search for that position very soon.

State funding continues to be undecided. The House Subcommittee on Appropriations bill is bad for higher education. It's actually hostile to higher education. The first version that came out had about half of the 15 public' taking significant cuts and half with significant gains. They took the same amount of money currently appropriated and gave some more, some less through a per pupil funding model such as used in K – 12 education. That does not take into account the complexities of different types of universities, the different types of mission, including research and the fact that a large research university has professional, undergraduate and graduate students. Educating a professional student is not the same as educating an undergraduate, in terms of the intensity of effort required. None of that is taken into account, so that simple universities with mostly undergraduates do well, but complex research universities suffer. In that budget, Oakland would have gotten about a 30% increase in their appropriation but Wayne would have gotten a 5.7% decrease (about \$11 million dollars). The reaction to proposal was not very positive. The House went back and did something a little tricky. They created a Plan B that moved things

around a bit so that fewer universities were affected, so that they could get the support of many of their colleagues who had universities in their districts that were going to be cut. In this revised House plan, only two universities are cut: the University Michigan and Wayne State. The good news is that the cut is less for Wayne State than the initial version—4% instead of 5.7%. That's still a significant amount of funding decrease for us. University of Michigan was cut something like 11%--a huge cut for them. The university has been working hard to make sure that this does not get through. The House is in a meeting as we're talking, so we'll know something later this afternoon. Despite some initial reluctance, MASU (the Michigan Association of State Universities) has weighed in, writing a fairly strong letter saying that all 15 public universities believe that all universities should have an increase in appropriation and no university should have a decrease. In essence, it was against Plan B without calling it out. President Wilson noted that he had talked to business leaders for Michigan who are supportive. Plan B will likely not be successful but it is very political so one never knows. We have been using our Republican politician on the board, Terri Lynn Land, to talk to her colleagues and to see if she can influence this. The Senate has not come out with their version yet, but they're not accepting what the House has laid out. We probably are okay, but it's a slippery slope. Even those institutions who might do well this year would face problems if the legislature changes, and the seesaw based on who is in control and their political affiliations and views on higher ed is problematic. There is clearly a hostile attitude toward higher ed amongst some of the legislature. Luckily, because of term limits, that changes quickly.

Obviously, the State appropriation will affect our fiscal year '22 budget. The two big drivers of that budget are the State support and tuition. We have a discussion with the Board of Governors and probably take a vote on tuition in late June. With those two things up in the air, President Wilson acknowledge, there is little more to say on the budget.

President Wilson concluded by noting that this has been a tough year for everyone and his appreciation for faculty and staff flexibility. People have stepped up and mastered alternative ways of doing things, whether it's meeting or staying engaged or teaching classes. In the long run, that is going to be to our benefit even once the pandemic is no longer with us. The fact that we've been able to learn how to do things differently will be beneficial for how we operate in the future.

President Wilson agreed to take a few questions. Brad Roth congratulated the President on the progress of the Social Justice Action Committee in creating the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council. He spoke to the role of the Senate with respect to how policy decisions go forward from here. The Senate passed a resolution a couple of months ago on this point. It stated first of all our strong support for all of the goals that have been articulated regarding diversity and secondly that the crucial element of implementation needs to take into account consultation with the Senate and the provisions of the Board of Governors statutes, which clearly establishes our role with respect to the implementation of policy changes in the educational realm. Roth asked for Wilson's view of how that referral of recommendations to the Senate would take place going forward on these kinds of matters and the significance of the Senate as a partner in going forward on

these issues. Roth noted that it is very important that those who are in a position to perform and understand how these things happen in the university are part of the process of determining how these kinds of ideas end up being put forward as actual policies.

President Wilson responded that he appreciated Brad's question. He had neglected to mention that the social justice committee has come out with its recommendations that have been posted on the web and prioritized. Some of them require significant funding and will not be begun immediately. Regarding the specific issue of the DEI Council in the Senate resolution, Wilson noted that he did not see anything in the resolution at all that he disagreed with in terms of how the Academic Senate and the DEI council would function. The DEI council is envisioned as an umbrella organization which will get input from students, staff and faculty. Wilson is pleased that the Academic Senate will have its own standing DEI committee. The DEI Council itself is more of an umbrella organization.

