

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY – ACADEMIC SENATE
Official Proceedings
May 6, 2020

Members Present: Keith Whitfield, Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs; Linda M. Beale, President, Academic Senate; Leela Arava; Poonam Arya; Faisal Almufarrej; Paul Beavers; Cathryn Bock; Erika Bocknek; Timothy Bowman; Tamara Bray; Leah Celebi; Wei Chen; Victoria Dallas; Susan Davis; Alan Dombkowski; Kelly Dormer; Brian Edwards; Samiran Ghosh; Wanda Gibson-Scipio; Ewa Golebiowska; Daniel Golodner; Siobhan Gregory; Smiti Gupta; Xiaoyan Han; Robert Harr; Lance Heilbrun; renée hoogland; Arun Iyer; Barbara Jones; Thomas Karr; Mahendra Kavdia; David Kessel; Thomas Killion; Christine Knapp; Manoj Kulchania; Sarah Lenhoff; Wen Li; Justin Long; Krishna Rao Maddipati; Bharati Mitra; Santanu Mitra; Ekrem Murat; Sandra Oliver-McNeil; Victoria Pardo; Charles Parrish; Rachel Pawlowski; Sean Peters; Richard Pineau; Michele Porter; Avraham Raz; T. R. Reddy; Shauna Reeves; Robert Reynolds; Brad Roth; Krysta Ryzewski; Ali Salamey; Berhane Seyoum; Naida Simon; Elizabeth Stoycheff; Neelima Thati; Ellen Tisdale; Ricardo Villarosa; William Volz; Jennifer Wareham; Jeffrey Withey; Yang Zhao

Member Absent with Notice: Pamela Dale

Members Absent: Juliann Binienda; Richard Dogan; Thomas Fischer; Samiran Ghosh; Peter Henning; Michael Horn; Kristen Kaszeta; Fayette Keys; David Merolla; Rayman Mohamed; Stella Resko; Scott Tainsky; Ronald Thomas

Others Present: Thomas Anderson, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Boris Baltés, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Associate Vice President of Academic Personnel; Monica Brockmeyer, Senior Associate Provost for Student Success; Michele Bruner, Senior Director, Student Academic Success; Darin Ellis, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness; Ahmad Ezzeddine, Associate Vice President for Educational Outreach and International Programs and Senior Associate to the President for Special Initiatives; Darryl Gardner, Director, Operational Excellence, Student Success; Latonia Garrett, Director, Student Service Center; Ingrid Guerra-Lopez, Interim Dean, Graduate School; Mark Jackson, Director, APEX Scholars; Cheryl Kollin, Senior Director, University Advising Center; Sharon Lean, Associate Dean, Graduate School; Dawn Medley, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management; Timothy Michael, Associate Vice President for Student Auxiliary Services; Ryan Mitchell, Academic Services Officer, Student Affairs; Judith Moldenhauer, Professor, Fine, Performing and Communication Arts; Matthew Orr, Program Coordinator,

Undergraduate Research; Bandon Shamoun, Academic Services Officer, Student Affairs; David Strauss, Dean of Students; Kenya Swanson, University Counselor, Student Affairs; Karen Tarpenning Szadyr, Liberal Arts and Sciences; Shawn Turner-Pewitt, Director, Career Services; Tonya Whitehead, Associate Director, Office for Teaching and Learning; M. Roy Wilson, President.

CALL TO ORDER: Provost Keith Whitfield called this regularly scheduled meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 1:40 p.m. The meeting was held via Zoom.

