

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
October 23, 2023

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; S. Chrisomalis; r. hoogland; P. Khosla; J. Lewis; B. Roth; S. Schrag; N. Simon

Absent with Notice: M. Kornbluh; N. Rossi

I. APPROVAL OF POLICY PROCEEDINGS AND PLANNING FOR NOVEMBER PLENARY

Linda Beale noted that she has begun including more summary statements in minutes of the Policy Committee so that Senate members will be encouraged to read the proceedings. In general, Policy's discussions with guests might be recorded more extensively, but internal discussions need not be transcripts but rather summaries of key points made. Under former Senate presidents there was very little detail provided on any discussions: clearly, we do not want to return to that sparse information since transparency is important.

Steve Chrisomalis agreed with Beale's points but noted that including some further information about Policy's discussion of the breakout results in the 10/23 proceedings would be useful, letting the members know that we see the value and will do again, though not likely at every meeting. The committees are where the primary work of the Senate gets done and where members are expected to raise issues they want addressed, but perhaps that point has not been made at plenary in a way that members have understood.

Beale noted that she mentions the importance of committees as the working groups of the Senate in most of her reports to the plenary. She joined the most recent FSST meeting where there was some discussion of how the FSST committee might serve to lead the discussion at the November plenary. Perhaps we can have various standing committees introduce a key item at various plenaries: we can leave it up to the committee to use small group discussions or some other form of moderated discussion.

renée hoogland found several things problematic in the last plenary discussion. First, a significant number of Senate members do not show up for the standing committee meetings yet complain that they do not have input. We try to make the standing committees a space where people can speak their minds and bring up issues. As chair of FAC, she shares the Policy Committee's charges to FAC with the committee but ultimately the committee deals with topics that members decide need to be discussed. Currently, a standing issue about faculty well-being is discussed at every meeting because that was something that came from the group. If people would take the standing committees more seriously, they would not feel unheard or uninvolved. Second, hoogland pointed out that the breakout session at the last plenary would have been more helpful if the outcomes had been discussed rather than items merely typed into the padlet by anyone attending. When hoogland does these activities in a class, there is always a general discussion immediately following that brings everything together. In this case, she and others were unable to access the padlet, so did not type comments nor see topics typed in. Third, there were a number of issues raised that were not Senate-related topics, such as people complaining about compensation.

Beale agreed that coming to standing committee meetings gives members a chance to have a voice. She described the standing committees and the plenary as a representational legislature like Congress: the standing committees do the detailed groundwork and bring recommendations

either to other committees or to the Policy Committee and then items go to plenary for a final resolution. There can be changes to those recommendations at the plenary discussion. That is why we have reserved the top two rows of seating for guests/liaisons with the Senate members sitting forward. Those in the reserved two rows are like the gallery at Congress, and the Senate members are like congressional members. For Gen Ed reform, we had a robust discussion in the Senate plenary with changes to the resolution as moved and supported by members, even though the resolution under discussion was a recommendation from CIC. If members want to recommend changes to a draft resolution that has come through any standing committee, they can propose amendments, and there should be a robust discussion. Breakout sessions are one of the ways to encourage that on some topics. Perhaps if we have standing committees lead discussions around a core presentation at some plenaries—whether they do it as a breakout session or however they want to moderate the discussion—that will help because every member is a member of one of those standing committees, and it could help give that sense of voice.

Brad Roth supported having FSST take the lead at the November plenary. He noted that we have inherited a plenary structure that resembles high school mandatory assemblies and does not lend itself to Senate members feeling invested. Having small group conversations in connection with presentations can surface considerations that may not arise otherwise, since not everything gets replicated in the work of the committees.

Beale will meet with FSST chair Gina Shreve again to discuss this further. It depends on members of the FSST committee, but she may be willing to do as small groups with each member of the committee reporting two or three key issues that came out of the small group that they led and FP&M AVP Rob Davenport responding. That will require more time being set aside for the full discussion.

