

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**Official Proceedings**  
March 4, 2020

---

Members Present: Keith Whitfield, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Linda M. Beale, President, Academic Senate; Faisal Almuftarrej; Jocelyn Ang; Leela Arava; Paul Beavers; Juliann Binienda; Cathryn Bock; Erika Bocknek; Tamara Bray; Leah Celebi; Wei Chen; Susan Davis; Richard Dogan; Kelly Dormer; Brian Edwards; Tom Fischer; Samiran Ghosh; Wanda Gibson-Scipio; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Siobhan Gregory; Robert Harr; Lance Heilbrun; Marisa Henderson; renee hoogland; Michael Horn; Arun Iyer; Barbara Jones; Thomas Karr; Kristen Kaszeta; Mahendra Kavdia; Fayette Keys; Thomas Killion; Christine Knapp; Manoj Kulchania; Sarah Lenhoff; Krishna Mao Maddipati; David Merolla; Bharati Mitra; Victoria Pardo; Charles Parrish; Rachel Pawlowski; Sean Peters; Richard Pineau; Michele Porter; Shauna Reevers; Stella Resko; Krysta Ryzewski; Berhane Seyoum; Nadia Simon; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Scott Tainsky; Ronald Thomas; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Jennifer Wareham; Jeffrey Withey; Hossein Yarandi; Fu-Shin Yu; Yang Zhao

Members Absent with Notice: Poonam Arya; Pamela Dale; Victoria Dallas; Alan Dombkowski; Xiaoyan Han; David Kessel; Justin Long; Rayman Mohamed; Avraham Raz; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Robert D. Welch

Members Absent: Timothy Bowman; Smiti Gupta; Peter Henning; Li Wen; Santanu Mitra; Ekrem Murat; Sandra Oliver-McNeil; T. R. Reddy; Ali Salamey; Neelima Thati

Others Present: Thomas Anderson, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Stuart Baum, President, Student Senate; Susan Burns, Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs; Darin Ellis, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness; Brian Escamilia, Development and Alumni Affairs; Paul Johnson, Education; Chirag Khimavat, Office of the Academic Senate; Mary Paquette, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts; Brandon Shamoun, Dean of Students Office; Karin Tarpennig, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Tracy Utech, Development and Alumni Affairs; Nancy Welter, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Angela Wisniewski, Office of the Academic Senate

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Whitfield called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:35 p.m. The meeting was held in the Bernath Auditorium in the Undergraduate Library.

Provost Whitfield began the meeting by saying that he and President Beale appreciate members attending the meetings. It is important to be updated on what is happening at the university and to share that information with colleagues.

I. APPROVAL OF PROCEEDINGS

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of February 5, 2020. PASSED.

II. REPORT ON ACADEMIC ANALYTICS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE SOLUTIONS

Darin Ellis, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, presented the report. He worked with the Senate's Ad Hoc Task Force on Transparency about Academic Analytics and Academic Performance Solutions (APS). These software programs are part of an overall strategy to increase the quality and the nature of data available to university decision-makers to help them make better decisions. In addition to third party systems, the university is developing in-house capability. The university contracted with the Educational Advisory Board (EAB) for the Academic Performance Solutions (APS) platform, which is a set of analysis tools that works with Wayne State data to provide insights regarding enrollment, instructional capacity, course completion, and logistics-type bottlenecks in moving through our educational system. The administration is looking at options to replace it with an in house platform. APS complements the Cognos report that deans and chairs might use to plan the number of sections needed for courses or to request educational resources. All chairs have access to that data. The ad hoc committee and Mr. Ellis discussed APS briefly. They focused on Academic Analytics.

Academic Analytics is a third-party system that develops and maintains a profile on 225,000 faculty members across 9,900 Ph.D. programs and 11,000 departments (mainly in the U.S., but some are international). Academic Analytics gathers, collects, and analyzes data on books, journals, citations, conference proceedings, federal research grants, honors, patents, trials, and book chapters. Only journal articles or journals that have a digital object identifier (DOI) will be captured. Journal articles that do not have a DOI will not be captured. Juried art shows and concerts are not included. The data is available and is brought into the system in a different context so it can be analyzed in different ways.

