

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
December 2, 2020

Members Present: Laurie Lauzon Clabo, Interim Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Ex-officio; Linda M. Beale, President, Academic Senate; Leela Arava; Paul Beavers; Juliann Binienda; Timothy Bowman; Tamara Bray; Pynthia Caffee; Leah Celebi; Wei Chen; Susan Davis; Richard Dogan; Kelly Dormer; David Edelman; Brian Edwards; Tom Fischer; Jane Fitzgibbon; Samiran Ghosh; Wanda Gibson-Scipio; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Siobhan Gregory; Lance Heilbrun; Marisa Henderson; renee hoogland; Arun Iyer; Barbara Jones; Thomas Karr; Mahendra Kavdia; David Kessel; Fayette Keys; Thomas Killion; Christine Knapp; Manoj Kulchania; Jennifer Lewis; Karen MacDonell; Krishna Rao Maddipati; Georgia Michalopoulou; Carol Miller; Santanu Mitra; Ramzi Mohammed; Ekrem Murat; Sandra Oliver-McNeil; Christie Pagel; Charles Parrish; Rachel Pawlowski; Thomas Pedroni; Shane Perrine; Sean Peters; Richard Pineau; Avraham Raz; T. R. Reddy; Shauna Reever; Stella Resko; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Krysta Ryzewski; Ali Salamey; Berhane Seyoum; Bo Shen; Naida Simon; Jennifer Stockdill; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Scott Tainsky; Neelima Thati; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Clayton Walker; Jennifer Wareham; Jeffrey Withey; Hossein Yarandi

Members Absent with Notice: Poonam Arya, Alan Dombkowski, Peter Henning, Joseph Roche

Members Absent: Faisal Almufarrej; Stephen Calkins, Xiaoyan Han, Michael Horn, Satinder Kaur, Wen Li, Justin Long

Others Present: Boris Baltes, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Associate Vice President of Academic Personnel; Amanda Bryant-Friedrich, Dean of the Graduate School; Marquita Chamblee, Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer; Rohan Emmanuel Kumar, Office of the Academic Senate; Louis Romano, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Mark Schweitzer, Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Clabo called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:38 p.m. The meeting was held via Zoom.

I. SOCIAL JUSTICE ACTION COMMITTEE UPDATE

Ms. Chamblee thanked the Senate for inviting her to provide an update on diversity, equity and inclusion

(DEI) since her last visit, in particular through sharing information about the ideas coming to the Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC). She noted that the establishment of the SJAC and its subcommittees emerged out of the response to the murder of George Floyd and the call for university action. President Wilson had sent a letter to the campus but determined that more was required. The SJAC was established on June 30th. The steering committee is comprised of the chairs of the seven working groups plus the President, Provost, Governor Shirley, Senate President Beale, and Chief of Staff Michael Wright. The overall committee received monthly updates from the working groups to provide some indication of the group's deliberations and planning. The specific charge was to closely examine our policies and procedures for identifying where bias comes into the way we do business and recommend specific actions to eliminate such bias, both immediately and over a shorter or longer term.

The working group members were selected by the President in consultation with Ms. Chamblee, the Academic and Student Senates, and the President's cabinet. In some cases, the working groups added additional people needed to accomplish the tasks. Each member completed implicit bias training offered through the Kerwin Institute at Ohio State University—an online training that could be taken at each person's convenience. This served to ground the work and thinking about bias by providing an understanding of how bias shows up. The seven working groups met weekly and did a tremendous amount of work between and during the meetings, actively engaging in working on issues at hand. The group working on the hiring and retention of diverse staff divided into five subgroups that looked at workforce planning, hiring, onboarding, professional development and other topics. The most extensive set of recommendations received are from this working group. Ms. Chamblee noted that she sat in on meetings of each of the seven working groups as often as possible to remain engaged in the ongoing considerations.

Recommendations were due from the working groups on November 20, though some are still not quite complete. Ms. Chamblee will organize those recommendations in terms of timing and priority for discussion by the SJAC. Though she could not go through all of those recommendations at this point, she noted that one idea that several groups had suggested in one form or another was that some sort

of DEI Council should be established to help develop strategies for implementation of the various recommendations. The function of that council will need to be clarified before it can move forward, but it seems to be one of the ideas that is widely supported for implementation in some form. Another pervasive idea is the need to determine how well we are achieving our DEI objectives and whether we are making progress in areas in which we are taking actions. One of the common recommendations was to develop metrics or scorecards that can guide continuing assessment of the climate at the university. As many will recall, there was a comprehensive university-wide “climate survey” in 2018: the idea is a need to assess areas that were identified then and perform some type of annual evaluation to measure our progress. We may need to do a similar survey periodically (every 4 or 5 years). Mentoring was another theme from both the faculty and staff recruitment and retention working groups. It is likely to be in the student access group as well. Staff in particular noted that mentoring and even the opportunity for “job shadowing” can be a major benefit for retention. Another idea that had considerable support was the need to conduct exit interviews of faculty and staff so that we have more data on reasons people leave the university. A further important realization is that there is a need for much better communication among the school/college deans regarding the steps they are taking on DEI and on best practices that might strengthen those efforts. Another idea that was supported by several of the working groups was to increase the staff in Ms. Chamblee’s office (Office of Diversity and Inclusion and Office of Multicultural Student Engagement) to help coordinate these efforts across the campus. That of course raises questions about resources to support these efforts, which is particularly difficult in the current budgetary situation.

Ms. Chamblee noted that it is important for faculty to be involved in this effort, and she wanted to share with the Senate some ideas for individual faculty involvement. One is to ask questions about what is happening in DEI within each faculty member’s individual unit. Asking questions will help improve the flow of information. Another idea for involvement is to consider what the DEI-related issues are within each faculty member’s own discipline. Ms. Chamblee noted that many disciplinary societies and governmental organizations like NSF and others are increasingly expressing interest in DEI within the disciplines and how the pipeline for new faculty can be expanded. Further, there will be opportunities to serve on DEI working groups, and Ms. Chamblee encouraged Senate members to serve when invited. She thinks that having multiple voices discussing these issues

across the campus will lead us to make better decisions. Moreover, if faculty have a particular expertise or simply an interest in DEI, let people know. The Office does educational programming and there are also opportunities within departments or even within committee work in the Senate to work on DEI ideas. Ms. Chamblee noted she is happy to serve as a sounding board for folks who have questions or ideas. She ended with a quote that exemplifies the significance of the work that we have ahead of us: rather than being discouraged by what we see around us, we should focus on what is possible and find in that some measure of motivation.

Ms. Hoogland thanked Ms. Chamblee for the presentation. She noted her strong support for what the SJAC groups are doing and what Ms. Chamblee’s office is doing. She asked Ms. Chamblee to elaborate on the discussion of scorecards—how will they work, what will they accomplish. Ms. Chamblee responded that the scorecard is an idea for assessing where we are. It could be as simple as looking at the data we already keep about student cohorts (retention, graduation and disparities among groups). It is really a question of identifying what metrics we hope to achieve and where the gaps are. We should keep similar data on faculty and staff recruitment and retention that we keep on students. Ms. Hoogland commented that her college currently falls short of where we would like to be so she is unclear how that data would be used to move forward. Ms. Chamblee again responded that there is clearly work to be done, but identifying the challenges is a start to collaboration on solutions. Clearly, solutions within one discipline like CLAS will be different from another like Engineering, so it is important to understand each area to determine what the needs are and consider how to arrive at solutions.

Ms. Beale added that a concern with metrics and scorecards is that they have a tendency to become punitive measures. There is generally an implication of comparative success, and that can lead to problems. If one unit has already been able to hire more faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds, it may be seen as a good training area and those successful recruits may be rather likely to be hired away from Wayne to a more prestigious place. They would look bad on a scorecard—you lost these three people—even though in another way it is good because they had a good opportunity to grow here and have advanced to a better position. A worry about scorecards is the nuances and subtleties that can easily be erased by trying to quantify everything. One of the worries about the DEI Council as currently recommended is that it is outside the regular academic process where those nuances are easily

lost: people who are not readily aware of context with a particular school or college can easily become judgmental. She asked how Ms. Chamblee sees avoiding that problem with the initiative? Ms. Chamblee noted that is an important question and one that has to be considered. Clearly, there are significant differences among units, and they face unique challenges and opportunities. She does not want the scorecard to be held up as a way to chastise people but as a way to support movement towards desired outcomes. And yes, nuance and contextual understanding—both within particular colleges and nationally—will be important.

Ms. Beale added that she considers academic governance as the primary way that such discussions can and should take place, because it fosters the interaction and communication among different areas of the university. Another way, of course, is through the council of deans, and she assumes that much of this work on best practices and challenges and opportunities would be taking place among the deans. Does Ms. Chamblee see this as a significant goal—encouraging those academic leaders to engage in those conversations? Ms. Chamblee responded that those conversations need to take place more frequently than they do now. That lack of communication among the deans in sharing best practices and working collaboratively has been noted in the working groups as a missing link in the communications that are needed. She hopes to work with the Provost and deans on considering what a school/college DEI plan would include.

Mr. Roth commended Ms. Chamblee for taking on this task and the work required to accomplish it. He noted that it is extraordinarily important that we move forward in this direction, but he does have a question about the future role of the Academic Senate in decisions. The outline of the structure for a DEI Council would involve not only generating recommendations but actually moving them forward. It is important to remember the role of the Senate under the Board of Governors Code: this body is the elected representative of faculty and academic staff who have a fixed role in academic governance. Mr. Roth asked how Ms. Chamblee sees the collaboration going forward as recommendations are put in place. Ms. Chamblee responded that the DEI Council that had been discussed earlier with the Policy Committee is still a very rough draft and needs more input before it is finalized. She agreed that she would like to work with a standing committee in the Senate, which Ms. Beale had suggested at an earlier SJAC meeting, on these issues, as a powerful voice. There will need to be further discussion on selection of members, how many members, how to include staff from a variety of

classification areas, how to engage students, how to create an entity that is agile. She noted that she has been exploring how other institutions are handling this so that we can develop a structure that will engage many voices in the work. Ms. Beale commented to inform the Senate members that the Policy Committee had a significant in-depth conversation about these issues with Ms. Chamblee recently. The discussion is set out in the proceedings and will give members some background on our concerns about the Senate's jurisdiction and the best way to proceed with some ongoing body rather than having it be another administratively created bypass of the Senate, as has so frequently happened. She noted that Policy members appreciated Ms. Chamblee's talking with us and continuing to consider the issues that we raised on this matter.

Mr. Seyoum added his appreciation for the presentation, since many of the faculty and staff have not been aware of the work of the SJAC. He asked how Senate members who have noted problems or have ideas about DEI issues can provide information to the SJAC. Ms. Chamblee noted that there will likely be a town hall or other university-wide format to communicate the work of the SJAC, as well as communications through regular channels with announcements and similar actions. One of the items learned through the climate study mentioned earlier was that people do not know where to go when they are experiencing or witnessing difficulties. There is work to be done to help people know who to talk to. Some have suggested creating a reporting and response system directly related to issues of bias, but that is still at a very rough drawing-board stage. Ms. Chamblee noted that she has also served as a sounding board for staff and others with particular concerns, to drive to find a resolution. Ms. Beale added that she thinks the lack of a university ombudsperson is a problem here. We also discussed this briefly in Policy and she will talk soon about whether that role can be developed in connection with the various mentoring initiatives. There seems to be a significant need to have someone who has the role of advocate for faculty and staff, and perhaps students, rather than the current Ombuds position which merely provides information to students through the Student Center.

Ms. Gibson-Scipio also thanked Ms. Chamblee for her work and noted that the issues that led to the SJAC initiative are important and not new—these issues of bias have gone on for a long time. A question is how to keep the initiative 'fresh' so that people continue to want to invest in it and so that people continue to develop ways to understand the dynamics of the problem whether within their units or university wide.