Jennifer Lewis argued for retaining much more detail about Policy discussions in the proceedings. She did not understand Beale's distinction between discussions with guests and internal Policy discussions: she stated it is important to name each Policy member and what is said, such as Chrisomalis's points in favor of breakouts and Pramod Khosla's about its use at a CLAS faculty council meeting. Chrisomalis supported adding a little more information in this case so that members who read the proceedings see that we reviewed the outcome of the session. Lewis also said it was important to include her suggestion that the padlet results be shared with the whole plenary: she said that the way she uses a padlet is to gather the ideas, group them by theme, and then send that version out to be addressed in the future. Beale indicated that she had already planned to distribute the categorized document of padlet statements with the next plenary agenda and address it in the president's report. Lewis noted CIC will meet Wednesday and consider whether the themes on the padlet reflect what each CIC member captured in their groups. Beale noted the Word document with categories includes every statement from the padlet, with some bullet points from the padlet in multiple places: for example, when a comment mentions both academic staff and faculty, it is included under both categories.

II. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Draft of Campus Climate Survey: At the last meeting of the Policy Committee, Loreleigh Keashly (CFPCA) agreed to share a draft of the survey; however, she informed Beale that they are now having trouble with the vendor. Once Keashly works this out with the vendor, she will share a draft with Policy.

Chief of Staff/University Relations Officer search: The president has established a search committee for a chief of staff/university relations officer to become head of various areas (i.e., marketing and communication, government relations, and Board of Governors relationship). It is a small search group, apparently with Beale as the only tenured faculty member who is not an

administrator. A search firm has been hired and the president wants a quick search. Members suggested Beale request that at least one more faculty member, selected by Senate or Provost, be added to the committee.

Awards and nominations: An email from the Office of Faculty Affairs and Development regarding yearly awards cycle deadlines went out this week (i.e., Distinguished Faculty nominations, Excellence in Teaching nominations, Gen Ed Teaching Award). Beale asked why the GEOC committee has been designated to decide who gets a teaching award. Hoogland explained they want people to teach Gen Ed classes with enthusiasm because they are difficult classes to teach. Recipients are awarded \$500 towards professional development. Beale asked about the review process. Khosla explained it is an ad hoc GEOC group of volunteers who meet to discuss the applications. He was on the group last year, for which there were six or seven nominations. He noted learning that a person has received a specific award is meaningless unless there is adequate context.

Beale suggested one of the topics Policy might discuss at some point is whether there is a better way to do these different awards rather than having numerous small committees' nomination processes. Having only six nominees seems problematic. We ought to discuss making these awards more meaningful with more monetary or university recognition. Perhaps if there was a more centralized awards committee process and recognition, there would be more nominations, with the result incentivizing more of what we are trying to incentivize by having an award.

Call for proposals: Beale pointed out the call for FIGs, learning community and living and learning community proposals; but she noted there had been no further discussion of the Wayne Experience (WE) requirement. WE was only suspended for one-year, so a change to the BOG statute and Gen Ed requirements is needed to deal with the WE requirement, or it will be automatically reinstated. This is an issue that likely first needs to be raised with Faculty Affairs AVP Darin Ellis. Lewis shared that U-M advisers teach many sections of their first-year experience course: upper-class students design the course, which apparently works well. Hoogland noted the FIGs will continue to replace a first-year experience course: although they are quite different from the WE course, they help students create community and make friends. Unfortunately, there were significant problems for the fall term. Her FIGs were canceled because the department's academic advisors did not know about them or recommend students to sign up for them. Further, the sign-up system only opened after orientation, so almost every student had already filled their course schedules. FAC had a conversation with Academic Affairs associate director Kelly Dormer at their last meeting who conceded that the university had reserved too many holds (for ten students rather than five).

Funding: Although this is something that would come primarily to the Budget Committee, Beale thought Policy would be interested to know she has asked CFO Dave Massaron how we fund items such as presidentially appointed committees or commissions. One example is the President's Committee on Environmental Sustainability which is chaired by Elana Past (CLAS) and has faculty appointees and spends on various events. Beale suggested that most of these should have representatives selected by the Senate (like Article XXX committees) rather than by the administration.

