

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ACADEMIC SENATE

Official Proceedings

April 5, 2023

Members Present: Mark Kornbluh, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Linda Beale, President, Academic Senate; Heather Abraham; Mohammed Al Hallak; Suresh Balasubramanian; Joan Beaudoin; Juliann Binienda; Pynthia Caffee; Stephen Calkins; Fernando Charro; Stephanie Chastain; Wei Chen; Chris Collins; Erin Comartin; Damecia Donahue; Paul Dubinsky; Sujay Dutta; David Edelman; Jessika Edgar; Brian Edwards; Erica Edwards; Jane Fitzgibbon; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Haidong Gu; Robert Harr; Marisa Henderson; renee hoogland; Michael Horn; Arun Iyer; Christine Jackson; Satinder Kaur; Pramod Khosla; Christine Knapp; Nasser Lakkis; Jennifer Lewis; Abhijit Majumder; Cynthera McNeill; Georgia Michalopoulou; Bharati Mitra; Ramzi Mohammad; David Moss; Gamal Mostafa; Lisa O'Donnell; Rachel Pawlowski; Gil Paz; Richard Pineau; Tamme Quinn-Grzebyk; Shauna Reever; Robert Reynolds; Joseph Roche; Noreen Rossi; Brad Roth; Ali Salamey; Bo Shen; Gina Shreve; Naida Simon; Cheryl Somers; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Wassim Tarraf; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Le Yi Wang; Jeffery Withey; Kai Yang

Members Absent with Notice: Nicole Audritsh; Alan Dombkowski; Barbara Jones; Cynthia Merritt; Shane Perrine; Stephanie Tong

Members Absent: Shelly Jo Kraft; Carol Miller; Sean Peters; Jennifer Stockdill; Hossein Yarandi

Guests: Amanda Bryant-Friedrich; Brelanda Mandija; Dave Massaron; Laura Lynch; Sarah Schrag; Karin Tarpensing

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the proceedings of the Academic Senate plenary session of March 1, 2023. PASSED.

II. ELECTION OF THE 2023-24 ACADEMIC SENATE PRESIDENT

The election of the Academic Senate president was held, and Simon (University Advising Center) announced the single nomination of Linda Beale who was elected by vote by acclamation.

III. FY 2024 BUDGET PRESENTATION

Massaron (VP and CFO) and Mandija (Sr. Dir., Budget and Planning) joined the Senate plenary to discuss the FY 2024 budget. The current budget process requires a series of hearings by the Budget Planning Council, made up of a cross-section of administration, faculty and staff. Last year we kept the budgets of units stable, so this year the process focused on prioritizing budgetary allocations since our projected revenues require that some harder decisions likely must be made. There will be continuing discussion as information becomes more certain regarding enrollments and state funding. The Board of Governors (BOG) will vote on the medical school tuition rate at its April 28 meeting, as well as the dining rates. Housing rates will not be voted on because our contract with the private vendor accepts increases in housing set by a committee so long as they do not exceed 3%. It is hoped that the university's budget and tuition rates at other schools/colleges can be set at the June Board meeting this year.

Audited financial results from FY 2022 have been shared with the Senate Budget Committee and will be presented to the BOG at the April meeting. The total net position increased by \$7.3 million, largely driven by vacancies across the board, particularly on the facility side. Gross student tuition and fees were down \$5.4 million. Our investment income was better last year, though it will be worse this year based on recent market trends. Our contracts and grants were up marginally, and our department activities increased marginally. Inflation has increased our expenses by 15.7% overall compared to the year before. Revenues come almost entirely from tuition, fees and state appropriations. Expenses include compensation, other expenses (generally research related), financial aid (a significant and growing piece of our overall expenditures) and facilities costs. Because 92% of our revenue is tuition and state appropriations, our ability to control money coming in is relatively limited. The state's historic disinvestment in education—and, in particular, in Wayne State University—has created significant pressure on us financially, resulting in the need to raise tuition and fees to cover more of our expenses and an overall decline in our position. If the state had increased its appropriation for us by a simple inflation factor from the 2011 budget, we would have \$135 million more from the state today, and many fewer financial problems to address. The state has typically imposed a tuition cap in recent years: this year, the governor's proposal includes a 4.5% tuition cap. We use that as an analytical tool to explain to ourselves and to the Board the bounds of our ability to generate tuition revenue.