Ms. Chamblee responded that she is delighted to see the weight of the university behind the initiative. She expects that we will make some immediate movement and that there will also be long-term strategies. One of the working groups is focusing on providing educational opportunities to help people gain understanding about bias, racism, and structural oppression. That will be important to build understanding that is not just superficial. There will be a lot of work, and the conversation will need to continue.

Ms. Chamblee then addressed a question in the chat about accessibility. The climate study identified a problem that people who identified as having a disability felt they needed support but were invisible. She considers disability to be an area in which the university will need to take action to identify the needs and issues of concern. DEI is not just race—it is gender identity, ethnicity, sexual identity, disability—the gamut of issues. The goal is to make this an inclusive campus community.

Provost Clabo thanked Ms. Chamblee for joining us and noted that this work is neither easy nor easily accomplished in the short term.

II. ENHANCING RECRUITMENT OF UNDERREPRESENTED FACULTY

Provost Clabo introduced Associate Provost Boris Baltes to discuss the working group addressing issues related to underrepresented faculty. Mr. Baltes noted that the group was focused specifically on full-time faculty. The group's charge and membership is attached as Appendix A. Mr. Baltes noted that Nikki Wright co-chaired the group, which included a number of administrators and two Senate representatives (one faculty and one lecturer, as requested by President Wilson), as well as presidentially appointed faculty.

The working group looked closely at the university's processes for hiring faculty (starting with the recruitment of suitable pools) and retaining faculty, especially those from marginalized groups. The group hoped to build on practices already developed here and capture data that would be helpful to us in moving towards our goals. They considered best practices at other institutions that have proven helpful in increasing the diversity of faculty hires, and at available research on the issues. The recommendations that we are making at this point do require some additional thought, but they are the items supported by the working group.

One of the recommendations, already mentioned by Ms. Chamblee as coming from various groups, was

that a "DEI Implementation Committee" be established to track the progress of the university in addressing recommendations. Our group was not sure specifically how such a group would work, but considered some sort of established group necessary.

Most recommendations are modifications to the current faculty hiring system using the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) steps. The goal was to keep track of hiring in terms of diversity goals as well as to put some conditions on the search process to ensure diversity in the candidate pools. One of the recommendations is to expand eligibility for serving on a faculty hiring committee to include lecturers, clinical faculty and research faculty. Another is to involve the OEO earlier: in our current process, the OEO office is only involved at the point that a search committee has selected a final candidate. The working group viewed that as too late—the search group has already invited applicants and gone through the process by that point. The recommendation is that the search and the applicant pool be examined at those earlier points in the process when recommendations on diversifying the pool can have the most impact. In addition, the group recommends requiring that search committees use the same "rubrics" for selecting and interviewing all candidates in a search to ensure the same evaluation criteria are used consistently. We also recommended that diversity advocates be included as members on all search committees.

For retention, we focused on two major areas: (i) what other institutions were doing to achieve better retention and (ii) how to achieve greater accountability on retention issues. For the first, the working group found that many institutions have developed broader kinds of mentorship. Wayne State already has departmental mentorship programs, and we suggest some ways to improve those. Other institutions, however, have developed university-wide mentorship programs that are thought to be particularly helpful to faculty from historically underrepresented groups because they find support outside their own department or school/college. For the second, the group developed a "scorecard" recommendation that would require schools/colleges and departments to develop DEI hiring and retention plans and establish annual metrics for evaluating their plan's successes.

Ms. Beale noted that ordinarily a speaker at the Senate would have visited Policy beforehand but that had not been feasible in Mr. Baltes' case. She noted that increasing mentorship and having the possibility of a mentor removed from the faculty member's specific unit could be helpful in terms of talking more openly about situations that arise. That broader option for mentorship is likely something that all

faculty would support, though it may be difficult to find appropriate mentors outside the faculty member's unit, depending on the discipline. Ms. Beale suggested some concerns, however, with the idea of a scorecard and fixed metrics. While she thinks it is important that units develop a plan and consider whether actions taken have succeeded or failed in accomplishing the unit's goals, she worries that any system of annual "metrics" here would tend towards punitive. After all, hires within units have been severely restricted over the last several years, with the "interdisciplinary hiring initiatives" almost the only source of new hires. If hires are restricted, units cannot increase their faculty diversity. In units that are allowed to hire, it will be easier to satisfy diversity goals. That will tend to make those allowed to hire "look better" in any system of annual comparative metrics, even though the disadvantaged units had no ability to make any change, and in fact in times of cutting back on budgets, those units may also find that the faculty from diverse groups within their units are more likely to be enticed to move to other universities, thus suffering a 'double whammy'. This is similar to the issue raised about scorecards in general when Ms. Chamblee addressed the Senate: this kind of metric can easily be used in a punitive fashion if there isn't broad awareness of relevant facts—for example, the number of Ph.D.s from underrepresented groups in a particular field and the number of open positions over the last decade, or the number of underrepresented candidates who have turned down a Wayne State offer because they received a more prestigious offer elsewhere. All of these things come into play in the success or failure of a search, but it is worrisome when it is condensed into a set of metrics that appear truly objective and quantified and are presented to the Board of Governors or Council of Deans without the detailed context necessary. Scorecards tend to lead to inappropriate assessments of efforts, so it is important to consider that rather than reach a judgment of a negative environment that doesn't actually exist.

Mr. Baltes agreed that these are important considerations and ones that whatever next committee serves to develop these DEI issues needs to consider deeply. Nonetheless, the members of the working group felt strongly that there had to be some form of accountability or nothing would change. Clearly, it can't be an unfair report card, and it should not be used comparatively (i.e., comparing department A in CLAS with department B in CLAS, etc.). Rather, the scorecard should lead to questions about why the goals set are not being achieved, and the answer may well be some of the things Ms. Beale mentioned—no Ph.D.s in the field; no hires allowed for several years, etc.

Ms. Beale added that this issue relates to the concerns expressed by the Policy Committee about the suggested DEI Council. A broad group representative of the university can be a fertile ground for ideas and proposals, but ultimately it is the administrator in the unit and the people over them—the chairs, deans, provost and president—that are the ones that must be held accountable on these issues, because that is where the power actually lies. She worried that this talk of accountability does not place the accountability with the responsibility—it seems to take a punitive perspective that assumes, apparently without asking various units what they actually do to bring in underrepresented faculty, that the faculty are not trying to hire underrepresented faculty, and it does so rather than assigning the accountability with those who actually have decision-making responsibility.

Ms. Lewis suggested that perhaps these concerns about accountability can be addressed in the type of 'scorecard' that is created so that it is not used to "ding" people but can even serve as a way of celebrating accomplishments. She suggested that there would likely need to be both university-wide parts of a scorecard and parts particular to the individual units.

Ms. Beale noted that this presentation was a rather general sketch of ideas and asked whether the individual reports from the different SJAC working groups would be shared with the Senate so that members could comment and provide input much broader than that available in the relatively small working groups on these matters. Ms. Chamblee answered that she will be consolidating the individual reports into an overall report over the holidays and believes that the different reports will be made available. Nevertheless, she has not yet discussed that with the President so is not sure whether or how that will happen. Ms. Beale urged that they be made available. It is important to have broad input on ideas and proposals, and to give everyone a chance to read the reports and not who served in the groups. It would be helpful to have that opportunity.

Ms. Stockdill asked what kind of inquiries were made to various departments that have hired in the last few years to see what protocols they followed. When Ms. Stockdill attended the bias training, it seemed to be that the trainers assumed everyone in chemistry just cloned themselves and were not trying to hire a diverse faculty, whereas in actuality the search committee disproportionately interviewed diverse applicants. For example, about 10% of the applications last year were from women, but 50% of the interviewees were women. The first offer was

made to a Latinx person who was also handicapped, but that person turned us down to accept another offer near their hometown. The second-best candidate, a white male, then did accept the offer. Thus, in making a scorecard, you have to be very careful what you assume and how you grade—it is much more complicated than who did you hire. Mr. Baltes agreed and noted that chairs and deans will play a significant role in creating a DEI plan and the unit's own way of measuring its outcomes. It should not be the DEI Committee but a department/college decision.

Ms. Stockdill followed up to ask to what extent the working group had sought current information from departments and schools/colleges on what they are already doing. Chemistry, she noted, does have a plan, and the department has various rubrics used for searches (filled out with varying reliability depending on how busy faculty are and how many searches are ongoing). The rubric is more important as a reminder to those on a search committee of key criteria settled on before seeing any candidates than as a scorecard. Shouldn't the working group have researched what actually happens on campus to identify the source of the problems? For chemistry, for example, it is very hard to hire an African American because there are so few African American Ph.D.s in this field. She noted being upset at the anti-bias training because there was a presumption that chemistry just wasn't trying to hire African Americans, rather than an understanding of the actual context. Mr. Baltes responded that the group did not do any sort of survey to find out what protocols were being followed and what the specific difficulties in hiring were. Nonetheless, Mr. Baltes does not think the majority of the departments adhere to the good practices that Ms. Stockdill is describing. It will be important for the deans to establish the current benchmark for what different departments are doing. And Mr. Baltes noted that he really cannot speak to the problems with the OEO training.

Ms. Stockdill added that another problem that occurs is that when the rare opportunity arises that there is a candidate who is entertaining offers from excellent schools such as NYU or UPenn but interested in Wayne State because of their childhood in Detroit, units cannot make that hire. What is needed is a buffer that allows departments to make strategic hires in those areas when they have a chance to recruit a diverse member of the faculty as a lateral.

Mr. Walker noted that he served on the SJAC hiring group. He agrees with Ms. Beale that the administration holds most of the power, but power also resides with those faculty who serve on committees. The current system does not work well, since we continue to hire mostly white people. Clearly

the solution will be complicated, but Mr. Walker thinks we do need to strengthen the tools to assure that there are plans and accountability by the chairs and deans.

Provost Clabo thanked Ms. Chamblee, Mr. Baltes, and Senate members for a useful discussion. She noted that both she and Ms. Chamblee would take back various considerations to the larger committee. Two stood out to her. First was the idea that any metrics developed by the schools/colleges/divisions need to be contextualized to consider broad factors that may impact hiring and retention in that area. Second was the idea of shared accountability for becoming a more inclusive environment.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

It was MOVED and SECONDED to APPROVE the Proceedings of the Academic Senate meeting of November 4, 2020. PASSED.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements.

Ms. Beale noted that this is the Senate's last plenary session of the year, and what a year it has been. All of us have struggled with the stresses of teaching and working and just managing our lives in the midst of the pandemic. She thanked each of the members for their participation in the Academic Senate and their willingness to serve on the many Senate and university-wide committees. If there are some among the members who are interested in serving on more committees, please let her know--Policy can definitely find other work to be done!

The following is a quick review of the key items that the Policy Committee and Senate representatives have been paying attention to or moving towards a policy recommendation for, other than Restart issues.

1. Enrollments and Research.

As most are undoubtedly aware, enrollments have declined—in part due to the pandemic, in part to national policy limiting international student visas, and in part due to simple demographics, especially in the Michigan tri-state area. Our graduate enrollment decline is particularly worrisome, since that affects instruction, research and budgets (graduate students pay more tuition than undergraduates, are key to much of the introductory course teaching as GTAs, and are essential for research as GRAs). Our Ph.D.

programs are also essential to our status as a public research institution and our ability to recruit stellar research faculty. A large percentage of our research is conducted by the School of Medicine, and that School is facing a tsunami of problems, from the inability of any Wayne pediatricians to practice at Children's Hospital after Wayne's former pediatric practice group's affiliation with CMU and exclusive contract with DMC resulting from President Wilson's effort to gain more control over the plan to the loss of revenues from DMC and from practice plans that have resulted in significant salary changes for clinical faculty and worries about hiring of research faculty and the long-term fate of graduate medical education. The Academic Senate Research Committee will engage in an in-depth discussion about these med school research and graduate education issues at its meeting next week.