Mr. Ellis described the two aspects of the platform: the discovery suite and the benchmarking suite. There are three main components in the discovery suite: the external discovery site, faculty insight, and research insight. These areas gather and collect profiles on researchers. Researchers may be found by key word or research project. The discovery suite lists researchers' work and shows their collaborators. Researchers can present their own research using key words. The data may be searched by scholar or research project. In the last 36 months, Academic Analytics has picked up 7,263 articles written by people associated with Wayne State, 245 book chapters, and 125 books. This website will be available to the public.

Faculty Insight is the individual's profile and that of their colleagues at Wayne State. It is available now to all

research faculty. It is found under research sources in Academica. It shows collaborations and possible collaborators by key words. Research Insight is much like Faculty Insight except that it is organized around a department or a program. The additional tools available at that level are things that someone in the research office would use to develop a university-wide research team on a large science project. There are tools to help find people across the university who might be nominated for an award or an honor.

The benchmarking suite is organized around broad fields, departments, or programs. It has comparative tools centered around thirty-two metrics and six basic aspects of productivity that mirror the data. There is no comparative data on patents and clinical trials. The comparison is based on such things as citations and articles per department and per faculty member. Metrics are available for departments and for fields. In the comparative tools you can do a custom comparison to an aspirational peer or with a self-selected peer group that might be shared with an accreditor.

There are unit-modeling tools. A department chair could use this tool to compare whether to hire a junior faculty member or a faculty member who is in mid career to assess how that differential might impact research in the entire department. Unit modeling can show where faculty are in their career, the overall composition of the faculty, and the movement patterns in the field to assess plans for faculty retention.

There are a number of analysis on-demand tools. One tool is graduate outcomes. Programs and departments can locate graduates and see how they are doing in their research. This information is valuable for program reviews and training grant proposals.

Another tool is the awards pathway. If you choose a major award and a discipline of someone applying for the award, this tool will tell you who received that type of award before they applied for the next award. Success compounds on success. If you receive an award, that sets you up for additional awards. You can see which awards faculty should seek first and how to set them up for later awards.

The benchmarking suite is not currently available to anyone other than certain academic administrators: the Provost, the Vice President for Research, their designees, the deans and associate deans for research, and the chairs of departments are the only personnel currently able to access the data. Deans are offering training in the use of Academic Analytics to chairs, but chairs are not required to be trained. Mr. Ellis has used the tools to find faculty with specific expertise for a number of projects.

Mr. Ellis demonstrated how the data are gathered, analyzed, and presented. Academic Analytics shows different aspects of productivity. There are five metrics on articles. They are article per author, faculty with an article, total number of articles, percentage of faculty with an article, and articles per faculty member. A small

department might not want to compare the total number of articles generated with a large department in the same field, but they might compare the number of faculty with an article or the number of articles per faculty.

Some faculty are concerned about the Scholarly Research Index (SRI). The SRI is a roll up of the z-score—i.e., a weighted determination of the position of the program above or below median compared to the rest of the field. Looking at the computer science weight, you see that computer science experts consider grants a sign of a good program. However, a computer science department might not have that as part of its mission and therefore would zero out that weight, thus changing the SRI. A department could develop a customized analysis for its own program. The SRI is not the only thing you see for other institutions at the institutional level. There are 400 or 500 institutions in the database with their SRI. The database displays the name of the institution, its location, its Carnegie classification, as well as other data.

Mr. Parrish asked how much the university was paying for Academic Analytics and for APS. The information is available in the Transparency Subcommittee report: Academic Analytics's four-year cost (FY2018 through FY2021) is \$754,300 and APS's five-year cost (FY2017 through FY2021) is \$807,500.