Massaron discussed enrollment decline and the demographic realities. National enrollment trends, as

well as projections of high school grads, are bleak. Not only are there fewer high-school graduates, but Pew Research recently showed that a majority of Americans now believe that people are not better off with a college education. Higher education has some work to do to convince the general population of the value that we all know is associated with higher education. That is a continuing challenge, which was apparent in our research on students who were admitted but did not choose to attend. Our biggest competitors are U-M and MSU, and our next biggest competitor is “none of the above”. We must understand that category. The Wayne State Guarantee does not result in much higher expenditures, since it builds on the state’s support for higher education, but it is intended to change student perceptions about the expense of college. They need to know when they look at the total cost calculator on our website that the majority of Michigan students will not pay the amount indicated. In fact, more than half of Michigan’s high school graduates could attend here for free if they fill out the FAFSA.

Massaron shared several slides to show potential results depending on the amount of tuition increases. If there were no changes in tuition rates or enrollments, the university would show a deficit for the year of \$8 million. Massaron explained the power of compounding: a 0% tuition increase in one year sticks for the rest of time because the university loses the ability to benefit from any compounding effect. The slides show results with a 4.5% tuition increase, but Massaron believes it unlikely that the BOG will approve such an increase. That slide simply shows the maximum impact on our students given the progressive way we handle financial aid. Pell-eligible students would see very little increase compared to the general population of our students, which is about 48%. Even with that maximum tuition increase, more than 50% of our students would pay only \$160 more per year. We are limited in our ability to generate revenue from our undergraduate tuition, because an increase in tuition results in an increase in undergraduate financial aid. There has been significant growth of our financial aid budget from 2018 to 2023. For that reason, the provost and schools/colleges, particularly the College of Engineering, have been working to recruit more international students for master's programs and students in undergraduate programs where there is more flexibility to generate marginal revenue.

The competitive and dynamic environment is another

limiting factor on our ability to generate additional tuition. If we increase the number of students here with the efforts that all of us have made—particularly faculty and academic staff around student success, there are additional pressures for people and resources. If we increase tuition, there are also additional pressures from our competitor institutions that compete to offer a higher education product at a lower cost. Overall, we are in a very competitive environment.

Where we stack up in terms of tuition and mandatory fees for 2023 is a byproduct that was not fully appreciated when we started to consider block tuition. It became evident as we worked through it that most of the other institutions in the state have block tuition. As a result, based on how we calculate the maximum credits people take, we appear more expensive. After the implementation of block tuition, we will drop below the median Michigan public university in tuition. It does not change our revenue picture; rather, it creates a more accurate comparison of our students' costs to other institutions, because other institutions already adopted flat rate tuition. We have instead shown a price assuming 15 credits because the statewide comparative standard is 15 credits. In effect, our comparative value has overstated our price. Although we will competitively drop below with flat rate tuition, our students will not necessarily feel a price cut. That is important to understand from the standpoint of competitive pressures. This is a long-term reality. No matter what happens, we know our revenues will not increase quickly, but our expenses will continue to climb. Our largest long-term expense is compensation because we are an institution that serves people with people, and that will continue to increase. Increases in financial aid are a necessity for an access institution. There is very little we can do on a short-term basis to reduce debt service, insurance, utilities and deferred maintenance. Senate members have inevitably felt the result of actions taken over the last three years such as hiring restrictions/reductions, position eliminations and increased utilization of one-time funds to support strategic initiatives.