2. *Changes in Higher Education.*

We addressed one recent significant change—the new Title IX regulatory regime imposed by the DeVos Education Department—in our last meeting. But there are a number of other ongoing changes, and demands (from administrators, students, politicians, and others) for a permanent increase in online education, for so-called “competency-based education”, for almost laser-like focus on “career preparation” rather than acquisition of critical analytical abilities and an ability to distinguish fact from fiction, and in some cases, for elevating STEM over arts and humanities. The future of higher education and the degree to which each of these trends is worth pursuing is a topic that requires in-depth consideration by the Senate. We have held some discussions in Policy, but this will require multiple discussions in our committees and in the full Senate as we consider what changes are appropriate and what changes may be damaging to the goals of higher education. Ms. Beale indicated that she will ask the standing Senate committees to undertake these discussions in the winter term, with hopes of producing a “White Paper” on the issue with Senate recommendations before the beginning of the Fall 2021 term.

3. *Emeritus Status.*

The Policy Committee discussed emeritus status in 2013 over a series of meetings, with the goal of eliminating a process that treated the awarding of emeritus status to retirees similar to promotion and tenure, where chairs and deans could independently

review candidates' contributions to the university and nix the award of the status. At many campuses, emeritus status is automatic. There are few ‘percs’ that go with it—continuing email and ability to use “professor emeritus” as a title are the main ones. No real cost is involved to the university. The Policy Committee in 2013 argued that, at the least, any requirements should be minimal—perhaps some fixed number of years' service or tenure at Wayne, and recommendation by a committee of peers that would go directly to the Provost, who would essentially provide *pro forma* approval. No P&T-type “hierarchy” should be involved. Although the Policy Committee had understood that there was administrative support for the compromise proposal thus developed, we learned that the update to the proposal continued to incorporate the P&T-type administrative approval process. We have re-opened that discussion this year with Provost Clabo, and thus we hope to succeed finally in revising the policy to make it nearly automatic.

4. *Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC) Proposal for a DEI Council.*

The Senate is very appreciative of the SJAC process and agrees that there are many actions that we, as a university community, need to take to advance the diversity of our faculty, staff, administration, and programming. Nevertheless, the Policy Committee had two primary areas of concern regarding the draft proposal for a DEI Council. First, the Council would bypass the Academic Senate as the elected organization on campus that should provide faculty and academic staff representatives to university-wide committees. As drafted, it would have the President select 10 members, and add a “faculty and staff” representative from each school and college, with the requirement that it be someone who had “access to the dean”, and then ask both the Student Senate and the Academic Senate for 2 representatives. Second, this 41-member group would have a charge that also bypasses the Academic Senate: most of the functions it would be expected to serve are within the purview of the Senate, such as “creating a metric for measuring school/college accountability in achieving diversity” and “implementing” the diversity recommendations from the SJAC. We have voiced strong concerns about this, noting that the Senate should be the one to establish an ad hoc DEI subcommittee (as we did with the Anti-Bullying and the Data Transparency Subcommittees) to deal with these matters, and can easily include in such a group not only academic staff and faculty, but representation from the other unions

(custodial, clerical, etc.) and appropriate ex officio administrators. We can also draft and consider a bylaws amendment to create this as a permanent Senate committee for the future.

5. *Phoenix Program Revision.*

We supported the revision to the “Phoenix” program that permits students with very poor GPAs to return and establish a decent GPA for graduation. The new program is more rigorous but still provides a real opportunity for those who lost their way but have the potential to succeed in completing their degree. If you have more questions about this program, you can read the materials in the Policy proceedings or contact Naida Simon, who worked with AVP Darin Ellis on the revision.

6. *Undergraduate and Graduate Grading Policy Changes for the Fall 2020 Term (and, in the Case of Undergraduates, Also for the Winter 2021 Term).*

Policy supported a continuation of the policies instituted for winter 2020, given the continuing severity of the pandemic and the shift to synchronous and asynchronous education that may be more stressful for some of our students.

7. *Synchronous vs Asynchronous Designation of Courses for Winter 2021.*

Policy learned that some departments had used a “synchronous” default label for all courses in setting up the winter 2021 schedule, with the expectation that professors could easily switch to asynchronous since that would not cause any scheduling problems for any students. (The reverse had happened for the fall term, and faculty were not permitted to switch from asynchronous to synchronous since that would require a matching student schedule.) Nonetheless, the Provost’s Office had determined that no switches from synchronous to asynchronous would be permitted once registration was opened. Provost Clabo indicated that she considered it ideally a faculty decision which type of course was taught and is investigating how best to deal with this situation. At the least, we agreed that affected faculty can poll the registered students and if there is no objection, faculty should be able to switch to asynchronous.

8. *Upcoming Retirement of Angela Wisniewski.*

Our long-term Secretary, Angela Wisniewski, has retired. As of November 20, she is no longer in the

office and is taking well-deserved vacation days after 37 years of incredibly loyal, able, and expert service to the Senate. The Senate President is already struggling to manage, as we do not yet have a replacement—in fact, although we’ve known about this impending vacancy for months, the position announcement was delayed until about a week ago.

Ms. Beale asked the Senate to provide unanimous consent to a resolution to be printed and given to Angie (along with the Senate’s other gifts) that states the following:

The Academic Senate of Wayne State University extends to Angela Wisniewski, our long-term colleague, friend and secretary, the heartiest congratulations on her retirement. We have appreciated your scrupulous service, your integrity, your competence, and your faithful carrying out of your duties no matter how difficult. You have always gone well beyond the demands of your office to serve and to help. We wish you the best in your future endeavors.

Ms. Simon moved the resolution and Mr. Beavers and Mr. Kessel seconded the motion. The Senate membership approved unanimously. Ms. Beale thanked the members for their support, noting that Angie will be moved upon hearing of this.

The Policy Committee is collecting a fund for a gift to Angie to thank her for her service. Various members of Senate leadership have seeded the fund with gifts totaling \$400. Each Senate member is asked to contribute as much or as little as desired. Checks should be sent to Linda Beale at 800 West Boston Blvd, Detroit MI 48202 or to Naida Simon at 5153 Woodlands Drive, Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302. [Notice added: At the Academic Senate Teams site are photographs of Angie with her Pewabic Tile gift bowl, vase and ornament and framed resolution. The Senate funds raised paid for those gifts plus a cash gift of \$1381.]

9. *Retirement of a Policy Committee member.*

Another of our long-term colleagues, David Kessel, is also retiring from the University at the end of this year. David has been an incredible colleague on the Policy Committee, essential in that he has headed the Research Committee for several years and that he brings to us a voice from the School of Medicine that understands the role of clinicians and Ph.D. ‘basic science’ faculty in the school, the importance of the school’s research agenda and grants to the overall R1

status of the university, and awareness of the multiple issues that affect the school. We will certainly miss David's contributions to Policy, but he clearly deserves a wonderful retirement. Ms. Beale asked for a show of virtual applause/handclaps for David and added that all of us will miss David's ready wit and multiple anecdotes from a life well lived. There have been many days when that wit has been an incredibly bright spot for us. Obviously, David's retirement means we will need to run another election for a seat on Policy. Naida Simon will speak to this issue as "New Business" at the end of the meeting.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee.

The Academic Senate received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of October 26, November 9, and November 16. They are attached to these Senate Proceedings as Appendix B. Ms. Beale invited members to email her if they have questions about any of the discussions, which are now recorded in fuller detail for benefit of the members.

VI. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Clabo noted that the campus is experiencing an increase in the infection rate, moving from an average of 2.29 positive cases a day four weeks ago to 8.7 currently. The Governor has ordered a general depopulation of campuses until the cases and positivity rate decline significantly. We do not expect to have widespread vaccination rates until later in the spring, so we will not come back this fall.

The students and many faculty and staff reported finding the "Mental Health Day" a welcome relief. There is a request that we do something similar for the winter term, and we want to do that with earlier notice to permit faculty to plan appropriately. The Restart committees will discuss the possibility of taking a day sometime in February, probably in the second or third week.

Enrollments tend to be somewhat worrisome, as Ms. Beale suggested. At this point the graduate enrollment for the winter term is down about 10.5% and overall is down about 6.7% compared to last year at this time. The graduate trend is particularly worrisome, suggesting that we need to focus more on graduate enrollments than we have in the past. We have tended to place a very heavy emphasis on undergraduates, yet our master degree enrollments have been the machine that drives the university. The Graduate Dean is working on the issue, with attention to Graduate School marketing needs.

The university was awarded a national "excellence in assessment" award—one of thirty-nine universities in the U.S. to have received the award in the five years it has been given. This award is from multiple industry leaders (VSA Analytics, National Institute for Learning Outcomes, and Association of American Colleges and Universities) and recognizes the university's success in incorporating assessment practices across the entire institution.

Provost Clabo also noted that five-year reviews are underway in Engineering and Fine, Performing and Communication Arts. The reports are due in February.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Kessel Retirement.

Ms. Simon announced that an election for Professor Kessel's seat on the Policy Committee will be conducted at the first plenary session of the Senate in 2021. Individual members can nominate others for the seat or self-nominate. If nominating another, please secure that person's consent to serve if elected before filing the nomination. Nominations may be emailed to Naida Simon, chair of the Elections Committee, at n.simon@wayne.edu.

B. Parrish Comment.

Mr. Parrish commented that in the catalogue of issues raised by Ms. Beale in her President's Report, she had not mentioned that Wilson continues to ignore the role of the Academic Senate in almost everything that he does. President Wilson has shown clear contempt for academic government, including his view that he can personally select people to serve as "representatives" of faculty on university-created committees such as Restart and SJAC, even though the Board of Governors statute clearly indicates that the elected Senate is the source for faculty and academic staff advice to the President.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Linda M. Beale
President, Academic Senate

APPENDIX A. Hiring and Retention of Diverse Faculty Working Group of the Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC)



Committee Charge

Hiring and retention of diverse faculty: critical examination of policies, procedures, practices, and processes for identifying, recruiting, hiring, and retaining diverse faculty, and determining gaps in the processes where bias might enter

Committee Composition

Nikki Wright (Co-Chair)	Assistant Vice President and Director, Office of Equal Opportunity
Boris Baltés (Co-Chair)	Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Marquita Chamblee	Chief Diversity Officer
Basim Dubaybo	Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, School of Medicine
Sara Kacin	Assistant Provost for Faculty Development & Faculty Success
Nicole Trujillo Pagan	Associate Professor, Sociology
Kimberly Schroeder	Lecturer and Career Advisor, School of Information Sciences
Neelima Thati (Senate Rep)	Associate Professor- Clinical, Internal Medicine
Clay Walker (Senate Rep)	Senior Lecturer, English Composition
Lisa Ze Winters	Associate Professor, African American Studies and English

APPENDIX B: Policy Proceedings

**Wayne State University
Academic Senate
Proceedings of the Policy Committee
October 26, 2020**

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; L. Lauzon Clabo; J. Fitzgibbon; r. hoogland; D. Kessel; C. Parrish; B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; A. Wisniewski

Guests: Dawn Medley, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management; Cathy Kay, Senior Director, Office of Financial Aid; Rebecca Cooke, Vice President for Finance and Business Operations; Robert Thompson, Interim Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice President for Computing and Information Technology; Melissa Crabtree, Senior Director, Campus and Classroom Technology Services

The item marked with an asterisk constitutes the Action of October 26, 2020.

I. Wayne Med-Direct Program:

Policy Committee invited Ms. Medley, Ms. Cooke, and Ms. Kay to discuss how the Med-Direct Program is working and its cost. The

Med Start program, the forerunner of the Med-Direct Program, began in 2005 for the purpose of recruiting talented pre- medical students as undergraduates at WSU with the expectation that upon graduation they would enroll in our medical school, but there was no requirement for them to do so. The Med- Direct program includes a contractual agreement for admission to the Medical School for FTIAC (first-time-in-any-college) students who satisfy certain benchmarks. Med-Start was funded with merit scholarships and top-offs for undergraduates; Med-Direct uses the same discount model. Med- Direct undergraduates receive a free ride--full tuition, fees, and housing, but as medical students they receive only tuition and fees. The university does have some endowed money for the undergraduate tuition. There are endowed funds at this point for one cohort of medical students' tuition and fees, but not a sufficient amount to cover the

four that will exist when the program is fully underway. Other financial aid is available for some medical students. Ms. Cooke suggested that if the endowment did not cover all the expenses the medical students would qualify for both merit and financial aid in the Medical School.