Roth shared his concern about bringing things within the Senate's jurisdiction so that we have to recruit more and more faculty and academic staff to devote time to different things. There is a real risk of draining energy and going to the same people. More Senate representation may drive us into a hole. Beale responded that Senate-selected representatives do not have to be Senate members, and faculty and staff are already being appointed to these groups by administrators rather than the Senate. Further, changing the bylaws to enlarge the Senate would provide more Senate members who can be appointed as representatives. When she was at Illinois, there were

14 standing committees to do the work of the Senate, and we have about half that many. This is something to think about as we try to work through bylaws revisions, which ideally should be done by January or February. She would appreciate any volunteers to help her with these revisions.

Panel on campus speech: The panel on campus speech with Roth, Jonathan Weinberg (Law) and Nancy Cantalupo (Law) will be held on November 1 from 12:30 to 1:30 in the Student Center. Beale asked whether there will be a simulcast function so it can be watched in the Bernath Auditorium before the plenary. That would be helpful since free speech has been a recurring topic of discussion. Roth agreed it might be a good idea to have something more than just the small venue and will make that suggestion to the organizer.

IPEDS: Beale shared with Policy the IPEDS academic workforce chart on the trends in tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, non-teaching faculty and non-tenure-track faculty from fall 2002 to 2021. Chrisomalis wanted more data after reading it because the raw numbers were not provided. These increases are well known in R2 and R3 institutions. Is it because R1s/R2s are expanding doctoral programs? Beale noted the chart itself is revealing. The top line is part-time faculty at 48.47%, and the next line down is tenured, which is continuing faculty from earlier times, at 23.63%. The next darker line is non-tenure-track (teaching faculty) at 12.55%—a definite upward incline, whereas tenured is a downward incline. The tenure-track non-tenured (assistant professors that are on a tenure-track) is also on a downward incline. The line for no-tenure-system-whatsoever is fairly flat at 6.58%. By appointment-type percentage of total headcount, it is 61% part time and non-tenure-track, and if you added in the no-tenure-system-whatsoever faculty, which is an even lower level of instructor, then it is 67.6%. It is a clear downward trend for tenured and tenure-track faculty.

Danielle Aubert pointed out there is a higher education policy committee in the Michigan legislature now. They just had a meeting with the union statewide, talking about top priority issues: they need a specific proposed policy and minimum thresholds. Health care was a big topic, especially for part-time faculty. Another that would help many people was a minimum wage per credit hour teaching that would be established at the state level.

Lewis stated that the College of Education has been explicit with a goal of hiring as many part-time people as possible along with non-renewal of tenure lines. Beale wondered if that applied more in teacher education rather than across the board because there had been concern in the Budget Planning Council sessions about decline of our teacher education student body while it was increasing in some other Michigan schools. She asked whether the college had received any of the pathway-to-faculty hires. Lewis confirmed Education did not put in an application, suggesting that having seven interim deans in the last decade may be a cause.

State Hall dedication: The dedication of State Hall will be held at 4 p.m. on October 30 with former president Wilson and many of his guests. President Espy has asked Beale to send out an invitation to the Senate to encourage Senators to come. Various members of Policy said they would plan to attend.

Block tuition: A topic for discussion at CIC, perhaps FAC, and eventually at plenary in the spring is whether students are struggling with too many course credits. The concern has been raised that advisers are not adequately advising some students about the difficulties of taking the full 18 credits covered by block tuition. Naida Simon noted the DFW rate will reveal whether there is a problem. Since 2015 for all undergraduates, the DFW rate is about 2%. If those numbers increase substantially, it will likely indicate a problem for some students taking 18 credits to benefit from the block rate. She has tracked withdrawals for both students who received a midterm (EAA) grade of C- or below and withdrew from that class and all

undergraduate withdrawals. All undergraduate withdrawal grades are about 2% of grades and of students who received a C- or below it is about 8%.