Mr. Ellis was asked how accurate the data would be compared with other domains, such as Google Scholars that has many errors. Mr. Ellis said that if a publication has a DOI it should be in the database. If there is author misattribution or a mistake, the Academic Analytics data quality team will correct the information. If Google Scholar picks up something that does not have a DOI, it will not be listed in Academic Analytics. Any book with an ISBN would be in the Academic Analytics database. Grants from local foundations for community engagement projects will not be in the database.

Mr. Edwards asked if a chair could designate an associate chair to be trained in the use of the platform. Mr. Ellis indicated that might be possible if the associate chair was charged with the responsibility of managing the database, but would require confirmation.

Ms. Gregory asked how a piece of work or a grant that is not acknowledged by the database would be acknowledged if it is a tool for promotion and tenure. Mr. Ellis said there are no plans currently to use Academic Analytics as a tool for promotion and tenure. The Wayne State professional record is used now and will be used for the foreseeable future in the shared governance processes such as salary and personnel decisions and for promotion and tenure. Such work may be listed in the Faculty Insight profile. It will be seen through the external discovery site. Faculty are invited to add such work, but it will not figure in any benchmarking query to the database.

The Senate thanked Mr. Ellis for the information.

### III. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE

#### A. Resolution on Academic Transparency

At the February Senate meeting, Mr. Beavers presented the report of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Transparency (the report is attached again as Appendix A). Today he presented a resolution asking for specific administrative actions regarding academic transparency. The resolution follows.

*The Academic Senate urges the WSU Administration to implement the four recommendations from its Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Transparency. These recommendations are*

- 1. That a faculty oversight committee be appointed (by the Academic Senate) and granted access to the Academic Analytics and Academic Performance Solutions platforms, on par with that granted to deans, chairs, and administrators, to monitor the databases/algorithms for errors and completeness. This committee (with staggered terms of two years) would report to the Academic Senate at least once per year regarding issues that may relate to the databases/algorithms.*
- 2. That a policy be established requiring that administrators share benchmarking reports with faculty members whenever those reports are used in tenure, promotion, and selective salary decision-making. Affected faculty members and departments must be made aware of the use of benchmarking algorithms if they are used in the tenure/promotion/salary processes.*
- 3. That when the benchmarking tools are used to implement budget reduction or enhancement decisions, reports from the benchmarking suite be shared with the contractually mandated Budget Committees, at the Department, College, or University levels.*
- 4. That appropriate training/information materials be provided to faculty members (either by the University Administration, or by the Faculty Oversight Committee) so that those faculty members will be able to understand the nature of the information systems, and/or be able to monitor their own records.*

Although Mr. Ellis had said that he does not expect the benchmarking reports will be used in tenure, promotion, and selective salary decision-making, Mr. Beavers believes it is important to have a resolution stating that if they were used for those purposes they must be shared with the faculty member.

Mr. Beavers MOVED that the Senate support the Resolution on Academic Transparency. SECONDED. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### B. Resolution to Support LGBTQ+ Student and Academic Life

Ms. Simon, the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, presented the following resolution:

*The Academic Senate, having examined in its Student Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Curriculum and Instruction, and Policy Committees the Student Senate's resolution of December 5, 2019, "calling upon Wayne State University to support LGBTQ+ Student and Academic Life in its mission to promote Diversity and Inclusion," hereby resolves to endorse that resolution's recommendations in all of their particulars.*

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the resolution as presented. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Provost Whitfield thanked Stuart Baum, the President of the Student Senate, and the other members of the Senate for the resolution to improve our campus.

### IV. CAPITAL CAMPAIGN

Susan Burns, Vice President for Development and Alumni Affairs and President of the University Foundation, Tracy Utech, Associate Vice President of Principal Giving and the Campaign Director in the Division of Development and Alumni Affairs, Gayle Foley, the Foundation Relations Officer for Wayne State University, and Brian Escamilla, Director of Development Communications, presented the plans for the next capital campaign. (Their presentation is attached as Appendix B.)