Another challenge has been the unexpected problem of discovering negative base budgets—i.e., units spending more than their budgetary allocation, sometimes year after year. This has generally been remedied, but it is a problem that will be difficult to fix in the School of Medicine. As an example, for an end-of-year budget with \$2 million left in expenses to be paid, standard best practice accounting would be to report a \$2 million

deficit. Instead, what happened here is that schools/colleges simply carried forward the negative \$2 million to their budget for the next year. In effect, they were bringing expenses across a line, which is not standard accounting practice and there are arguments about whether or not it is appropriate. We will fix this in the upcoming budget, but it created another pressure on the overall financial picture of the institution. The goal now is to deal with the problem with transparency. There has been underinvestment in our BAO resources and our financial officers in schools/colleges. We bring people in with no understanding of our systems and provide little training, support or help in understanding metrics. Therefore, more investment will be made in these offices. This will not fully fix the School of Medicine because it has its own special set of budget issues that must be dealt with as it moves forward.

There are some challenges ahead that include \$3 million in negative impact from FY 2023 in what is estimated from enrollment. Massaron pointed to the concerted efforts for increased enrollment by the provost and VP Ahmad Ezzeddine: if those efforts pay off, it could be a net positive. We are seeing some indications that enrollment may be somewhat better than estimated. As an institution, we rely on Institutional Research to give us the data and try to avoid basing it on anecdotal evidence or individual pieces of data. We are expecting some higher inflationary increases in unavoidable expenses (i.e., insurance and utilities). We must grapple with the School of Medicine debt as it comes online, but will delay that as long as possible and use the state money so that we can push that problem forward.

As noted earlier, a 4.5% tuition increase is unlikely, but it would result in \$16.2 million in additional revenue to help close the budget gap. \$16.2 million in the general fund is equivalent to about 165 positions. Compensation and benefits compose 90% of what can be cut. A five-year projection will be rolled out as better data becomes available. With the assumptions we have here, the deficit will range from \$12 to \$21 million. This assumes a delay in some additional spending, based on the Budget Planning Council's meetings. Compensation alone is \$12 million of the deficit and \$6 million is the FY 2023 structural deficit—a result of last year's budget deficit. When you start \$6 million behind, it has a reverse compounding effect. That \$18 million is difficult for us to impact. For the additional \$17 million in 'other expense increases', there are some categorical things that can be considered: the timing of starting a new capital

campaign with the new president coming in; reconsideration of some of the other proposed investments; delay of some of the costs associated with the School of Medicine debt in terms of when the money is needed for the new construction.

To minimize that deficit, we must address the long-avoided issue of vacant positions across the institution and how we handle hiring for new positions. This is not a secret: there is communication going out about the requirement of all new hires to be approved by the Financial Stability Committee, comprised of Massaron, Provost Kornbluh, Carolyn Hafner (AVP, Chief HR Officer) and Boris Baltes (AVP), in order to plan over the next few years and ensure we are being strategic about where hiring decisions are made to allow us to grow in a way that is consistent with our strategic plan.

For housing, we are trying to stay as close to 0% as possible. Our occupancy is in the mid-60s to low-70s (depending on whether it is measured by people or rooms). Our consultants are reviewing the most recent Corvias proposal: 0% across the board; 2% in Anthony Wayne Drive; 4% in University Towers. To stay close to zero, we need to drive occupancy. With occupancy, we drive life back to campus which creates a different picture for future enrollment efforts and a different picture for our campus overall.

There are two problems with dining: i) a service issue that has become more acute, and ii) a cost issue coupled with volume and demand issues. We have been able to push dining increases under 5% but likely cannot get much lower. Long-term, we must consider student input, our dining options, how we offer it and how to be innovative. It is a different world now than it was pre-pandemic on campus and people's utilization of the offerings we have on campus are significantly less—i.e., a count of people entering and leaving the Student Center was about half of what it was prior to the pandemic. Obviously, our enrollment is not half, but if we have 50% fewer people going in and out of the Student Center, there is a different economic footprint with which our food service provider must grapple. As a result, we have to think innovatively about how we deliver offerings that bring people here and serve the people that are here.