Charles Parrish followed up with another question, noting that the President appointed social justice committees with more than 100 people and fewer than 12 or 14 faculty. There was no consultation with the Academic Senate on that. Further, as Linda has pointed out, President Wilson has cancelled the quarterly one-on-ones with the Senate President and has held only one of the two committed joint meetings between Policy and the Cabinet. The message that sends it contempt for the body that the Board of Governors set up for consultation.

President Wilson took issue with both of Parrish's points. As to the makeup of the Social Justice Action Committee, it is a huge

group. There are members of the Academic Senate on each of the smaller groups, and the Senate President serves as a member of the steering committee. The other groups are all working groups with various combinations of people: one of them had almost all staff, another had many students. It depended on the subject matter but it all came back to the main Social Justice Action Steering Committee for discussion. There was ample representation of Academic Senate on that.

As for the other thing, President Wilson said that he had not refused to do the meetings. What has happened is that Linda sent a letter requesting that he schedule the one-on-one meeting as well as the second meeting of the Policy Committee and Cabinet. Wilson responded that he would want the Provost to meet with him and the Senate President, and invited Linda to include her Vice Chair as well, if she wished. He indicated that he thought it was appropriate that the meeting include the Provost and Vice Chair rather than just the President and Senate President.

Parrish asked Wilson why he believes that he should pick the representatives of the Senate rather than the Senate selecting its own representatives, as in the request for representative on the Social Justice Action Committees. Wilson indicated that he asked the President of the Academic Senate to provide names.

Beale indicated that it might be helpful if she spoke at this point. She noted that the agreement made between her and President Wilson last year was to have quarterly one-on-one meetings, and the President also committed to having one joint meeting per semester of Policy with whomever the President wished from his executive cabinet. Beale emailed the President well past the midpoint of the semester after he had made no arrangement for an additional one-on-one

meeting, asking to hold that one-on-one meeting and reminding him also of the need for the Policy and Executive Cabinet joint meeting. Instead, Wilson indicated he would not hold the one-on-one but would add the Interim Provost (and, if Beale wanted, the Senate Vice Chair). Beale responded to that email to say that she did not think that either should breach the earlier agreement to hold regular one-on-one meetings. Wilson responded to that email that he was holding firm on not having it as a one-on-one meeting. There's a reason that a one-on-one meeting with the Senate President is important. First, it shows understanding and respect by the university President of the Academic Senate President's role. Second, the Senate President meets with the Provost weekly through policy and bi-weekly one-on-one, so there is already ample communication with the Provost. Third, it allows a private conversation that can go into topics that might not otherwise be dealt with: it is an opportunity to collaborate and talk frankly with each other. Beale noted that another reason for finding that addition inappropriate was the way the single joint meeting of Policy with the Executive Cabinet members was conducted: the administrative agenda, supposedly scheduled for half of the meeting, ended up being more or less a "show and tell" of data that we had just talked at length about with the Provost at our Monday Policy meeting. From Beale's perspective, that was not a positive way to hold the meeting. What should happen in the one-on-one sessions is open discussion about issues, knowing that they're not being recorded, that it's between us and that we can maybe deal with bridging some of the chasms that have been created by the tendency to disregard Senate issues.

President Wilson responded that he disagreed with most of what Beale had to

say. Beale suggested that they talk about these issues later.