Ms. Burns began by reminding the Senate members that the university's comprehensive capital campaign was completed in fall 2018, having exceeded the goal of \$750 million by raising \$776.5 million, counting the Fund for Medical Research and Education (FMRE). The reward for a successful campaign, she said, is a bigger goal. The Development Office is currently preparing for the next campaign by working to position the university appropriately. It is assumed that the campaign goal will be \$1 billion or more. This time, however, FMRE funds will not be counted in the campaign, so a \$1 billion goal will require raising 150% of the amount raised in the last campaign.

The Development Office cannot move incrementally, doing everything a bit better. That won't achieve what is needed. Development is looking to our peer institutions to learn from what they are doing. We

need to think bigger in terms of making our case for support. Any campaign is successful primarily because of the articulation of a very compelling case for support. Thus, Development is considering opportunities that would elevate the university in a transformational way and would attract philanthropists who have the potential to make gifts of \$1 million, \$10 million, or \$20 million. To develop a case that will attract that kind of philanthropy, the Development team needs to engage the entire campus community—in particular the faculty—to identify the best possible cases for philanthropic support.

Mr. Escamilla spoke next. The name of the campaign is Bold Moves. It is an initiative to identify and develop large transformational ideas to build on the strengths of the university and to create significant fundraising opportunities with donor investors. It is a community-based method of discovering new priorities and new ideas at the university, something that will encourage faculty, staff, and students to explore ideas about which they are knowledgeable and passionate and that will make a significant impact on the university, Detroit, the region, or the state. These are ideas without regard to cost. That is why the campaign is called Bold Moves, so people will be bold in their ideas and be inspired to participate in the initiative and with the Development Office to make the ideas real. Now is the time to develop bold ideas, since the Pivotal Moments campaign was successful and the university is on track to reach its strategic plan goals by next year. It is hoped that by the end of this initiative there will be strong ideas that may serve as priorities for the next campaign and attract donations from donor investors who want to make a significant impact with their philanthropy. These should be ideas that might inform the next strategic plan or at least ideas that might emerge as initiatives to match donor interest in the schools and colleges.

EAB, our partners in educational research, put together a best practice plan identifying some challenges and opportunities to meet those challenges. They found that donor investors view their philanthropy as an investment in the institution. Donors want to see transformative impact, compelling ideas, and connections with the faculty doing the work. They don't want to just write a check. They want to be involved in a large significant idea that matters to them. EAB worked with and developed case examples at four universities. Each of the universities developed a process that included criteria, scoring, and a process for identifying and developing large-scale ideas that were meaningful to their universities, had the potential to be transformational, and could interest the funders interested in, and capable of, making a significant investment with deep impact.

Mr. Escamilla reviewed the experiences at the College of Charleston and the University of

California Davis (UC Davis). Eighty proposals were submitted at the College of Charleston. Thirty percent were approved and eleven ideas have received at least \$1 million. As of two years ago, they raised \$70 million. UC Davis expected forty proposals. One hundred ninety-six were submitted. Forty-six fully met the criteria. Seventeen ideas are featured as the priorities in a multi-million-dollar campaign. They already received a \$40 million gift out of the ideas generated by this process. The ideas are not necessarily unique to UC Davis but other universities might approach the issues differently. The process was so successful for UC Davis that they are thinking about new ideas in addition to the seventeen that came out of their first process.

Wayne State will try to develop ideas to the point where they meet the criteria for Big Moves. Then the Development Office will create fundraising materials around them and actively fundraise for their success. How we get from today to the large high-scale ideas involves a process.

Ms. Foley said that the university is following the process that EAB recommended. They want the process to be transparent, highly communicated, and easy to understand. A steering committee was formed that is co-chaired by Provost Whitfield and Vice President Susan Burns. The other members are Ms. Beale, Vice President of Research Stephen Lanier, Dean of Students David Strauss, Professor of Science and President of the Academy of Scholars Wei-Zen Wei, and Chief of Staff and Vice President for Marketing and Communications Michael Wright.