I. APPROVAL OF THE PROCEEDINGS

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

II. MATTERS SUBMITTED BY THE POLICY COMMITTEE

A. Anti-Bullying Committee Charge and Members

Ms. Beale explained that the Policy Committee established the Anti-Bullying Committee because the climate survey revealed that many employees across the university were the targets of bullying and intimidation or they witnessed such behavior directed at another person. Jennifer Wareham, Professor of Criminal Justice, chairs the committee, which has representation from faculty, academic staff, administration, graduate students, and the AAUP-AFT. The committee was charged with defining the various inappropriate behaviors and procedures to address the concerns and assure that due process would protect the accused and the accuser. All the unions will have to address possible sanctions and penalties for inappropriate behavior. The paper "Establishment of an Ad Hoc Anti-Bullying Committee" is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix A.

B. Response to Inclusive Access Proposal

The Inclusive Access Proposal is similar to an issue that the Senate dealt with last fall when Timothy Michael, Associate Vice President for Student Auxiliary Services and Chief Housing Officer, and Jodi Young, the manager of the Barnes & Noble Bookstore, proposed the First Day Access program. Policy Committee was not consulted about the program prior to receiving announcement of its implementation. Students who participated in the

program would have their textbooks the first day of class. The Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Affairs, and Policy Committees looked into the program. They found that the textbooks likely would be more expensive and the process for students to opt out of the program if they did not want to participate was difficult. An opt-in process would serve students better. It was decided not to implement the First Day Access program.

Policy Committee was surprised to see the issue brought forward again in the spring with a new name, Inclusive Access. This program is promoted to faculty. The Senate was not consulted about the program and the Policy Committee does not know how it was approved. Policy received an announcement of the program. The committee had an extensive discussion with Tim Michael about the program and agreed that at most it would be a pilot program. Policy Committee still has significant concerns about the program. The memo of April 29, 2020, addressed to Tim Michael with the subject "Inclusive Access Proposal from the B&N Bookstore" is attached to these Proceedings as Appendix B. Policy Committee asked that their questions be addressed before the announcement is sent to faculty.

III. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

A. Report and Announcements

This has been a momentous year for the University and for the faculty and academic staff in particular. Because of the pandemic, the people that we represent have put in countless extra hours of class preparation and student advising, dealing with everything from how to use a whiteboard in Zoom to how to console over Zoom a student who has encountered an immense personal loss—from death of a family member to illness, to finances to the personal equanimity necessary to carry on in the face of a crisis. And yet we have persevered. We have continued to meet our classes even when we ourselves have faced enormous stresses and fatigue. The Senate committees have continued to function, even when we have struggled—more than we should struggle—to get necessary information from administrative officials. We are here today, meeting virtually, in a testimony to the importance of shared governance and the dedication of the near-hundred faculty and academic staff members of the Senate who serve on behalf of their colleagues in departments, divisions, and schools or colleges.

You have had an opportunity throughout the year to review the minutes of the Policy Committee in detail

and see the kinds of issues that we have addressed. Many are routine appointments and useful discussions that continue the shared governance tradition of the university. Some, however, have been major issues—often ones that are an attempt to address “hot spots” that arise when an administrator (it is usually an administrator) acts without considering the impact on faculty and academic staff or thinks that Senate consultation is unneeded or, regrettably in some cases, acts without respect for the shared academic governance process to proceed with a decision administratively determined to be “efficient.” Back when Rick Nork was VP for finance and administration, it was assumed that faculty use campus parking just like administrators (9 to 5) so why consult, or “travel concur” works for administrators with secretaries to enter the data, so it’s an “easy” system. I want today to highlight just a few of those major issues from this year’s Senate work, with a focus on the most important ones.

First some successes:

Transparency Task Force

One of the successes of the year was the Academic Senate’s creation of a Senate task force to review transparency concerns regarding use of and access to data in software systems increasingly being used as administrative tools to gather information about students, faculty and campus processes. In particular, the task force considered the new Academic Analytics database and the part of the system that had been declared off-limits to any access by other than high level administrators. The task force put forward 4 recommendations and Provost Whitfield accepted all four, including access for a small group selected by the Academic Senate to sensitive databases. Paul Beavers and I attended a meeting with the licensing staff to discuss. The next step—which has been delayed by the pandemic—is to create an ongoing Senate subcommittee that will continue to work on this issue and include the people who will have actual access to receive training and access to the system. We particularly appreciate Provost Whitfield’s working with us on this issue to address our concerns.