Ms. Beale believes the university needs a long-term plan for funding the program if the full endowment funding is not actualized. The current program admits 10 undergraduates a year, so that when the program is fully populated, there would be 40 undergraduate students and 40 med school students annually. If we do not get the funding expected, would the number of students admitted be reduced or are there other plans for funding the program? Ms. Cooke said since this a pipeline program for the Medical School, she expects the Dean of Medicine would determine the number of students who could participate in the program based on the school's resources.

Provost Clabo added that the Med-Direct program addresses a problem cited by the LCME on its most recent visit: the lack of student diversity. This program targets students from diverse backgrounds who face financial challenges. The first class of students in the school contributes significantly to the diversity of the school. PC asked Ms. Medley to provide data on gender, ethnicity and background of each of the existing cohorts of students and agreed to do so.

One category in the program budget was additional program costs, covering expenses such as courses MCAT exam preparation, undergraduate research opportunities, and other "student success" programs. A coordinator now located in the Honors College handles these Med-Direct supplemental programs. PC members were supportive of the programs though concerned regarding adequate endowment funding.

Although the university recruits nationwide for the program, Ms. Medley noted that it is predominantly a Michigan program, with 16 of 50 applicants out of state, none international. While helping to prevent a 'brain drain' of good

Michigan students, it also attracts top students from outside the state, such as one from Illinois who was successfully recruited. The Discover Detroit award requires a 3.5 GPA and a 24 ACT score and permits students to attend WSU at the in-state tuition rate. The Med-Direct students would have qualified for that program: the majority have ACTs above 30 (in the 38 - 39 range). The Medical School has a recruitment committee of vice deans on which Ericka Jackson, director of undergraduate admissions, serves. The vice deans of diversity, admissions, and education serve on the interview committee before the students enter as freshmen. They work with John Corvino, Dean of the Honors College, and faculty in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Recruitment focuses on STEM-oriented students.

Mr. Villarosa asked whether there was any remedy if Med-Direct under-graduates opted for another medical school. Ms. Medley responded that the issue would be referred to the provost but did not occur with this first class.

[Ms. Cooke, Ms. Kay, and Ms. Medley left the meeting. Mr. Robert Thompson and Ms. Melissa Crabtree joined the meeting.]

II. Restructuring of the Division of Computing and Information Technology:

C&IT is centralizing all campus IT services. Mr. Thompson said the reorganization is designed to provide a consistent level of IT support throughout the campus so that everyone receives high quality IT support at a desktop or server level and for research. He believes the reorganization will enhance our infrastructure including cloud technologies and cloud storage, the agility of research teams, and the ability to deploy IT resources quickly and in ways that do not require a lot of initial planning for purchases. It requires expertise to do it right, which is a significant justification for the consolidation plan. C&IT was earlier charged with strategic planning for standardization of classrooms (after taking over the classroom technology coordination

function from the Libraries). Mr. Thompson indicated that he believes the pandemic will change the way faculty teach in the long term, so this consolidation will plan for those changes, including strategic investments in virtual classroom technologies and a consistent level of support for in-person classrooms. He also sees a plus in developing a “common set of security standards” for campus technology rather than the current “silos” that make it hard to predict risks and vulnerabilities. Consolidation will ensure consistent patches for servers, desktops and software for anti-virus protection at the server level to prevent loss of data, a growth area for any IT organization that requires added investment to handle threats. An important part of the plan is to have multiple layers of department support and cross-training of tech support personnel, rather than one person for a department, especially in operational and research areas when that person is not available due to vacation or illness. Consolidation has been a topic of discussion with the administration for years, with the goal of more efficiency and better preparation for future demands by working in teams as opposed to working in silos.

Mr. Thompson reviewed the timeline for implementation of the changes. On April 22 President Wilson announced that IT would be consolidated. On September 16 Mr. Thompson held a town hall for all the campus IT staff and announced the timeline for restructuring changes. On October 19 he announced the new organizational chart, the reporting lines, and the Warrior project page. On November 2 the changes in the reporting relationships will take place. An inventory and discovery phase will be conducted in the first quarter of 2021 and a phased alignment of centralized IT and school/college/ division operations will begin, continuing over the next two years. Unanticipated issues will arise that will have to be addressed as the project is carried out.

Ms. Beale noted her poor experience in seeking help from the C&IT helpline and with service in the Academic Senate

office compared with the Law School’s IT staff. The response in the Law School is fast even at night and on weekends. She has found that often the centralized staff do not know how to correct problems and have to contact another person to resolve problems—this has certainly been her experience in calls to the C&IT helpdesk. Across-the-board standardization is not necessarily a plus, since it can have negative impact for units with specialized needs. Beale noted that there was no real consultation with the Senate (and, she has been informed by those involved, none with the deans) on the question of whether IT services should be consolidated. The former CIO Darren Hubbard mentioned it almost as an aside in his presentation to the Budget Planning Council in the spring, indicating that one school had agreed and that he foresaw a ‘dotted line’ relationship between C&IT and school personnel. There was no proposal for consolidation, no discussion, and no consensus that it should be implemented. The Policy Committee and the faculty who served on the Council were shocked when the President’s announcement came out without any consultation whatsoever with FSST, Curriculum & Instruction, Faculty Affairs, and Policy. She agrees that some standardization of security requirements and cross training of people can be advantageous, but she worries that this complete centralized “restructuring,” coupled with layoffs determined by the central office rather than individual units, can easily go awry (as it did in the case of Human Resources) and fail to serve the needs of individual faculty, departments, and research units or even take into account the well-laid plans within those units.

Mr. Thompson responded to the concerns raised and indicated that the purpose of the discovery and inventory process is to learn the unique needs of the departments and colleges. He does not want to be heavy-handed in the

centralization of IT.

Ms. Beale does understand that virtual classrooms should be a central function and in fact had earlier recommended the shift from Libraries to C&IT. Nonetheless, there is much overlap with academic issues, and C&IT is not staffed in any way by academics. Further, there is concern regarding budgeting of central C&IT services at C&IT. At the meeting of the Senate Budget Committee earlier in the day, Vice President Cooke said there would be 27 layoffs in C&IT (the only layoffs in the 2021 fiscal year). The worry, again, is that central administration does not fully understand the way the school/college IT employees work within the units or the way faculty—who do not want an entirely online university in the future—want to use technology in teaching.

Mr. Thompson views virtual classrooms as important and is prepared to make investments to meet the IT demands of delivering teaching and learning in the future. He believes there will be budgetary savings from consolidation, since we won't be "spending excess money on redundant services or areas where we have redundant licenses." The savings could be redirected to areas of growth or where security and virtual classrooms are needed.

Mr. Thompson stated that he does not know where the layoffs would be or what the targets would be. They will not make decisions to significantly hurt critical services. Ms. Beale questioned this, noting that Ms. Cooke's presentation at the Budget Committee meeting showed C&IT as the only area that would suffer layoffs. Mr. Villarosa said again that 27 positions are targeted. Mr. Thompson responded that part of any reorganization is assessing where there are redundancies and where functions can be consolidated. He explained that some of the items in the inventory and discovery process are to reconcile multiple or redundant

services.

C&IT is investing in virtual desktops for virtual classrooms. They are looking at research IT support and classroom technologies that will allow more virtual teaching and learning activities. These could be supported partially through savings as part of the restructuring, reducing license costs, looking at areas where we are not delivering services efficiently such as Centers. Other funding from the restructuring effort that enhances services is the money spent on hardware in departments. Having standardized desktops that are part of the desktop program that replaces the computers every four years reduces the hardware costs in departments.

Mr. Roth is concerned that the words "efficiency" and "redundancy" obfuscate the lowering of support to units that are considered too well served compared to the norms in order to redistribute the support to other units. That makes people especially nervous. Ms. Beale noted that those units have expended considerable effort to ensure they have the kind of IT support they need, but this will essentially decimate their careful plans in order to "standardize" across units that haven't done good planning internally. Mr. Thompson acknowledged that consolidation levels the different schools/colleges, but he claimed that the university must consider the value of the services to make sure we're doing the right thing for the institution as a whole. He stated that C&IT is trying to keep the staff who currently work in departments in those departments for the long term and does not want to cause unnecessary disruption to the individuals providing support in the units. Mr. Thompson has recurring meetings scheduled with every dean to make sure the consolidation accommodates needs.

Ms. Beale said that C&IT should update the Senate's Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee, for a while at every meeting, about the reorgani-

zation. Mr. Thompson appointed Melissa Crabtree to serve as the liaison from the administration to the committee. She will be able to do that.

Ms. Crabtree mentioned some recent changes as a result of reorganization and consolidation. When consolidation was carried out eight years ago, the academic side was explicitly left off. These examples support reorganization or consolidation so that units are not left behind. Smaller academic units and centers within academic units generally did not get support from their local IT person. C&IT's first goal is to make sure that the units know how to get appropriate support. She also responded to Mr. Roth's comment. In the eight years that C&IT has been consolidating and standardizing support for academic and administrative units, their "customer satisfaction ratings" have never dipped below 95%. [*Comment added: Notably, only the pharmacy school had opted into IT centralization prior to President Wilson's announcement. Administrative units were the primary "customers".*]

Mr. Villarosa questioned whether the effects from the pandemic have been taken into consideration relative to the layoffs, since it seems clear that the particular layoffs have been planned for some time. Those layoffs should be dramatically reduced given the external changes due to the pandemic. Ms. Beale added that it was clear at the Budget Committee meeting that the *only* layoffs are in C&IT and are set out with explicit numbers in the FY 2021 budget that will be presented to the Board of Governors at their October 30 meeting.

Mr. Thompson said the "inventory and discovery phase" should be completed in the first quarter of 2021, which is when the opportunities for savings and efficiencies and long-term re-alignments will take place. The alignment with centralized services will take a long time. He indicated that "thousands of desktops will have to be purchased, and C&IT

employees will have to be trained to provide the services the various units need." All schools and colleges cannot be updated simultaneously.

Ms. Simon asked about the procedure for layoffs. Most of the technical staff are members of the Professional and Administrative union. Mr. Thompson said it is a seniority-based system whereby employees with least seniority are laid off first. A laid-off employee with high seniority would be able to bump an employee with less seniority to assume that person's job. He noted that both management and union positions are targeted for layoff.

Ms. Simon also asked when the Canvas Learning Management system would be populated for the winter 2021 semester. Registration begins next Monday.

Ms. Fitzgibbon said that having unity on a platform would be very helpful for faculty who teach in different buildings. Some of the instruction in the College of Fine, Performing and Communication Arts is not transferable. Will that be part of the consolidation? Mr. Thompson said that a major goal of the consolidation is to have a common set of standards that allows faculty to use the same procedure in classrooms across the university.

It seemed to Mr. Parrish that the consolidation would result in organizational glitches that would be very difficult to overcome. As a faculty member he wants a technician whom he knows. He has a technician whom he knows and who knows the equipment he uses. The technician knows his department and college, has always been available, and knows how to get things done. Consolidation has not always improved the functioning of a division. The consolidation in Human Resources has been problematic. The HR directors in the schools and colleges report to the dean but they are most

responsive to the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. Mr. Parrish added that the employees who work at the C&IT Help Desk have been very responsive and helpful. He also commented that he does not use a desktop computer. He uses his laptop.