The committee's key decision is to identify what makes a Bold Move. It is to be transformational, compelling, attracting individual donors, foundations, or corporations. The ideas should build on the strengths of the university or on its emerging strengths. They want it to be distinctive, something that will differentiate us from our peers on the local scale, the national scale, and the international scale. We don't want to do something merely because others have done it. Such a goal may be a good goal for fundraising but not for this activity. We want it to be distinctive for Wayne State. Collaboration could be across schools and colleges or within one department. The goal should be enduring and have a lasting impact.

The selection process has two steps. The steering committee will decide on the scoring and the timeline. The scoring criteria, the RFP, and the timeline will be available on the website. The first step will be the submission of a short abstract of about 250 words per question. The full proposal will be about eight pages in length. They will encourage faculty to submit many ideas and to collaborate. They might suggest that people who submit similar ideas and proposals collaborate. They will help with the preparation of ideas and proposals. Even if an idea is selected, it may not be funded. All initial and full proposals will be evaluated

and will be part of the campaign. The ideas that are not funded for the campaign could become a priority for a school, college, or unit.

Ms. Utech reviewed the work that has been accomplished for the campaign. The steering committee has been seated and begun work on materials. Development has met with the Council of Deans and the President's Cabinet. Vice President Burns, Ms. Foley, Ms. Utech, and Mr. Escamilia have met with the Policy Committee. The steering committee drafted the criteria, developed the submission form, established a two-step process, and established a timeline. It created a scoring system that will be transparent and online. Before applying people will know the criteria against which their idea will be scored and they will know the timeline.

The staff in the Development Office will talk with as many individuals and groups as possible and create a Bold Moves website. The website will have an online discussion forum that will allow faculty to collaborate easily, to see what others are doing, and to identify ideas in which they may be interested. Development will talk with people about the goals, the mechanisms by which people might get together and collaborate, and what would make a good Bold Move. They will communicate in writing, by email, and possibly with printed material. The RFP is expected to be announced on April 1 with the deadline for submission of ideas November 1. During those seven months the Development Office will promote the Bold Moves campaign for proposals and propose ways for faculty to collaborate. The goal is to have a large number of quality submissions from the original RFP by November 1. The steering committee will review the initial submissions and will notify the people who are selected to submit full proposals by December 1. Everyone who submits an idea will be notified of the results. Full proposals are due March 1, 2021. The proposals selected as priorities will be announced April 1, 2021. The announcement of selections will be widespread, and an event with a symposium will highlight the selections.

Then the work of the Development Office begins. They will talk with potential donors about all the ideas. Bold Moves is not the only component of the capital campaign. The other pieces that make a successful campaign are the school and college priorities. In addition, there are institutional priorities and projects that may be inspired by donors that fit well with something the university has wanted to do and that can become reality with philanthropy. Starting in the fall or earlier the Development Office will begin working with the deans and the leadership of the units to learn their priorities. When the university announces the projects selected for Bold Moves, the Development Office may begin talking with donors. By fall 2021 we will be in the full-fledged silent phase talking with as many donors who are capable of giving at the highest levels possible to secure leadership gifts. Within four years following the start of the silent phase, the university should be halfway to its goal. That is when the campaign is launched publicly and opened to marketing and a groundswell effort to bring in

everyone to support the university under the umbrella of the campaign.

Ms. Hoogland asked for more information about the proposal, such as projected length and content. Ms. Utech said they are still developing the specifics but it will probably be about eight pages with a proposed budget. Ms. Burns said the proposal would be similar to the content in the first portion but it would have more detail. The guidelines, multi-modal projects for the different types of proposals and at least one example of an abstract and a proposal will be posted on the website. Students are allowed to submit ideas but they need to have a faculty or staff mentor. All information about the project including the budget should be submitted. The budget should be as specific as possible.