Lewis (Education) asked whether these slides could be shared with units. Massaron agreed to share them with a clear disclaimer that the Board has not signed off on

4.5% and the administration has not yet made a recommendation. Again, the presentation is for analytical purposes with a high-level understanding because it is early in the process. There will be significant input through the Budget Planning Council, on which several members of the Academic Senate serve, and he does not want to get ahead of them because that body has significant input on what is proposed. Units must understand this information is not a final decision.

Somers (Education) questioned the pervasiveness of the negative base budgeting across campus. Massaron confirmed it was in almost every academic unit. Most likely, after one BAO did it, people decided this was a way to slowly work through a cut. To be fair, when a unit has cut after cut put forward by deans that must be achieved to meet budget, it takes time to achieve. People likely saw negative base budgets as a mechanism to work towards that, but over time it got out of control. While this is unique, the idea of seeking ways to mitigate or increase the length of time before you make a cut is not at all unique. Usually what happens in institutions is units use one-time funds to deal with issues at first, but that was not what happened here. Someone may have an agreed-upon operational cut that is not made for two years, but usually that is done by utilizing funds set aside. The cut is not done until the one-time funds are gone. Here it was a slightly different methodology. They have dealt with it, and it should not have a tremendous impact, but it exacerbates a continuing problem that must be addressed, particularly as they work through the accreditation process with the School of Medicine going forward. There needs to be a strategic budgeting process that mirrors their strategic plan and wise use of the different sources of revenue that the School of Medicine has to get to the other side of the picture. The School of Medicine in particular is concerning because there is not significant cushion there.

Somers noted the confusion balancing that with carryforward conversations. She also asked how the Financial Stability Committee would balance decisions with vetting already done with the deans regarding positions. Massaron was hopeful it would not slow hiring down but rather ensure a more robust conversation about the filling of a vacancy and the future of an entity. For example, if a college had a particular program that was not growing and there was a vacancy, and they had another program that was growing, are the dean and the faculty working together to think about

where that line belongs in five or ten years and how to mitigate the short-term impact? A tenured faculty line is a multi-decade marriage the institution has to that person and to that program. He and the provost are hopeful this creates more conversation and thought around that. For example, the Budget Planning Council often gets good questions from the Academic Senate president, just as at Board meetings where she raises questions to ascertain why certain consultant contracts are necessary. Those questions force the institution to grapple with the issues raised. That is part of what this process is trying to do. Another purpose is to ensure that the provost and Massaron are aware of raises that people are contemplating at both the staff and administrator level. There are various positions across the institution that are either overpaid or underpaid when a market analysis is done. In a resource-constrained environment, people often will make less than the market rate. In particular positions, such as IT, the private industry pays much more than the university. That requires thoughtfulness about market-based adjustments to ensure equity across units and awareness of the follow-on impact. Decisions for a raise are often made at a micro-level, but they have an impact across the institution. For example, a director may be given a large raise when there are 15 other similar directors in that unit. As time goes by, another director comes in, resulting in a similarly large raise. The goal is to have more visibility into that process to help constrain costs.

Pawlowski (Honors) raised a concern about the Aramark contract, especially with the discussion around service and low recruitment. She has seen students tell potential students that the food here is terrible. She also pointed out the poor experiences with Aramark service at recruitment events. Massaron explained that when we restarted this fall, Aramark struggled in quality and service: they have gotten better, but they are still not where they need to be on the catering side. There is a national search for a new individual who will head housing, dining, and have a skillset around conferences and better utilization of our assets. Campus is empty at times, and there are some valuable assets that we think people might want to use, but we do not have someone with that skillset who can help us make use of the assets. We are hoping to find someone who can do that. In the meantime, his deputy has been managing this along with the housing side, and they have been pushing to have better service, to implement the KPIs of the contract (which they have not) and to do benchmarking. Aramark complains that the numbers are bad at the Starbucks in