Jenn Stockdill thanked President Wilson for attending the Senate meeting. She indicated that she would like his thoughts on coming to the faculty through the Senate earlier on ideas and plans for change. Generally, a major change is made and faculty find out about it two weeks before it is going to be implemented. Faculty have many ideas for making it work better and often many reasons why the current strategy will likely end in disaster. But we are simply told it is too late because it is already decided. So many things have been made either more obnoxious or worse or dysfunctional because of this pattern of high-level decision making without input from people below. For example, right after I came to Wayne, Travel Wayne was implemented. They held a meeting with the chemistry department. We had many questions, and they simply responded, "yeah, those are going to be problems." It was too late to fix it. Another example is the issue of holistic admissions, which is an admirable goal but took place without the appropriate planning. By the time the presentation was made to the Academic Senate, the system was already live. Nevertheless, they didn't have a plan in place for many critical issues. If they had come earlier, when the policy was developing, they could have benefited from the faculty's insight. The reason faculty are hired is because of our creativity, our problem-solving skills, our ability to see things and analyze them. These are skills that are not necessarily limited to our field of expertise. It is frustrating when major changes come that are expensive and mess everything up. We lose our excellent staff who we need, as in the mess of HR reorganization. And all we are told is that it is too late. If administrators had come and gotten ideas at an early stage by saying that

they are looking at these options and asking what our thoughts are, there could be a better solution with that kind of feedback.

Wilson responded that he understands Stockdill's point and will talk to his Cabinet to reinforce that message. In terms of the holistic admissions, he believes that was dictated by the circumstances of no longer using standardized tests. That was something that we didn't much choice about.

Stockdill responded that the problem with the admissions change was in the implementation of the software and what kind of questions they were asking the students. Chemistry has been doing holistic grad admissions for over a decade and has experience on how to evaluate a student without test scores. To do that well, you have to specific questions on the application and provide detailed instruction, which the university did not do in this instance. Even though it had to be implemented quickly, if the staff had held meetings with the faculty and Senate a month or six weeks earlier, they could have changed the application system. Instead, they came to tell us what they had done when it was already live. That is useless.

President Wilson noted that he was not familiar with how the admissions process was developed, but did agree as a general philosophy with what Stockdill espoused. He will talk to the members of the Cabinet to reinforce that throughout the organization.

Provost Clabo noted that the Senate was running 20 minutes late. President Beale suggested that Wilson take the last question from renée hoogland, the only remaining hand up.

hoogland noted the timeline set out for the strategic planning steering group. She

understands that the timeline is set to have a plan in place immediately upon the expiration of the existing plan, but thinks that is an insufficient reason for putting such critical planning over the summer and at the end of a truly difficult year. The world won't end at that moment. In the same vein as comments made previously, it's crucial – at this moment when everything is chaotic and it is uncertain what the fall semester will be like—to consult broadly and across many groups below the higher administration about the plans that will be put in place. Hoogland noted that she tends to be a pragmatist: in her experience, having support from all the stakeholders for the plans to be implemented provides a much better chance of being successful. As Jenn just said, there's a lot of frustration among faculty. It is “now we have to do this, but we weren't informed about this and nobody asked us if this is a good idea.” The strategic planning moment is precisely a beautiful opportunity to make sure that the people on the shop floor are consulted about everything that is being developed within the larger framework. As you just said that you endorse that kind of philosophy, this is a perfect opportunity to put that philosophy to practice and show it is a sound one.

President Wilson noted that there was a town hall on the Strategic Planning process about a month ago and the process started with the Board before that. Typically, eight or nine months is enough time for strategic planning. Unlike the last time we did the plan, we have a different Board and they have different expectations. One of the expectations is that they are very involved, so we started off with a Board retreat early in the year. The timeline is dictated by them, in that they want a new plan finished by the end of the year. Wilson noted that he does not necessarily agree that the plan is the Boards, but rather thinks it should be within

the organization. Therefore, the administration is trying to implement the Board's wishes. He finds the new Board's activism not necessarily appropriate, but it is better to have them wanting to help rather than the alternative, as in the past. The Board Chair puts a lot of effort into making sure the Board is working together, but the downside of that they are much more involved in things that are traditionally in the purview of either administration or faculty.

President Wilson excused himself to attend to matters before the budget meeting of the Board, wishing the Senate a good next year, hopefully on campus. He encouraged all to get vaccinated if not already and to fill out the survey.

Beale thanked the President for coming and the meeting adjourned at 3:55 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,



Linda M. Beale
President, Academic Senate