Mr. Thompson said they are not trying to eliminate local tech support but to have personnel who are cross trained so more than one person can support a unit. As Ms. Crabtree said, C&IT wants to ensure that they are responsive to the needs of faculty, staff, and students. He is confident that the changes will improve their ability to provide services.

Mr. Thompson displayed the organizational chart when services are consolidated. There is, he said, an opportunity to invest in academic research technology support. They want to energize research activities through strategic investments like classroom cloud technology that will make research faster and more efficient. Ms. Beale asked how budgetary support for research relates to the office of the Vice President for Research. Is the Vice President providing some of the support for research technology? Mr. Thompson said some of the research employees are helping broadly to support research technology on campus. Mr. Thompson is talking with Antonio Yancey, Assistant Vice President for Research Administration and Operations, about addressing redundancies such as multiple departments paying for memberships in organizations. They might be able to create an institutional membership. They talked about funding for IT as indirect cost recovery on grants.

Ms. Hoogland asked how extensively and to what detail this information is communicated to department chairs and deans. Mr. Thompson said there has been regular communication with the business affairs officers and with 160 IT employees at the town halls

since the announcement. C&IT has about 220 employees. If department chairs want information about the consolidation they should contact Mr. Thompson.

[Mr. Thompson and Ms. Crabtree left the meeting.]

III. Report from the Chair:

Provost Clabo met with the members of the Day Care Implementation Committee last week. The committee will submit a proposal to the Provost with short-term and long-term solutions during the pandemic and post pandemic. The administration will look at what proposals can be supported and where they can support the lower-cost options and those that meet immediate needs. As soon as the Provost gets the proposal she will bring it to the Policy Committee for consultation.

The Provost thanked all who are supporting the mental health initiative. They have received considerable positive feedback from students. Many faculty who do not teach class on Friday will cancel class another day. Provost Clabo is very pleased with the support from faculty. Ms. Hoogland mentioned that students in her classes were very appreciative for the break. The Provost said this is an example of how Wayne State has led through the pandemic. The initiative was focused on the students, but faculty and staff are appreciative also. She thanked the Policy Committee for its rapid support of the initiative. A website is being built with resources and activities for the day.

Last week the Campus Health Center tested 883 people for the coronavirus. That is more than 20% of the campus population. Our positivity rate is 1.13%. Some people have said the Campus Health Center is not doing a good job of testing and contact tracing. Her response is that the proof is in the results. If it was not doing an exceptional job we would have a positivity rate like other schools and colleges in this region. The results of the test are available in 48 hours. Provost Clabo received three complaints today. She reviewed the information with the clinicians. The complaints either lacked significant detail or the detail was incorrect.

Provost Clabo asked that members send complaints related to the testing to her.

Approved as submitted via email.

IV. Action Items

A. Budget Documents:

The Senate Budget Committee met earlier today. As was previously stated, the committee was told that the only layoffs would be the 27 layoffs planned in C&IT. The committee was not given any detail on the budgets of the individual schools and colleges— unlike the members of the Board of Governors on the BOG finance committee, neither the Student Senate nor the Academic Senate were given the September 25 budget book with that detail, even when requested.

B. *Student Success Collaborative:

In response to the pandemic in March, Senior Associate Provost for Student Success formed the Student Success Continuity and Learn Anywhere project to coordinate the transition of many student academic support programs and academic advisors to the remote and online environment. Ms. Brockmeyer believes it was successful and is building on that project to support student success collaborations during the 2020-2021 academic year. She asked the PC to appoint two faculty to the committee. PC nominated faculty whom Ms. Beale will contact to confirm their agreement to serve.

C. *Student Non-Academic Misbehavior Hearing Committee Panel:

Policy Committee appoints faculty and academic staff to this panel. They serve three-year terms. The workload is not onerous, and no cases are expected this academic year. Policy Committee asked Ms. Beale to contact the members whose terms are expiring to see if they are willing to continue for another three-year term. They also nominated a replacement if another member is needed.

D. *Agenda for the November 4 Senate Meeting:

Policy Committee reviewed the agenda. No changes were made.

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE
PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
November 9, 2020**

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; L. Lauzon Clabo; J. Fitzgibbon; r. hoogland; D. Kessel; C. Parrish;
B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; A. Wisniewski, Rohan E.V. Kumar

Guest: Ewa Golebiowska, Professor of Political Science and Chair of the Curriculum and Instruction Committee

I. Respondus Exam Software:

Professor Golebiowska chairs the Academic Senate Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CIC). She reported that the committee held a joint meeting on October 28 with the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) to discuss the Respondus Exam Software and is in the process of finalizing the draft report to the Policy Committee.

In brief, the Respondus software proctors exams by locking down students' computers, recording both video and audio during a student exam session, and photographing the student's face at various times during the session to check for consistency using facial recognition software.

The committees have three major concerns about the software as a proctoring method for exams. First, the software proctors but yet is unable to detect dishonesty independently: faculty have to review the data to determine if there has been dishonesty, which will be particularly difficult for faculty teaching large classes with hundreds of students. A related concern is that the software flags students based on its facial recognition system, and there are at least worries that the software poses problems for students of color since facial recognition has been found to be less accurate with people of color than with white people. Second, the software may not appropriately take into account actual normal student activities during use and thus "flag" students causing interrupts that reduce time

the student can devote to the exam. These activities include using scratch paper to jot notes, talking to oneself while parsing questions, showing anxiety about the test, and movement away from the desk for bathroom breaks or other needs. Third, the exam software appears intrusive as an invasion of student privacy because of the web-cam monitoring function, and it assumes that students will have a private, quiet site for taking the exam that may not apply for a student who shares living space with others, whether family or other students who may need internet access at the same time. Ms. Golebiowska noted that the recordings are retained for four years, which represents another significant concern for many on the two committees.

Ms. Golebiowska then noted some counterpoints to those concerns. The primary principle that a proctored exam upholds is academic integrity and the prevention of cheating, so there needs to be some arrangement that supports academic integrity. Further, while the second and third issues are clearly worthy of consideration, it is worth noting that students are monitored during in-person exams by proctors and similarly prohibited from engaging in various activities (eating, pacing, use of cellphones, etc.) that can support cheating or disrupt others in that setting.

Moreover, the faculty can simply use the software as a deterrent, without actually reviewing the recordings, on the assumption that students who are aware of the monitoring will be less likely to cheat. Finally, one of the most difficult issues is the lack of clear data. The software is not new and has been used by a number of faculty for some time, but it is not clear how often these concerns about inappropriate flagging interruptions arise for students or what number of students find the software invasive of their privacy. Ms. Golebiowska suggested that the university should not "throw out the baby with the bathwater", in that there may not be a one-size-fits-all solution but Respondus may work well for some faculty. Sara Kacin at OTL has suggested that faculty in some fields may be

able to change the method of assessment from exams to other means, though there are practical implications for those teaching large classes with fewer TAs than in former years.

There was substantial discussion among Policy members about these issues and other issues. Ms. Beale asked what student complaints have been recorded and whether faculty can essentially waive the web-cam requirement for selected students. The student representative noted that students who need accommodations are the most concerned about Respondus use. Ms. Golebiowska noted that her remedy for students who need accommodation or express privacy concerns is to offer a copy of the exam for those students with the web-cam requirement disengaged. Ms. Simon noted that students complain about unreliable internet connections that can cause them to lose time on the exam, sometimes taking multiple tries before they can log back into the exam. Another problem is that the exam apparently cannot actually discern clear cheating: Ms. Simon took the exam twice and actively cheated (visibly handling her phone in front of the web-cam to call an expert and read off exam questions to get the correct answers) but the software did not flag the visible cheating!

Ms. Beale noted that there is a difficult weighing necessary here to determine whether positives outweigh the negatives—the main benefit is the potential to deter cheating, but the main disadvantage is the potential disruption for students for a variety of reasons (internet access; student activity; flagged actions; privacy concerns). Mr. Parrish, seconded by Mr. Villarosa, noted that once students discover how easy cheating is, the software becomes an invitation to cheat, that leaves non-cheating students feeling unfairly disadvantaged. Mr. Roth suggested that the unfairness issues, from being kicked off, having internet failure or the other difficulties noted, seem to predominate. Ms. Golebiowska suggested it would be helpful if there were data about how often these unfairness difficulties arise, but it is not clear who would have such data.

Faculty may or may not learn about issues students face. Ms. Simon noted that one remedy for internet problems and time getting back on after a flagged activity would be to provide more time, but that wouldn't solve the problems for students needing accommodations or for those who share an apartment with multiple other students, resulting in privacy and internet demand issues. The group suggested that the committees should consider what options were available and include that in the final report.

While Ms. Golebiowska was present, Ms. Beale also noted that some issues had arisen at the last Academic Restart committee that should be discussed at FAC, SAC, and CIC. The most urgent among them is the question of continuing the ***policy of P/NP grading for undergraduates*** for the Fall 2020 and Winter 2021 terms. Students have asked for a continuation of the policy, and academic administrators believe it may help increase registrations for the winter term. AVP Darin Ellis had planned to start implementation this week but Ms. Beale had pointed out that this is clearly an educational policy issue that is required to come before the Senate for review. (See Beale 11/08 email to Ellis on this issue.) Recognizing the sense of urgency on the issue, the committee agreed that the committee chairs will share the information with their committees and take a poll of their members that will be made available to Policy and the Provost by Wednesday at 2 pm at the latest.

[Ms. Golebiowska left the meeting.]

II. Report from the Chair:

Provost Clabo updated the committee on the increased ***COVID-19 positivity rate*** on campus and in the community. Michigan had 6275 cases a few days ago—more than three times the 1950 peak in March. We've moved from a seven-day rolling average of 2.5 a day to 5.5 a day. Campus positivity rate is at 2.13%, and Detroit's is at 4.3%. Unless there is a reversal, it is likely that we will reach the trigger for targeted action or even depopulation of the campus within weeks.

The spread is primarily being driven by relatively small but indoor gatherings of people who do not live together. This will increase over the Thanksgiving Holiday. The planned loosening of residence halls to allow small gatherings will not take place. The Public Health Restart Subcommittee will now meet twice a week to be able to take steps as needed. The good news today was that it appears the Pfizer vaccine will be effective, but it takes 2 doses and it must be stored at 80 degrees below zero or loses effectiveness, so that will make distribution difficult and it will take time to vaccinate a majority of the population. The university health center is purchasing an 80-below freezer for this purpose.

The **mental health day** was a big success with students. There were 1500 who arrived for the swag bags, and students have emailed to say how important it was to know that people care. Michigan is following our example, with two 'well-being' days planned. There is some administrative support for planning a similar day in the winter term, perhaps in February, since January has Martin Luther King day and March is spring break month. Policy was generally supportive, especially if it was handled like the Election Day break this year with the ability for the calendar to accommodate the classes by having a day added at the end.

III. Report from the Senate President:

After receiving information from several of our Senate members, Ms. Beale sent "get well" wishes from the Senate to Professor Emeritus Alfred Cobb. She shared the warm email received in response upon his return home with Policy and noted that we should ask colleagues to let us know about such illnesses or other problems so that we can regularly reach out to our colleagues, whether retired or still working. She will mention this at the next plenary session as well.

The Provost's Office announced the deadlines for various faculty award nominations. We should encourage Senate members to nominate individuals for these

various awards. Some deadlines are in November and early December. Members should review the information on the Provost's website and consider nominations.

Dean Sheryl Kubiak, who is chairing the Diversity, Equity & Inclusion Social Justice Action Subcommittee, will visit Policy next week to talk about forming a DEI Council. It is important that such administrative bodies be established so that they are coordinated with and work through the Senate rather than bypassing the Senate's jurisdiction. Please be prepared for a full discussion of the appropriate makeup and procedures for such a group.