the Student Center, but Massaron noted that he does not visit that Starbucks unless he has time to spare—it takes much longer than any other Starbucks, and that is a function of Aramark's management driving down the numbers. When the contract is up in about a year, we have to grapple with the fact that there is debt that Aramark carries that will have to be picked up by somebody with the commercial kitchen and usual residences. Our volume is down 1000 to 1500 fewer meal plans. We need to figure out how to make the catering system function in a way that works for the campus and how to provide service with a lower participation rate. Innovation is necessary because students utilize the cafeteria very differently post-pandemic than they did prior to it (i.e., in the spacing and types of offerings). He suggested rethinking the cafeteria at the Towers residences and, at some point, breaking off the new space that was built to create more student-centered space to drive this traffic into the general area of the Student Center. When you walk through the Student Center, often the tables are full with students and staff. If we can drive more people there, we can drive better utilization. He hopes the new hire will focus on this. In the meantime, we will push Aramark over the next year to do better. He suggested the need to see what else the marketplace can offer. The last time we went out to bid, we only got one response. It is unclear if that was because of market talk or the reality of who we were.

In reference to the statement about most Americans doubting the value of higher education, Edwards (Medicine) shared that his wife works at the University of Windsor. In reviewing information from a recent open house, he learned their engineering college is advertising that 92% of their graduates are employed within six months. He questioned if those numbers are available for every college program at Wayne State. Hopefully, they are reasonably decent for most groups because that is the fundamental concept of value for money. Secondly, has anybody here evaluated the impact of the revolution in artificial intelligence (AI) on the programs we offer? He has read that it will eliminate jobs in certain areas that are involved in doing routine prose. He believes that is a factor looming over some of our programs, essentially eliminating jobs for graduates. Do we have a valuation of the employment of the graduates in that program? If it is good news, that is what we want to advertise. Massaron explained they do compile that information. For example, it is part of the ranking and accreditation system of the law school. For other schools/colleges, it is

less visible, so marketing has highlighted recent graduates from various schools and colleges in an effort to connect the value of that education to a human.

Beale pointed out that an ad hoc Academic Senate subcommittee on AI that has been charged to look into all the aspects of how AI affects our educational process, both in terms of students who might plagiarize by using a ChatGPT to answer on an exam or an essay, and in terms of how it can be used productively in classes. Pineau (CLAS) is chairing the subcommittee which includes various Senate members, and they are working towards a recommendation that would come to Policy and be shared with the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee and the Student Affairs Committee. She encouraged Senate members to review the Policy minutes from November regarding these concerns and potential opportunities, as well as questioning where we should have academic policy and where we require statements to ensure academic integrity from the student conduct perspective. There are many issues involved in this question and Senate members, as faculty, should be thinking about these issues, including mention of this on the syllabus. As for opportunity, Massaron noted a vendor pitched the idea of integrating AI into enrollment. There was a study that showed salespeople did 30 to 40% better when they used AI to help craft their answers, and there are already companies popping up around the idea. For enrollment purposes, when students ask X or Y, you could increase the efficacy of your response by relying on this to draft that response. Like most new technological developments, there are both positives and negatives with AI.

Edwards asked whether there is currently a unit at Wayne State that helps students find jobs. Massaron confirmed there are certain units within schools and colleges that do that as well as Career Services that reports to the provost.

Edgar (CFPCA) commented on enrollment and the cyclical demand for courses, degrees and fields. Regarding the Financial Stability Committee and the decisions made for how things are supported or funded, she questioned if there was consideration for the impact of disinvestment in particular divisions. In the Department of Art and Art History, she can speak to disinvestment in terms of facilities and equipment as well as faculty lines. That has directly impacted enrollment in classes. For example, she attended a

conference last week where people in her field talked about the pooriness of our facilities and questioned how they could send people to our program when we cannot support them adequately.