Ms. Binienda asked if the funding of a project would include the FTE and if the person who submitted the proposal would do the project. As far as the committee has defined the process, people would not be submitting ideas for other people to implement per se. People are encouraged to collaborate. Mr. Escamilia said that when a proposal is selected, the Development Office staff has to try to secure funding. That may take years. If the project is funded, the person who made the proposal would lead and would be part of the conversation with potential funders. The donor will want to talk with the people involved in the project.

Mr. Edwards asked how many big donors are on Development's list of donors. Ms. Utech said the list is always evolving. The university has dozens of big donors and hundreds or thousands of potential donors. They talk to as many potential donors as possible. Ms. Burns added that they would present the ideas to current donors and current volunteer leaders and many people in the community. They may approach someone who would not make the big gift but that person may know someone who would be interested in making a big gift. Several hundred donors on Development's list are rated as big donors with whom they have some engagement. A donor could be someone with whom they have not talked but because that person hears about a project, they might be introduced to the university.

Mr. Pineau asked how many years a project should cover. Ms. Foley said projects should be within the timeline of the capital campaign. They could be something that is achieved within a certain time or they could be projects that build a framework for something that has lasting impact or that achieves something that has lasting impact.

Mr. Heilbrun suggested that the time periods for the committee to evaluate the abstracts and proposals be expanded to two months. The abstracts are scheduled to be reviewed between November 1 and December 1 and the proposals are scheduled to be reviewed between March 1 and April 1. Both months are late in the semester and both span holidays with Thanksgiving being in November and spring break in March. Increasing the time for review would give the reviewers

more time for thoughtful assessment of the submissions. Ms. Burns responded that there is a long time between the announcement and the deadline for the first submissions. She expects the committee to review the submissions every month or two. There is a benefit to submitting the abstract early because there will be time for revisions and resubmission.

A member asked what she could communicate to her colleagues as an incentive to participate in the process. Mr. Escamilla said participating in the Bold Moves process gets more leadership, more visibility, and stronger support for an idea. More people will see it. The more people who are aware of a proposal the more likelihood that it may attract donors or become a priority in your school or college. Ms. Utech said that the projects selected would benefit from having a full-blown case statement and case materials developed in conjunction with the development communications team. This initiative is not to replace other ideas. Development will always support people who have strong ideas. This process is to inspire people to expand their current ideas to make them transformational and more impactful so they might appeal to a larger donor as opposed to an idea that is great but at a smaller dollar level.

The Senate thanked Vice President Burns and the staff in the Development Office for their presentation.

## V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

### A. Report and Announcements

1. The Policy and Budget Committees will meet with the candidates for the position of Vice President for Finance and Business Operations when they visit campus this week.
2. A significant concern that was reported in the climate survey carried out in 2016 was people experiencing and witnessing bullying and intimidation. The Policy Committee is working with Boris Baltés, the Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Associate Vice President of Academic Personnel, to create a clear policy that defines bullying. It is an important but difficult issue and likely will require the creation of a small committee to draft a statement. Remedies likely would be subject to the individual employment agreement if the person charged with bullying is a supervisor or possibly changes to the student code of conduct if students are involved. The problem might involve administrator and faculty, administrator and staff, faculty and staff, or faculty and student.
3. There are federal government regulatory changes to Title IX. The university must comply with them. PC has been discussing the types of relationships that develop among members of the university community. There are often caring relationships that develop, even among people with differential

power (such as administrator with faculty) that would be hard to prohibit. Policy's focus has been on not driving relationships underground but requiring disclosure and removal of people from supervisory or evaluative positions of power when there are such relationships. The committee has commented on drafts by the General Counsel's office. They are still working on the changes.