Ms. Beale received information from several women faculty in the School of Medicine inquiring about an Ombuds-like role at the university. They noted that they see a need for something different from the Title IX coordinator in the General Counsel's office or the Grievance and Contract Implementation officers with the Union. They want someone independent to whom they can go for advice about dealing with issues that arise, such as when a senior male faculty tends to choose other male faculty as work partners. We currently have someone with the Ombuds title in the Student Center, but that is primarily an information office rather than an advocacy office and only serves students. Ms. Beale suggested that there is likely a need for a genuine university Ombuds office that serves faculty and staff and is independent of the administration so that it can effectively serve as an avenue for raising concerns and getting advice about proper channels to follow or guidance in having concerns heard by the appropriate personnel. She asked for comment from members. Mr. Parrish noted that there had been such an office in the past, but it was politicized, so it would be important that the person be installed for a specific term of years. The university president should not be able to terminate the person without cause. Provost Clabo noted that the NSF grant with which Boris Baltus is working has as a goal creating some avenue for "outside" mentoring and advocacy—i.e., faculty mentors located outside the junior faculty's

own department. Perhaps this process can satisfy the need or can be coordinated with the effort to create an Ombuds office. Ms. Beale will set up a Zoom conversation with Mr. Baltes to discuss this issue as a first step. Mr. Roth noted that the Anti-Bullying Committee is discussing similar issues as well, since most models for dealing with those types of issues presuppose an Ombuds role at the university. Mr. Villarosa suggested that the union should also be involved.

[Not mentioned at the meeting: the Graduate School seeks nominations and self-nominations for membership on a taskforce on graduate faculty membership. Nominations are due to Dean Amanda Bryant-Friedrich by November 10.]

IV. Action Items.

1. State Hall Renovation Advisory Committee:

Policy discussed Ashley Flintoff's request for Senate representation on a new committee being established to consult on the design and renovation of State Hall. Policy reviewed the members it had appointed to the Classroom Advisory Committee whose charge had included considerations of appropriate design for State Hall and concluded that it would be appropriate to ask the Facilities staff to continue working with those same people in the State Hall design process. Ms. Beale will provide those names to Ms. Flintoff after the meeting.

2. Senate Representation on the Juneteenth Celebration Task Force:

Provost Clabo provided the memo distributed to President Wilson and the Board of Governors regarding arrangements for celebrating Juneteenth, an idea initiated by the Student Senate and supported by the Academic Senate. Mr. Roth noted a few concerns regarding specific items mentioned in the memorandum. For example, the suggestion that "Black-owned food trucks" be invited for the event would likely violate the Michigan law prohibiting discrimination in

favor of any group by public institutions. Further, the discussion of "safe spaces" in the memorandum raises some concerns where it is discussed in the context of pedagogy, as opposed to student services. We will need to be very careful how we are using the term, so as to avoid problems. Provost Clabo noted that these recommendations came from a subgroup of the Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC): it will be important to honor the resolution by careful planning. The committee will include Student and Academic Senate members, members of the SJAC and members of the community. Several members of Policy suggested that Brad Roth should serve, and he agreed to the nomination. Other potential faculty members were suggested for an additional slot or slots, and Ms. Beale will follow up on those.

3. Senate Plenary Session:

A draft agenda for the December 2nd Senate meeting was reviewed. Members agreed that the two selected topics would be appropriate if the presenters are willing.

4. Reports from Liaisons:

a. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee:

Ms. Simon is the Policy Committee liaison to the FSST Committee. The committee discussed three important issues. The first was the use of Canvas. It continues to have more than 90% of faculty using it for classes (Blackboard peaked at about 88%). Ms. Hoogland noted a problem using the 'hide grades' feature, resulting in loss of the 'hidden' grades and the need to redo the complete process. Others noted that they still continue to put their original grades into a spreadsheet for loading into Canvas when complete. Some consider the interface not to be user friendly for selecting texts. It was suggested that those with problems contact Bob Novak for help. The second was the use of Zoom. It was noted that there are multiple licenses and at least 950 Wayne personnel with more than one Zoom license, so C&IT is working to merge accounts. Zoom bombing is also a problem. C&IT will continue to work on that with DOSO. The third was the First

Day Pilot. It was successful, with expectation of expansion for the winter term. The best savings for students is if faculty are using the courseware, but another advantage is having the books for the first day of class. Students can use the books through census day (day 22) and then give them up if they do not want to continue with them. The bookstore receives a reduced markup and the university, a reduced commission: this allows students to get a discount on price. Cengage, however, may provide better deals for some books. A survey will be done of students and faculty who used the pilot, and those results will be shared with Policy. Both Ms. Fitzgibbons and Mr. Beavers noted that the task force worked well together and really enjoyed the process.

b. Budget Committee:

Mr. Beavers, the Chair of the committee, noted that Susan Burns would provide a report on Development in a Budget meeting this month.

V. New Business.

Mr. Parrish mentioned that it would be worth reviewing the emeritus title issue. It continues to seem unreasonable to have a process similar to promotion and tenure to entitle someone to the title after they have taught here for a decade or more. It does not carry any expensive perks: library access and email use (available to all retirees) and listing in the Bulletin and in the faculty directory. It is particularly unreasonable to allow the administration to deny the title to anyone when the faculty in the person's unit has supported the title. Ms. Beale agreed that this is an important issue that should not be controversial and said she is strongly in favor of granting the title automatically or at most through a relatively simple unit vote process with no administrative veto. She added that we had an extensive discussion along these lines several years ago in Policy, and suggested it be put on the agenda again in the near future. Provost Clabo asked if the prior discussion could be located and forwarded to her for reference.

**WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS OF ACADEMIC SENATE
November 16, 2020**

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; L. Lauzon Clabo; J. Fitzgibbon; r. hoogland; D. Kessel; C. Parrish;
B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; A. Wisniewski, Rohan E.V. Kumar

The item marked with an asterisk constitutes the Action of November 16, 2020.

Guests: Marquita Chamblee, Associate Provost for Diversity and Inclusion and Chief Diversity Officer

I. Social Justice Action Committee Initiatives and the Proposal for a DEI Council:

Ms. Chamblee provided an update on the Social Justice Action Committee (SJAC) and Subcommittees established by the President in late June 2020. There are seven different subcommittees or working groupings who are charged to look at issues of bias in various practices, policies and procedures in order to develop recommendations for improving equity across the campus community: Hiring & Retention of Diverse Faculty; Hiring and Retention of Diverse Staff; Student Access and Success; Policing; Inter-Cultural Education; Campus Climate; and University DEI Initiatives. The chair or a co-chair of each of the seven groups, along with President Wilson, Interim Provost Clabo, Chief of Staff Wright, Diversity Officer Chamblee, BOG Governor Stancato, and Senate President Beale, form the SJAC (the steering committee). The subcommittees have been meeting since July 1st and their recommendations are due to President Wilson on November 20. Ms. Chamblee will consolidate those recommendations into a single report for review by the SJAC.

Ms. Chamblee indicated that the University

DEI Initiatives group is charged to look at structures internal to and external to the institution to consider how we might go about the process of thinking about DEI across the university. One of their recommendations is a DEI Council. (Appendix A includes the DEI Initiative subcommittee's proposal for a DEI Council and Monica Brockmeyer's Extended Comments on the DEI Council.) The Council will have 26 school/college faculty and staff representatives—one faculty and one staff member from each school/college. Ms. Chamblee stated that "these are people that have either some background or connection to DEI or some work in the college or some affiliation with DEI initiatives and direct contact with the Dean. We thought it was important that whoever participates from schools and colleges have contact with the Dean so that they have the ear of the leadership." In addition, President Wilson and Ms. Chamblee will appoint ten additional people, the Student Senate will appoint two representatives and the Academic Senate will appoint two representatives. All appointees other than the student representatives will serve terms of two years; student representatives will serve one-year terms.

Ms. Simon asked about representation from units on campus other than schools and colleges. Ms. Chamblee stated that the President's appointees will be an opportunity to identify other staff and academic staff. Ms. Beale noted that the Board of Governors statute is quite clear that the Academic Senate is to serve as "the" voice of the faculty and academic staff" and asked whether that had been considered. Ms. Chamblee stated that that is why there are two representatives from the Senate. Ms. Beale responded that the structure as proposed is not an appropriate recognition of the role of the Senate. The Senate is not "a" voice representing faculty and academic staff, it is established by statute as "the" voice representing faculty and academic staff. The proposed group is made up of administratively selected faculty and academic staff from each of the schools/colleges in contravention of the

Board of Governors Senate statute. Ms. Beale indicated that this is one of the two most significant points of concern about this proposal for a DEI Council that she had strongly emphasized at the recent SJAC meeting when this Council proposal was put forward in a fashion that indicated that the administration had already accepted the idea: (i) *its “implementation” and reporting function*, which clearly belongs in the Office of the Chief Diversity Officer and *simply cannot be exercised by a faculty/staff/administrative group*, and (ii) the fact that *this proposal creates an administratively selected and run organization that bypasses shared governance and the Academic Senate*. The Academic Senate does not merely appoint representatives who are members of the Senate when we establish groups or when we work with groups that are set up by us with the Provost. For example, we can and do appoint Senate Representatives that are not current members of the Senate or even eligible for membership on the Senate. There is no statement in the proposal that calls for representation from the many custodial, clerical and other represented staff at the university, but the Academic Senate can easily go to the Coalition of Unions for appointees that represent those represented staff whose perspectives are needed and we can easily appoint people from divisions other than the schools and colleges. We do so informally or formally whenever it is important to have that broader perspective to inform our views on issues and appropriate measures to address those issues. The idea that the President should establish yet another university-wide, purportedly “representative” organization that is parallel to and separate from the Academic Senate is a slap in the face of what shared governance is intended to be because this is an administratively run and controlled process, even insofar as the school and college participants are expected to be those who have close contact with the Dean—i.e., administrative staff, department chairs, and faculty who would take their direction from the administration rather than providing an independent faculty/staff perspective. Ms.

Beale invited others to address this issue and noted a need for Policy members to discuss as well the suggested functions of the organization: those seem largely unworkable for a group of this nature and thus appear to be mainly “window dressing” for policies the administration plans to implement.

Ms. Clabo suggested that the reason for this kind of structure was that the majority of our staff are not represented as members of the Academic Senate but would “have issues that should be addressed by the diversity council.” [*Note Added: Representation for other represented staff was only mentioned at the SJAC as a response to Ms. Beale’s concern about bypassing the Senate; it was not specifically included in the charge or offered as an original rationale for the Council.*]

Ms. Chamblee responded that the structure is not so much to be duplicative of the Academic Senate as to “provide a focal point for DEI issues on campus in ways that we have never had specifically for that in the past.” She indicated that “with all of the curricular work ... at the Academic Senate, there’s not going to be, from the best of my awareness, a great deal of overlap in the work of this [DEI Council].” [*Note Added: This statement presupposes that the Senate’s jurisdiction is limited to “curricular work”, which is a much narrower view of its jurisdiction than actually embodied by the Senate statute.*]

Ms. Beale strongly disagreed with both of these points. She noted that the Academic Senate easily encompasses additional viewpoints and strives to solicit ideas and issues from across the university. Furthermore, the Academic Senate took a strong role in the development of the Climate Survey and, as Ms. Chamblee is well aware, was the *only* group on campus to take an additional step in response to that survey, after discussions and presentations by Ms. Chamblee and others at the Faculty Affairs Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Curriculum & Instruction

Committee and Policy Committee. The Senate, with the full support of Provost Whitfield, established an Anti-Bullying Task Force that began meeting before the SJAC process was established and yet was ignored by the administration in formulating that process until the Senate insisted on appointing the chair of that task force as a Senate representative to one of the committees. Moreover, the various recommendations on faculty and staff hiring and retention, on curricular initiatives, on teaching initiatives, on policing and the campus safety advisory committee—all of these are matters that are within the jurisdiction of the Senate under the Board of Governors statute and will be bypassed through this Council. The communicative function is also a major part of the Senate's role: we are elected members who are charged with communicating information to our colleagues in our 'home' units. The more administrative organizations are created to take over our communicative role, the more difficult it is for the Senate to serve that function appropriately. Faculty and academic staff become overburdened and ultimately may even choose to serve on the administratively established groups rather than Senate because of the likelihood of garnering related administrative recognition.