Massaron noted there has been substantial investment in HVAC and a new elevator in the art building. There is also substantial investment in financial aid for students in CFPCA, exceeding that available in other schools/colleges. Overall, that must be part of the conversation to make decisions. This is another reason why the Budget Planning Council is so important—it is the means of representation of academic input to ensure these matters are considered. Academic input from Senate faculty and academic staff, the provost and deans can help ensure decisions are well informed. There will be additional investments in facilities, but admittedly there is still a long way to go. There were some institutional decisions to build non-core facilities, which detracted from our ability to invest in core ones in the current world we are in.

Reynolds (Engineering) shared that he had recently attended an AI conference and described Chat GPT as being the tip of the iceberg. There was discussion about co-pilots, which can effectively be student teachers or assistant teachers, teaching an online class in the future. This is something down the road, but they are things we should be thinking about now because that will definitely be our competition for the future.

Massaron agreed. For example, DTE has invested heavily for a number of years in AI in their accounting system. They have, per transaction, about a third of the number of accountants that other industries have for the same type of work because it is all done through computers figuring out where to move the transactions. There is also a question about long-term careers and what people will do. We have had these kinds of existential crises throughout history, and there are always new things for humans to do. There is a disruptive period, and it is going to be real in our operations, which is why we are spending time trying to find the right financial analytical tools for the future.

Paz (CLAS) raised the issue of funding for future new programs. He had heard the MedDirect program was not initially funded, and questioned if a process is in place to ensure we can afford new programs when an administrator has programs they push. Massaron responded that this is an issue he and the provost discuss

frequently—and they agreed about the need to be careful. MedDirect has never been fully budgeted. That puts pressure on the financial aid office and otherwise. They are in the process of doing a program review to see the impacts, measure statistics and understand its efficacy, and whether or not it merits the investment it has gotten or whether or not that investment needs to be refined. He addressed similar questions around the Wayne Guarantee. By virtue of the finance legislation that the state put in place for scholarships, we have additional need-based financial aid available because we are required to maintain effort at what we spent the prior year for financial aid for students to be eligible for the state's \$5500. There are some students that are Pell-eligible and when they are provided need-based aid, they cannot use that entire \$5500, so there is additional money available. An outside consultant was hired to build a model to help us understand the impacts on our existing programs—i.e., the many different scholarship programs of Heart of Detroit and Detroit Promise are put into one model to understand what level of student would come here for free when including the state support, so we could draw a line where that would not have a significant marginal cost. While the Wayne Guarantee sounds like it will be expensive, it is largely being funded by virtue of the additional state scholarship dollars. This is an opportunity for us to better explain to people who may think they cannot afford to come here—it is likely to be free based on family income and assets. The idea is to try to break the cycle of losing potential students who think it is too expensive. The data showed a significant number of FTIACs that we have lost because of lack of understanding of the true cost of attendance at Wayne State. If there are concerns that this is a break-the-bank kind of program, 80% of the students that attend pursuant to this program are a net positive on a revenue basis. It is 100% budgeted both internally by the Office of Student Financial Aid, and externally by a nationwide consultant.

Donahue (University Libraries) thanked Massaron for the candor of his presentation. Based on the information presented, there seem to be opportunities for innovation and for the Senate to come together as a group to devise solutions to these issues. Are there any conversations about revisiting the master plan as it includes all of these changes? Massaron responded he does his best to try to make it as understandable as possible. He is a lawyer by trade, so part of the teaching of lawyers is that you have to learn to communicate. There is room for innovation and there is also one-time funding available to fund that