4. The Budget Planning Council (BPC) is the university-wide committee on which several Senate-selected faculty and academic staff sit, including Paul Beavers, as chair of the Senate's Budget Committee, and Linda Beale, as Senate President. The council holds hearings with all the schools, colleges, and administrative units that are currently underway. When the hearings are completed the BPC members will discuss their views on the allocation of funds for the next fiscal year. The administration does not expect a large increase in the state appropriation so it is unlikely that any unit will get a large increase in its budget. The BPC process is a mechanism that arrives at a consensus recommendation to President Wilson on budget allocations for the divisions and schools/colleges. Last year, however, President Wilson did not follow various unanimous recommendations of the group.

### B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of January 27, 2020, February 3, 2020, February 10, 2020, and February 17, 2020. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix C. Ms. Beale commented on some of the issues in the Proceedings.

#### January 27, 2020

Ms. Beale called attention to the discussion about the RaiseMe program and the Heart of Detroit Tuition Pledge (item #1).

#### February 3, 2020

The discussion in item #2 covered the issue of bullying and intimidation.

#### February 10, 2020

It is likely that there will be a discussion of the University Research Opportunities Program (item #1) at the April 1 Senate meeting. Referring to the changes in the staff at the University Press (item #3), Ms. Beale mentioned that all the staff members who were fired were rehired and that the former interim director, Kathryn Wildfong, was rehired. President Wilson moved the reporting line for the Press from Jon Cawthorne, Dean of the Library System, to Michael Wright, Chief of Staff and Vice President for

Communications. This is the best outcome possible for a very poorly handled restructuring.

February 17, 2020

Timothy Michael, Associate Vice President for Student Auxiliary Services, and Richard Pineau, Senior Lecturer, Department of Mathematics, met with Policy Committee about Bartleby Learn (item #5). In response to Policy Committee's concerns and recommendation, as of February 3, the bookstore removed Bartleby Learn from all active and passive marketing information in the store, on the website, and in their email campaign. Policy asked that a notice be sent to students about the rationale for discontinuing the promotion. Mr. Michael was somewhat reluctant because of fear of liability. Policy asked that he consider the request and tell Policy Committee what the university would do. The university should not encourage students to use apps that allow them to cheat or plagiarize. At the time of the February 17th PC meeting a prompt remained at the checkout telling the cashier to ask whether the customer wants to sign up for Bartleby when purchasing a book. The personnel had not figured out how to remove it.

## VI. COMMITTEE REPORT

### Elections Committee

Ms. Simon, the chair of the Elections Committee, announced that the Senate would elect its president for the 2020-2021 academic year at the April 1 meeting. She asked those interested in the position to contact her or the office secretary. [NB: in light of the Covid-19 Stay Home order, the election has been moved online.]

The election of the Faculty Hearing Panel and the Academic Staff Hearing Panel will be conducted online. Eight faculty are running for four slots and eight academic staff are running for four slots. All Senate members may vote for both the faculty nominees and the academic staff nominees.

Rachel Pawlowski's and Victoria Dallas's terms as members-at-large expire at the beginning of the fall 2020 academic year. The form for nominations will be sent via email to all faculty and academic staff in the university.

## VII. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Whitfield mentioned the lecturers' concerns about their status. They were shared with the President, the Provost, and others. A forum will be held in the near future to discuss one of the issues that arose, that lecturers feel they are not valued. That is of concern to the Provost and to Dean of Liberal Arts and Sciences Stephanie Hartwell. Lecturers provide a significant portion of the instruction. The Provost wants to hear from them about their struggles. He has to find out if we

need to provide direction to the leadership and training to chairs about how they work with lecturers. If people are struggling, he encourages them to talk with someone that can work with them and with their unit to improve the situation. If this is a cultural issue we have a lot of hard work ahead. Changing culture is hard. After the forum the Provost will report to the Senate some of the content of the discussion and actions that might be suggested for implementation. We cannot have the lecturers feeling that the university does not value them.