Israel-Palestine crisis: Beale noted that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains an ever-present topic in news and social media. She asked whether Policy members have heard more about the impact of the Israel-Palestine crisis on students or other faculty colleagues.

Roth noted the political science department will be hosting a panel on the Israel-Palestine crisis on Monday, November 13 at 3 p.m. in Bernath Auditorium. Meanwhile, there was a meeting last Thursday hosted by the Office of Multicultural Student Engagement with Saeed Khan (CLAS) and Howard Lupovitch (CLAS, Director of the Cohn-Haddow Center for Judaic Studies). There was a large crowd, with the room too small for all the students who attended. It was a successful event, and there will be an online version for faculty and staff on Thursday 10/26 at noon. Although there have apparently not been incidents on this campus, there have been many incidents throughout academia. He has been pleasantly surprised that Wayne State has not had more difficulty, when silence is itself considered to be an affront on this issue by many. People are easily whipsawed: it is a hard situation for everybody. Lewis noted that she was approached by Palestinian, Lebanese, and Jewish students in two different classes who noted their fear in talking about this safely on campus: in fact, several students asked to talk privately off campus. Lewis did not credit the university's position for the lack of incidents but noted her hope that faculty had urged compassion in classes. Aubert reported that graphic design faculty ordered pizza and invited their students to print posters together as a way to join with friends and be in community during this difficult time. Simon noted the problem that arose at a recent MSU football game when a pre-kickoff quiz from a third-party vendor showed a picture of Hitler: it turned out MSU did not review the programming before using it.

Khosla suggested the need to educate faculty who are in classrooms to make sure they provide appropriate messages in class and do not cross the line of sharing personal opinions that can impact students. In terms of neutrality, the message should be to show support and for faculty to not share their own views. Chrisomalis responded that the message already sent urged caring and mindfulness of students: he would be concerned about a further message suggesting talking points for how faculty should conduct classes. Roth thought it was unclear what more could be done because it is a question of academic freedom. There are various academic fields for which this is centrally relevant, and the university has not officially embraced a doctrine of neutrality, even for the university administration. Even if it did, it would be inappropriate for that to extend to a demand that faculty members be neutral on these questions. It is important that faculty members be sensitive to the kinds of unintended consequences of certain expression in the classroom, but there is no way to make that point further without being condescending or superfluous.

III. NON-ACADEMIC STUDENT MISBEHAVIOR HEARING PANEL APPOINTMENTS

Three terms are expiring in 2023. Policy members agreed to ask those with terms expiring to continue for another three-year term. They chose one alternate in case someone does not agree to be reappointed. Beale will reach out to determine the nominees' willingness to serve another term.

IV. HONORARY DEGREE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Beale noted the recognition of people with honorary degrees is a core exercise of the university as an academic enterprise. There is apparently a single slot on the committee, for which it is

important to appoint a full professor, but it might be possible to extend the appointment to one STEM faculty member and one non-STEM faculty member. Policy suggested two faculty members, and Beale will reach out to determine their willingness to serve.

V. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH WORKING GROUP APPOINTMENTS

Beale introduced the topic of the school of public health working group appointments (10 required) to Policy. Having served on the School of Public Health Exploratory Committee, she provided some background. Former president Wilson had appointed an exploratory committee in September 2022, requesting a report by mid-November on whether we should take initial steps to establish a school of public health. VP of Health Affairs Mark Schweitzer chaired that committee made up of various administrators and faculty including Carol Miller (Engineering), Melissa Runge-Morris (Medicine), and Patrician Wren, chair of the Department of Public Health in CLAS. The report noted the time needed for a development process, including hiring of a number of new faculty and the creation of new degree programs required to be an accredited school of public health (two Ph.D. programs, one DPH program, three areas of specialization for the master's programs, a certain number of faculty in each area and a significant number of high-level faculty), as well as working carefully to build support for the idea of a new school and encourage some or all of the people who are now in family medicine in the medical school to participate.