innovation. We are trying to be as quick acting as possible. For example, there is a new degree in engineering, and he does not know of any other institution that has been able to turn so quickly to offer a new program. That was in keeping with what the faculty of the college wanted. Even the dean said at his previous institution that would have taken five or six years to work through. The faculty has been a willing partner in this innovation, and we will fund it. There is a plan to revisit the master plan completed prior to the pandemic. Many offices and student areas are used differently than they were prior to the pandemic. The needs of students, faculty and staff are different, and all those things need to be revisited to update that master plan to make sure the investments we had planned still make sense. We need to revisit some of the space needs and reconsider some of the moves that were going to be made across campus. There will not be individual offices for team members that come in only two or three days a week. We must consider more efficient ways to utilize space. He is aware that does not work across the board for faculty and staff, but he hopes we can have a meaningful conversation about what type of office space and classroom space we need. We may be able to reduce that footprint, given that a lot of facilities are not being used but still cost us for heat, drainage and electricity. As part of that master plan, he hopes to engage in a community conversation about what kind of space we think we need and what kind of space we will need into the future.

IV. GRADUATE TRANSFER CREDITS

Dean Bryant-Friedrich (Graduate School) presented a proposed revision to the graduate bulletin/transfer policy. The current language that is used in the policy and the proposed changes are as follows in bold:

Current Language ...The petition must be supported by a transcript showing a minimum grade of ‘B’ for the courses to be transferred; ‘B-minus’ **and credit earned with ‘S’ and ‘P’ (satisfactory or pass) grades are not acceptable for transfer....**

Proposed Change ...The petition must be supported by a transcript showing a minimum grade of ‘B’ for the courses to be transferred; ‘B-minus’ grades are not acceptable for transfer. **Ungraded courses, evaluated as “pass” or equivalent, may be transferred if approved and assigned ‘S’ credit by the departmental graduate director....**

During the COVID era, there were many programs that had to shift to using S and P, and we are now starting to see people seeking admission to Wayne State with those grades on their transcript. The proposed change here would allow ungraded courses evaluated as pass or equivalent to be transferred if approved and assigned an S credit by the departmental graduate director. There are several issues with the current policy including disadvantages to transfers students, less generous policy than competing transfer policies (which are B or above stipulations) and the increase in pass/fail coursework at institutions due to COVID. Advantages of the proposed revision include retaining graduate director oversight of transfer credit, which is important to ensure that students have the right coursework. No program is compelled to accept transfer credit, ungraded or otherwise. We make use of an existing mechanism here at Wayne State, and it does not impact the GPA of the student or require the termination of a letter grade for transfer purposes. Beale added that this replaces language that was different in two different places, so now it will be standard language in both of those places.

Harr (CLAS) suggested there be language that explains why this change is being made. Five years from now, departmental graduate advisors and directors will not remember this, and he anticipates this becoming a de facto policy. If a student receives a pass grade on something, it is just going to be transferred. Bryant-Friedrich believes people would go back to the minutes of this meeting to look for the reasons why, because the presentation will become a part of the minutes, and people will see that in the presentation we are doing this because of the change that happened with COVID.

hoogland questioned if this change will be permanent and not revisited once the effects of COVID subside. Bryant-Friedrich confirmed there is no plan to do that. It still allows the graduate program directors to have the final approval, which is very important, so there will be no need to change it.

Beale pointed out that was a key answer to part of Harr’s question: it is still under the departmental graduate directors to make that determination. Harr agreed, but graduate directors may not be aware of why they are doing that, and it may just become policy—we gave past students credit for a pass course, and we will just keep doing that. He does not believe anyone will be looking at the Academic Senate minutes because most of them do

not attend this meeting. Beale noted it is coming from the Graduate Council where it has been discussed and they do attend the Graduate Council meetings. Harr questioned if there would there be some language in a document that they will see that will explain why it is in there. From Bryant-Friedrich's experience, there has not been any kind of legacy language to explain why certain changes have been made. She is aware there is an issue with historical knowledge there, but there is not accompanying language in any of their documents. It is also in Graduate Council minutes. It is a bigger issue for people having to go back to minutes for historical information because most graduate program directors do not have time for that.