Mr. Parrish said that the issue is not a question of being nice to the lecturers. In the next AAUP-AFT contract negotiations we will see if the administration will be responsive to the proposals from the union that will provide lecturers with economic security and long-term job security. The problem is not a matter of courtesy. The problem is not just cultural. We have lecturers who have been fired annually for decades. They don't know if they will have a job the next year. We have been struggling with this issue for a long time and the administration has systematically resisted a solution. Twenty-seven people in CLAS don't know if they will have a job in the fall.

Provost Whitfield disagreed with Mr. Parrish. The purpose of the forum, he said, is to talk about how to create a civil environment for all faculty. He believes a larger discussion is needed rather than the one piece of the problem that the lecturers raised. What needs to be discussed is not just at the yearly time when they are let go, but how they are treated throughout the year.

Mr. Parrish said that when lecturers are permanent members of the community they would be treated better. The Provost countered saying that having a job does not mean you will be treated well.

Provost Whitfield read a note that he sent to faculty about the coronavirus. There are websites where more information can be found.

The coronavirus threat is real and significant although the immediate risk is low. We have been closely monitoring developments globally and nationwide and we are working with healthcare professionals and others to prepare for potential cases in the state or on or near our campus. To that end the President charged a committee including administrators, faculty, and staff to ensure that the campus is prepared and informed, that appropriate precautions are exercised and that continuity plans for our academic mission and campus operations are in place. At this point, there are no confirmed cases in Michigan but many epidemiologists and infectious disease specialists feel that it is a matter of when and not if we see cases of the coronavirus in Michigan. So now is the time to prepare. As faculty members you will have an important role in managing the risks of the coronavirus and the spread of it. For now, we'd ask you to consider reviewing your attendance policy so as to strongly encourage sick students to stay home and recover. Staying home when you are sick is one of

the key recommendations of the CDC. We hope that you will ask your students to follow these recommendations and not come to class if they are feeling ill. We also recommend that you begin to consider ways to continue your teaching responsibilities should the spread of the coronavirus necessitate limits to people meeting in large groups or even the possibility of closure of the campus. Although at this point we see campus closure unlikely, it's a contingency that we are beginning to consider. For more information see the university communication regarding the coronavirus, how to prevent it, and other advice related to minimizing the impact of this illness. Another great source of information is the CDC. I'll end by saying this is a challenging time for not only this campus, not only the state, but for the nation. Disruption in our academic mission is challenging and can be disconcerting especially if it involves threats to our health and wellbeing. We appreciate your willingness to help us address these challenges and help ease the anxiety this situation has caused.

Ms. Lenhoff asked several questions related to work policies that would affect staff when the coronavirus hits this area. What is the policy on distance work in the event that COVID-19 spreads more intensely in this area? Is worker pay protected in the event of a campus shutdown? Is distance work encouraged or accepted as precautionary measures if things get worse? Are these expectations different based on the employee's classification? The Provost said that these elements are under consideration. Faculty will be on the committee discussing the best way to hold classes and the options available. If the university were to be closed because of the virus, people would be kept intact.

Mr. Harr asked how the university would handle a situation if students travel overseas. Would the students be quarantined when they return? The Provost noted that it appears the virus can be dormant for a while so even if people are quarantined there is some risk of transmitting the virus. He hoped that faculty would allow the students to remain at home. Mr. Harr said that if classes are moved to distance learning the university cannot load onto the faculty the responsibility to find the medium. Provost Whitfield said that issue would be discussed. The policies that are implemented will err on the side of trying to be safe.

Ms. Davis mentioned the need for guidelines for students to stay safe who are in the experiential curricula providing care for patients in the medical centers. Some health care facilities rely on our medical students for patient care. Another issue raised was the availability of technology for students if classes go online. The Provost will take these questions to the committee that is providing direction on how to deal with COVID-19. He urged everyone to follow the recommendations to reduce the risk of contracting the virus. Communications will be sent frequently. If people need more information about the situation they should contact his office.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS: There was no new business.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Linda M. Beale  
President, Academic Senate