Mr. Roth added that it is very important from the standpoint of the role of the Senate as envisioned in the Board of Governors code that the Senate not be circumvented by administrative actions. The question that must be asked is what sort of policy and prescriptions are going to come out of this and what is the process by which they are implemented. He said, "It is a problem if this Council is going to come up with various educational policy prescriptions or related recommendations which affect one way or another faculty and academic staff responsibilities and expectations, and then those are somehow 'implemented' through the Council without full participation of the Senate. ***That's basically the end of shared academic governance: it crosses a red line in the most direct way.***"

Ms. Chamblee insisted that "there is no intention" to do that. The DEI Council will not create educational policy 'without the involvement of the Academic Senate'. It's about policy and practice and engaging in equitable practice."

Ms. Beale noted that the very document distributed to SJAC states that this Council will "implement" initiatives focusing on "retention, recruitment, policy modification" using "content experts"; will establish "metrics and outcomes for scoring success" for the academic units, will consider student composition and retention. She emphasized that ***all of those issues are within the Senate's jurisdiction***. She added that "the more you curtail the Senate's role in achieving those goals, you are saying that is out of bounds for the Senate because you've established another committee to handle it, and you don't need shared governance for it."

Ms. Hoogland noted her complete agreement with the points made by Ms. Beale and Mr. Roth. That led her to ask the question—why was the Senate not involved in this in the first place? The Senate has elected members. The Policy Committee goes through a careful process to select representatives for any kind of committee, whether it is a Senate committee, the Article XXX committees, an ad hoc task force, a search committee or whatever. She stated that she did not understand why, when we have this whole body of elected members representing the entire university's faculty and academic staff, you don't trust the elected members to perform their representative function well. People have been elected to the Academic Senate by their peers; Senate members have a representative function—they are not here merely to express their individual perspectives but have a legitimate function that should be viewed by the administration as a critical resource in ensuring good policy decisions. She suggested that Ms. Chamblee, as a member of the administration, should ask herself why the administration does not trust the Academic Senate's representative function.

Ms. Chamblee responded that the SJAC process had Senate representation and she has appreciated the Senate voice on the working groups. Ms. Beale responded that having only one Academic Senate representative on each of those seven large committees is not how such a project would have been handled if the administration had come to the Senate to discuss how best to organize concerted action on social justice issues rather than forming and reaching decisions in a top-down fashion.

Mr. Parrish added that we recognize that Ms. Chamblee can only do the best she can with the situation presented to expand the impact of her office. He stated that the way this has been handled is “in President Wilson’s lap,” since Wilson has shown that he does not have any respect for the Academic Senate and thus gives the Senate representation only grudgingly. These kinds of things are all administratively driven by the President and his chief of staff Michael Wright, whose basic concern is the marketing dimensions of the President’s presentations.

Ms. Beale followed with two contextualized questions to Ms. Chamblee regarding her view of how a Council such as the one proposed could handle the various actions that are listed on the materials presented. Ms. Beale noted that surely Ms. Chamblee’s office would be the place to produce an annual report on our actions and successes on diversity and equity inclusion issues, and it would also be best equipped to talk about the metrics that make sense for measuring DEI, while the Senate would be in the best position to provide input on many of the DEI issues that have to do with faculty and staff recruitment, student recruitment and retention, and similar items because Senate members deal with those issues with administrators on a regular basis, especially through the Policy Committee. *Does Ms. Chamblee agree that these are the routes that would need to be followed?*

Nonetheless, this Council proposal is to establish a permanent committee for DEI

review and implementation. Ms. Beale finds it incomprehensible how a group of 40 people who don’t have administrative jobs related to implementing these areas could possibly “implement” initiatives. *If this Council were established, what kind of regular process for DEI review would be adopted?*

Surely the SJAC process would not also continue long term. Ms. Beale seeks to understand why people think this is a good idea.

Ms. Chamblee suggested that the DEI Council provides a way “to communicate between groups in the various schools and colleges” what is going on in terms of DEI initiatives. There is currently “not a lot of collaboration”. That is the value of a “cross-university Council with specific focus on DEI initiatives.” It will extend the work beyond her office. The other piece is to have “people with some background and experience in doing DEI-related work” who can help us move these initiatives forward. She agreed that much of the work would come out of her office, but she thought it would be helpful to “focus on DEI” through the Council. As to the SJAC and subcommittees, she assumed they would not “exist forever” but did not know for sure what President Wilson’s plan was for the SJAC steering committee itself.

Ms. Beale reiterated that the faculty and academic staff members of the Senate have connections with every single school and college and beyond and are expected to, and increasingly have been doing, that communicating with their peers about what they learn at the Senate. If the Senate is bypassed, it will hinder rather than help communication on these DEI issues because it again becomes administratively directed communication, not peer-to-peer communication. The proposal notably left out how the faculty and staff would be chosen by the schools and colleges, but the required coordination with the deans makes it highly unlikely that it would be truly representative.

She stated that she understands Ms. Chamblee's goal—and it is an admirable one—of increasing communication across the university. Nonetheless, she considers that is a role clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate. It is the reason Ms. Beale created an Academic Senate Teams site for communication and sharing of things we send to other people or raising issues of concern. It is the reason Senate documents that appoint faculty and academic staff as Senate representatives to non-Senate committees now include a statement of the expectation that they will share with the Senate what the committee is discussing so that it can be discussed more broadly within the Senate. That is what shared governance is supposed to do. It is exactly those things mentioned by Ms. Chamblee—bringing in expert voices to bear on issues from across the university, communicating what has been developed, and working with others across the university to address shared concerns. That is the Senate's business.

Members briefly discussed the availability of the annual affirmative action report. Ms. Chamblee noted that it is produced by General Counsel EEO and Mr. Parrish noted that it is usually on the Board of Governors agenda. It is useful because it brings into focus difficulties at departmental levels in meeting diversity goals. He commented that there were about 55,000 PhDs in the U.S. last year, of which only about 2,500 were African American. That small number makes it very difficult to recruit African American scholars to the university. Ms. Beale added that it also makes retention of those we do successfully recruit even more difficult, as they are so often picked up by higher ranking schools. We are hampered by lack of faculty titles compared to our peer departments and schools in other public institutions, as discussed earlier at the Academic Senate Budget Committee meeting with Development.

Mr. Parrish noted that certainly DEI efforts need to be in conversation constantly, and there are receptive members of the faculty

and academic staff to these goals. The problem with establishing a structure like the Council is when they start instructing the academic side as to how to recruit, what to do, setting requirements. It's an idea that sounds good on first response, but likely to become a real problem as a mostly administrative operation.

Ms. Chamblee noted that the Council idea emerged from several of the working groups, with different ideas of what it should encompass. Mr. Parrish voiced a concern that the Council may ultimately harshly criticize a particular department for not doing well enough. Ms. Chamblee suggested that her idea is not to condemn but to provide support to departments who want to make a difference in recruiting and retaining diverse faculty and staff. Mr. Parrish asked what the budget to support that work was, since it takes a budget to encourage people to recruit: the axiom goes—if you accomplish this, you will get budget support for that. Ms. Chamblee responded that there is no budget at this time. Ms. Beale noted that budgetary tools such as Mr. Parrish suggested would also be extraordinarily problematic coming from such a Council, and Ms. Chamblee agreed that they should not have a role in budgets or budget incentives. But Ms. Beale noted that gets to the "implementation" point yet again: the charge states that the Council will implement retention and recruitment policy modifications. Yet those are clearly educational policies that relate to the schools and colleges and the Academic Senate's jurisdiction—and do have budgetary implications as well. Mr. Parrish added that in public administration, a basic precept is that "budget is policy": a DEI Council as proposed, 'implementing' policy without being supported with budget becomes little more than a talking shop that points fingers at people. Both Mr. Parrish and Ms. Beale reiterated that we appreciate the goal, the question is how can it be achieved. In addition to finding the composition of the group a slap in the face to the Senate, Ms. Beale thought the group as constituted would simply not be able to do the functions stated for it. Mr. Parrish

noted that if the President had come to the Senate initially with the idea of setting up some kind of group to carry out this communicative and review function, there would have been support where the Senate had a real role in establishing a structure that might have genuine impact. Unfortunately, the structure just adds a couple of Senators at the tail end—the Senate would have only 2 representatives on a committee of 41! That is not the way consultation and shared governance should work. Ms. Beale stated again that this is the point she made at the SJAC meeting and originally when President Wilson first informed her about the process he was establishing for considering social justice actions on campus. Regrettably, he seemed to be saying that he just wanted to do something quickly that would show he was taking action, which comes across as a PR concern that disregards any shared governance processes.

Mr. Villarosa then stated that he agrees with the troubling nature of the Council proposal as eroding Senate responsibility, but he went on to add that Ms. Chamblee's office has not been supported with the kind of budget needed to work on these matters. Perhaps if she had more staff it would have been possible to make sure that true consultation with the Senate could have happened. The office could have considered ideas and utilized the existing governance structure, with expanded input as Ms. Beale suggested. He is concerned that a parallel organizational structure establishes a different dynamic that is problematic for all the reasons already stated.

Ms. Beale asked whether the proposal as written is expected to go forward or whether Ms. Chamblee foresees any reconsideration. Ms. Chamblee responded that it would likely have some amendment but would come up at a future meeting of the SJAC. Mr. Parrish asked whether the proposal would be put in place by the President or go to the Board of Governors. Ms. Chamblee indicated that she would work with the President to put it into effect.

Beale summarized that she sees genuine problems with the way the proposal is currently set up, which is regrettable because it is important for the university to make progress on these issues. But establishing even more bureaucracy—in a place where faculty and academic staff already feel the pressure of too much bureaucracy and administrative bloat in the growing number of AVP positions in a budget that has cut back on numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty, cut academic staff positions and faces a shrinking total enrollment below 26,000—is extraordinarily worrisome. It does not appear that there has been sufficient consideration given to what the Council is supposed to accomplish and how it could possibly accomplish that. It could make sense for the Senate together with Ms. Chamblee's office to create a well-structured small advisory committee with her office staff and a group of 12 Senate-appointed faculty and staff (including non-academic staff) with staggered terms to provide advice and ideas for communicative strategies or areas where problems occur. That could be a very workable idea. But the idea of having a Council that "establishes metrics" by which academic units are judged and that "implements" DEI ideas is problematic. Indeed, when you consider the various suggestions in the document presented by Monica Brockmeyer, it seems even more worrisome. Having the Council review and act on score-card data on a regular basis might raise legal issues with the Michigan affirmative action legislation limitations. Having the Council have input into school/college budgetary decisions and processes, which would almost be inevitable if it had a real role in recruitment and retention, would be hugely problematic. These ideas are extraordinarily broad and completely ignore the existing shared governance mechanisms. Beale urged that there be some reconsideration before this is finalized, even in sending to the steering committee. She noted that she is the only faculty voice on the steering committee: every other person is either a university official or a person who is chairing/co-chairing a group and therefore has some

vested interest in the ideas. Ms. Beale is the only independent faculty voice there, which is worrisome in itself.

Brad Roth noted that there are two kinds of issues. One is how a group like this, with 40 people, could actually do the work suggested in a productive way. The word “implementation” is problematic. It is one thing for a group to recommend ideas and suggest metrics, but for this group to “implement” policy that affects educational matters and matters affecting the rights and responsibilities of faculty would be an impossible situation. Perhaps there is a way of redrawing this to avoid encroaching on Senate territory, such as having its work be preliminary to review by the Senate. Beale noted that even if that implementation and charge were remedied, there would still be the problem of administrative selection of faculty and academic staff, rather than selection by the Senate as mandated by the BOG statute. Parrish commented that the administration is likely to enact the proposal because the President is already committed to it.

[Ms. Chamblee left the meeting.]

II. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Policy Committee approved the proceedings of October 26 as drafted and approved the proceedings of November 9 adding a phrase in the discussion of safe spaces.

III. Report from the Chair

Provost Clabo noted that the trajectory of the COVID-19 surge is clear, as the campus positivity rate has increased in 4 weeks to 5.37 percent of tests and the city has moved to 6.8 percent, both from rates around 2%. We’ve moved from a seven-day rolling average of 2.29 cases a day to 6.71 a day. The Governor’s Order late Sunday requires ending face-to-face classes effective Wednesday the eighteenth. An announcement will come out from the President shortly to that effect, with exceptions for clinical students. Unlike Michigan, however, we are

not closing the dorms and sending our students home to perhaps spread the virus there. They are permitted to stay on campus if it is best for them, with dining services provided, including free meals over thanksgiving break for people who choose to stay. Mort Harris will remain open by reservation, with machines moved farther apart and increased air circulation. Libraries will remain open at 25% capacity, and the Student Center as well, requiring ID and screener. For faculty and staff, the message is that if you do not have to be on campus you should not be here.

In response to Beale’s question about labs, the Provost noted that at this time they expect the labs will continue with the existing restrictions. In response to Fitzgibbon’s question, the Provost noted that we have not had clusters that have been tracked and we are continuing to do contact tracing. Public health departments, however, are overwhelmed and unable to conduct effective contact tracing. The Provost expects that clinical partners will no longer admit our clinical students within weeks because of the surge and shortage of testing reagents and PPE supplies. Students tend to use more PPE than seasoned clinicians. No more than 2 households are permitted to gather, so it is important to recognize this immediate issue of the Thanksgiving holidays.

IV. Report from the Senate President:

Ms. Beale noted that the President had sent out an announcement about a mid-December commencement, but the Academic Senate has not been included in the planning. In May, she had agreed not to participate given the rapid turnaround for the event, but she had assumed that the Senate would continue to present the faculty and academic staff voice at the ceremonies in the future. She asked the Provost to suggest that this oversight be remedied.

A recent survey was sent from EAA about academic advising regarding the three-year contract with EAA. Ms. Beale noted that the Senate would like to

follow up to get more information on the kinds of services the EAA contract provides.

After the last Policy meeting, the Graduate School Dean's Office contacted us regarding their desire to put in place the same grading policy for graduate students that was instituted for the Winter term. The information was shared with Policy and the full committee voted to support the grading policy extension for the Fall term.

The Graduate School is establishing a taskforce to reconsider the question of who qualifies to serve as graduate faculty. Under the current policy, only tenured faculty may serve but Dean Bryant-Fredrick would like to find ways to include people who may have different titles. In some cases, there are persons working in the field who teach as part-time faculty or lecturers and are the experts in the area. Students should be able to include them on their committees. The taskforce will consider establishing different types of graduate faculty to allow that expansion.

As this was Angie Wisniewski's last official meeting with the Policy Committee, since she is retiring and will be using her vacation days after November 20, Ms. Beale noted her profound appreciation for her work and everything she has done. Members applauded and noted that we do not know how we will function without Angie, who has been the solid and constant foundation of the Senate for 37 years.

Ms. Beale noted in closing that there had recently been an announcement of an award given by Patrick Lindsay's office (VP for Governmental Relations)—the Arthur L. Johnson Community Leader Award. It is rather odd for the university to select someone from the external community for a leadership award. Provost Clabo indicated that the award has been in existence for a long time and was created in honor of Author Johnson's service to the university and community. In the past, the VP for Development would present the award.

V. Action Items.

1. Senate Plenary Session Draft Agenda:

Policy briefly discussed the draft agenda for the December 2 Senate meeting. Boris Baltes and Marquita Chamblee have agreed to participate. It is hoped that there will be detailed presentation about the DEI Council and other recommendations.

2. Emeritus Status:

Beale summarized the reason this is coming up for discussion again. Materials distributed include the original policy approved in 1959 and the two memoranda from the School of Medicine suggesting an expansion of emeritus status, at least within Medicine, to clinical and lecturer faculty. The procedure in those proposals closely resembled promotion and tenure criteria and procedures. We discussed the issue over three Policy Committee meetings in 2013. At that time, proceedings did not detail discussions, so there is very little information from the proceedings. Also distributed to Policy was a description by Ms. Beale of those discussions: she remembers being surprised with the tenure-like process that existed. As she recalls, the entire point of the Policy Committee's review and draft of a revised policy was to avoid a procedure that resembled promotion and tenure requiring approval from the chair and dean. So we compromised in the Policy Committee draft, also distributed, by requiring either 10 years in service or tenure.

Although Provost Winters had appeared to accept that policy draft, the current website entry shows an amended policy that retains the role of the departmental chair and dean as providing an "independent review and recommendation". Beale asked the Provost whether the administration is open to removing that process, which seems hard to justify for something that merely recognizes that the person has retired from being a member of the faculty at Wayne. Other than email and library privileges, there is nothing provided by the university.

The Provost thanked Policy for bringing this forward but noted that she would like to review the materials in more depth than was possible

because of the time spent on the Covid-19 surge over the last few days. She added that she was aware that in many places emeritus status is a matter of course—serve X number of years and the status is given when you retire, while at others, emeritus status is given only on the basis of contribution to the university. She asked if faculty who have already received emeritus status based on that contribution criterion and process would consider their status somehow diminished by opening it more broadly without a decanal process. Charles Parrish said he did not think that would be an issue. The problem is that if it is set up as a P&T process, then people will tend to think they should make it harder to get. But it opens the door to petty politics if the person is on the wrong side of someone in the administrative line that has to approve. Linda Beale added that she thinks the Policy revision that the Senate has supported creates good will among retirees, who appreciate the small honorific. That's much better than creating ill will by refusing to grant emeritus status to someone who has been here for years. Policy agreed to bring the item back on the agenda for the next meeting.

3. Switching Course Offerings from Synchronous to Asynchronous:

Ms. Beale noted that she had received an email from faculty in CLAS that included a chain of emails noting that the Dean's Office was informing departmental course schedulers that any course scheduled as synchronous could not be switched to asynchronous. The problem arose for the Winter term because of a mixup that had occurred in registering for the Fall term: schedulers had listed various courses as asynchronous without checking first with faculty, and then were told that they could not switch to synchronous because students may have selected asynchronous because of their difficult schedules. For the Winter term, the departmental schedulers tried to solve the problem by assuming that they could list all courses as synchronous and then let faculty switch if they preferred asynchronous: they considered this should be okay, since this would not involve the problem of a student being unable to meet the schedule (though some students may prefer synchronous classes over asynchronous). The email stated that the

Provost's Office had issued the policy against switching. This has now created problems for faculty who had spent considerable time designing their courses as asynchronous and now would have to redesign the course to be synchronous if not permitted to switch.

Provost Clabo was not aware of any policy on this and asked to be sent the email chain. Mr. Roth noted that he had also received it, and that it did say it was a Provost's Office policy. It appears that there were several departments that ran into this problem. Mathematics definitely is one. Provost Clabo indicated that whether to offer the course synchronously or asynchronously is clearly a faculty decision, though it is important that the course be listed accurately so students know what they are getting. She has heard various complaints about asynchronous classes from the events she and the President host with students. Beale agreed that students may well prefer synchronous classes, but the problem here is that apparently the people doing the scheduling did not know there was a policy, which has created a problem for faculty who had planned their courses one way and now may be forced to redesign the courses to suit another method. Provost Clabo indicated she would check with Darin Ellis and find out what the process should be for switching. Beale asked if she would consider it appropriate for the faculty who would like to switch to asynchronous to poll the registered students to see if they agree, taking care not to commit that it would definitely be doable. Provost Clabo said she thought that was a reasonable approach.

hoogland noted that she had the same impression that students preferred synchronous because of the contact, but in fact the enrollment data in her department show high enrollments in asynchronous classes and low enrollments in synchronous classes. Provost Clabo noted that enrollment for the Winter term appears to be down considerably—about 17% compared to the same week last year. When she asked for a check on whether synchronous or asynchronous were filling up best, she was told that the synchronous classes were preferred. Perhaps it is a difference from department to department. Beale noted that it could also be scheduling conflicts that lead a student to choose to take one course

asynchronously so that that course and a course with a synchronous schedule can be done in the same semester.

hoogland added that she is varying her plans for her classes, doing one class synchronously on zoom but assigning students work to do on their own for the second class rather than doing two classes a week on zoom (i.e., half online as a class and half offline). That doesn't fit neatly into either the synchronous or asynchronous framework, and it appears there is not a current label for that sort of class. The Provost asked hoogland to talk to the Registrar to see if there was a way to label it for the students.

Fitzgibbon added that she runs the 3300 courses in her area. The asynchronous fill up immediately and had a waitlist, whereas the synchronous had fewer students. That may mean that for Fall 2021 these courses should move to entirely asynchronous. Provost Clabo responded that she will ask for data showing how that is working in each school, college and department. Darin Ellis's impression was that students were choosing synchronous over asynchronous. We should know what they are choosing, but we should also see if they are happy with that choice as well. It may be that asynchronous looks appealing until they realize they do not have the contact and regular participation that synchronous provides. Beale added that the pandemic situation also creates its own context—trying to study and care for family at home may make asynchronous classes more appealing. Maybe by Fall 2021 we will be closer to normal. Provost Clabo responded that she does not think the vaccine process will go as rapidly as some media are suggesting. She is on the Governor's task force for vaccine prioritization. The December shipment to Michigan will cover only 150,000 people, which is insufficient even to reach all those providing critical care.

IV. New/Old Business

a. Information from Monica Brockmeyer.

Beale noted that she had asked Meihua in institutional research for information on cohorts of undergraduate students over the last 3-5 years showing ACT/SAT, GPA and FTIAC, gender, ethnicity and retention into second year. Meihua had responded that she had produced

some data along those lines for Monica but that it was "proprietary" to Monica so she could not provide it to the Senate. Beale checked with Provost Whitfield, and he said that none of that information is proprietary and he would have Monica provide it. We still have not received that, nor other information that Monica has said she would provide on the test-optional procedures. Dawn Medley also agreed to send specific information when she was last at Policy but has not done so. Provost Clabo noted that she will make sure we receive the data that we have asked for. [Note: none of that data has been received to date.]

b. Research.

The School of Medicine's hiring and salary freezes are apparently affecting what people who are in part on grants get as raises. They would normally get a raise from the clinical practice group (e.g., Wayne Health, the former UPG) and a raise on the research grant but are now restricted from matching the practice group raise with the grant funding. Researchers are suggesting that this is affecting their ability to have those people work for them on their research. David Kessel indicated that this would be a discussion at the research meeting in December and a fuller report can be brought to Policy from that. He thinks it is connected to the de-emphasis on graduate medical education in connection with the limited resource and deficit situation of the Medical School.

c. Heart of Detroit Scholarship Funding.

Ms. Simon noted that an announcement from the Provost's Office changes the credit requirements for HOD funding. The original plan required and paid for 15 credits each semester (fall and winter), with any summer credits paid by the students. The announcement allows students to maintain the scholarship if they only register for 12 credits in fall and winter terms, but they will still be responsible for paying for any summer credits they take. Beale suggested that this seemed unfair: they were promised 30 credits of funding, albeit in the fall and winter terms, but now they are being allowed to take only 24 in the fall and winter because of the pandemic, but if they do, they will forego funding for 6 credits since they

will not be funded if they take the additional 6 in the summer when they take advantage of the lower fall/winter credit requirement. Beale noted that Policy had originally suggested that requiring 12 as the minimum for fall and winter terms would be more appropriate for students who may need more support, allowing them to take 6 fully funded in the summer. Certainly, if the pandemic is justifying allowing fewer credits in the regular term, we should continue to provide the full 30 credits of support originally promised. Provost Clabo indicated she would doublecheck the information with Cathy Kay.

Approved as submitted by Policy Committee via email.