With a show of hands, the Academic Senate approved the resolution on proposed revisions on graduate transfer credits.

V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Beale reminded the Senate members to cast their votes for the member-at-large election if they have not done so already. The provost was not able to attend this meeting because he is in California celebrating his mother's birthday. There are a couple of issues that Policy has devoted considerable time to, and more details can be found in the proceedings of the Policy Committee. One issue that Policy has discussed for at least 18 months is the question of chartering centers and institutes. Often, we have centers that exist not because they have been chartered under the Board of Governors chartering statute, but because they are centers under a grant. Even for those centers, there is often a question whether they should apply for a charter. For example, often a center does interdisciplinary work and curricular work that brings in some general fund support—i.e., facilities are provided or people in different schools and colleges are involved in the center, existing courses are promoted, and similar issues. Policy tries to make sure that we are at least aware of what the situations are currently so that centers are appropriately chartered and reviewed in a timely manner. Too often, centers are essentially skating along without the appropriate reviews. One example that came up recently was whether the Center for Leadership in Environmental Awareness and Research (CLEAR), which is established under a grant and not chartered under the BOG statutes, could support a certificate by merely asking the Graduate Council to be the home of

the graduate certificate without any faculty of record that would have power over any future curricular changes or other faculty-based decisions normally handled in departments or non-departmentalized schools/colleges. The Policy Committee and Provost Kornbluh have argued that there should be a faculty of record behind any degree or certificate. The only other case we have of the Graduate School serving as the home of a degree or certificate was a degree that was created in the Medical School and somehow, under Ambika Mathur's graduate deanship, was moved to be a degree in a medical school specialty that is under the Graduate School. That seems particularly odd, since neither the Graduate Council nor Graduate School staff would be able to serve as faculty of record in making any updates to or determinations under that degree program. It is not clear how that was approved. Policy considers this an educational policy matter—i.e., we need to be clear how these policies work and what the procedures are so that we do not have, in essence, a rogue group of faculty saying "we're going to create a certificate" that the Graduate School approves without there being a faculty of record.

The other graduate issue under discussion for some time at both the Policy Committee and Graduate Council is graduate faculty status. Hopefully, there will be a new proposal from the Graduate Council, ideally one that makes the decision about such status and that is located in the departments and schools/colleges rather than the Graduate School.

There has been discussion about the Campus Safety Advisory Committee and the way it is set up and whether it satisfies the Michigan statute that is now around 30 years old. Policy has had these discussions internally, discussions with the members of that committee and discussions with our General Counsel and will continue working forward with that. We have General Counsel agreement and administrative agreement that we need to set up the elected group that the Michigan statute calls for and perhaps continue the larger umbrella group that would include others for informational purposes. The smaller elected group would receive complaints and undertake an investigatory process with the campus police as the Michigan statute requires.

Another issue that has concerned Policy and has resulted in lengthy discussions was the shooting at the MSU campus and the heightening of concerns about security. At the last Senate meeting, the provost mentioned that


we would have to speed up some of our security changes here, with the biggest one being the fact that so many buildings have different locking systems for the same building that make it difficult to coordinate whether doors are locked or open, depending on what is happening in terms of the event itself. U-M, MSU and our campus have all asked the state for additional funding to address those kinds of security issues, so we have got our fingers crossed on that.

The last significant issue under discussion was both the Wayne Online proposal presented at the last plenary and the question of whether we should have any policy parameters for what kinds of short courses can be used. Beale encouraged Senate members to read the proceedings, and to let her know via email if there are any questions about these and other issues she has mentioned.

It is likely that Senate members want to know about the presidential search. As a member of the committee, Beale can say very little about the search. They will be doing airport interviews soon and there is not yet a decision about whether a group of finalists will be able to meet with anyone beyond the search committee. She is pushing for that, but does not know what the result will be.

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Linda M. Beale
President, Academic Senate