There is, of course, a significant resource requirement for developing such a new school, in that at least \$20 - \$30 million would be necessary in startup funds. It is also important that faculty understand that they will not be forcefully required to change schools, but it is likely that a school of public health including a doctor of public health and various masters programs in public health topics (such as biostatistics and epidemiology) will encourage current faculty to participate. While it will be a voluntary move, faculty in family medicine may find that a difficult decision to make. The existing bachelor's degree apparently would not have to move to a new school of public health: it could stay in CLAS, or it could move. The MPH degree program must first be re-accredited (expected March 2024) before any application for a new school can go forward. It then takes at least two years from application to accreditation.

President Espy is in favor of establishing such a school: she started one in Texas and sees it as something that could be a feather in our cap, especially with our reputation in Lansing and nationally, if the resources are made available. The working groups (on the chart distributed) are intended to provide deep discussion and planning about steps to create such a school, assuming there are resources. From Beale's perspective, it could be good for us to have a school of public health that would be very different from the one at U-M: our school would be much more focused on community and urban/rural health disparities.

The initial report about what future steps would be required noted that there are strong reasons to go forward but a number of caveats, including the requirement that there be sufficient upfront funding to make hires that will be necessary for accreditation and that there be support within the current health professions community. Beale will share the report confidentially with Policy members. There apparently is a possibility that we may receive funding from the state and from county and city agencies. There is also a possibility of building partnerships with Henry Ford Health and MSU on this.

Beale asked Policy members to start thinking about faculty members to appoint to each of the working groups so the names can be collected at the next Policy meeting to make the selection process easier. For the curriculum and degree offerings working groups, it should be tenured faculty associate or full professors. Chrisomalis noted that colleagues in his department are concerned that the school would negatively impact the CLAS department, which is very active in

teaching. Beale stressed that is why Senate appointees should be on these working groups, so that concerns are voiced and addressed. Policy should choose people that are at a level where they might be interacting with public health and have ideas about things that relate to public health.

VI. CENTER FOR EMERGING AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES CHARTER REQUEST (REV'D)

Policy members agreed the co-director of the Center for Emerging and Infectious Diseases, Paul Kilgore, was responsive in addressing the issues. Beale will draft a memo recommending chartering of CEID.

VII. NOVEMBER 1 DRAFT PLENARY

Policy discussed and approved the draft of the November 1 plenary.

VIII. STUDENT SENATE RESOLUTION ON RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

Khosla presented the DEI Committee's discussion and noted the concerns of the students. They are requesting recognition of student holidays from religions representative across the campus, such as Islam, Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism. There was discussion about the Michigan House of Representatives bill, with various members suggesting that the university should not act until we know what Lansing will do. The current university policy recognizes that there are many different religious holidays and encourages faculty to be cognizant of students' needs. It is difficult to plan in advance, however, since various religious holidays change dates from year to year. It would be particularly difficult in lab courses, where it is not always possible to shift labs for individual students. Roth was unsure how to respond, without further information on how greater accommodation could be achieved. Beale noted there are many other reasons that a student may miss a class or even an important assignment (e.g., medical, pregnancy reasons, death of a family member), and she believes most faculty are understanding of such needs and accommodate whenever possible. It is not clear, however, that there should be a university mandate with a list of everything for which faculty should be accommodating. Khosla agreed, noting that the current policy already allows these accommodations: it is just a question of whether they can or should be mandated. Lewis added that faculty accommodations should not be just for religious observance but rather there should be a norm of empathy for students. Perhaps the Senate could take the lead on discussions about these norms.

Khosla noted that DEI's recommendation was a referral to Policy. There was a consensus that the specific recommendations in the Student Senate resolution seemed problematic and that no change to university policies of faculty discretion to set individual course policies should be taken unless Lansing acts at some time in the future to create a mandate. Beale will draft a memo from Policy to the Student Senate on these issues for consideration.

Approved as revised at the Policy Committee meeting of October 30, 2023.