UROP

The UROP program’s survival is what I would call at this point a qualified success, depending on how funding is allocated for the next fiscal year. Originally, Monica Brockmeyer had announced a plan to completely restructure the program without first getting data on how the restructuring would

affect current faculty and students who have used the program to enrich undergraduate education. After the Academic Senate, through the Policy Committee, became involved, we learned that 55% of the current users of the program would not have access under the proposed restructuring, and we were able to redirect the restructuring towards a real expansion rather than an elimination of the benefits of the program for the current users. Provost Whitfield again facilitated cooperation in this restructuring, and solicited funds from OVPR to ensure that there was an understanding university-wide that involvement of undergraduate students in research is an essential element of education in a university that claims to be a public urban research university.

Anti-Bullying Committee

Similarly, as discussed earlier, we have discussed the issue of bullying and intimidation on campus and as a result have created an ad hoc Academic Senate Anti-Bullying Committee. The charge and membership has been circulated to the Senate with the agenda for this meeting. This is a response to the significance of this issue as shown in the Climate Survey conducted a few years ago.

Second, some ongoing concerns:

Academic Freedom Violations

Perhaps the first items that caught all of our attention were the several instances of violations of core academic freedom principles that led us to censure (at varying levels of censorship) various high-level administrative officials: in particular, Dawn Medley, AVP for Enrollment Management, for causing a whistleblower email about discrimination within her division to be deleted throughout the university's email and computer systems—a clear stifling of First Amendment rights critical to academic freedom in an academic enterprise—that was followed by her “outing” in a public meeting of private medical information about a former staffer; and Carolyn Hafner, for a violation (acknowledged by her to the BOG audit subcommittee) of core due process procedural protection rights of university employees in the internal audit's harsh initial investigative techniques in response to an anonymous complaint—probably arising out of envy—about an academic staff member; and Dean Steffi Hartwell, for stifling free speech of faculty, staff and students around claims of bullying behavior. The response to these censures was, to say the least, disappointing—Ms. Hafner was promoted to Interim head of Human Resources, and Ms. Medley was recognized (with lots of

promotional effort by the university) with a “Spirit of Community” award. The senior administration has not appeared to take these violations to heart: we have not seen evidence of administrative understanding of the need to stress the importance of academic freedom, such as establishment of additional required training for all administrators about free speech, due process, and academic freedom as core values of the academic enterprise.

University Pediatricians and Children's Hospital

The problems with our clinical pediatricians go back several years, as we have discussed here in the Senate on prior occasions. They were greatly exacerbated by the administration of David Hefner as VP for Health Affairs and President Wilson's top-down dealings with the School of Medicine, the negotiations with Henry Ford Hospital System, and especially the University Pediatricians clinical practice group. Children's Hospital recently announced that UP—the members of which have now left Wayne University and some of whom have become faculty at Central Michigan University, to which the related PEPPAP “institutional adjustment” funds have also gone—will have exclusive representation at Children's while any pediatricians remaining with Wayne Peds (about 25, apparently—we have still not been provided a clear number of the remaining clinical pediatricians) will no longer have access to practice there. That may well affect the medical school's residency training and opportunity for medical students to work on critical advanced pediatric medical issues. These are serious and worrisome developments and have meant a loss of some of our Senate colleagues from the School of Medicine.

Lack of Administrative Consultation with the Senate

This year has seen an increasingly worrisome trend, from the President and from various VPs, to create ad hoc administrative committees or processes that duplicate shared governance processes.

1. Bookstore issues

As the Senate members are aware, this has included

Bartleby learn—We were shocked to see this program offered by the bookstore with AVP Michael's approval. As we researched the program, we saw that it was essentially encouraging students to commit academic misconduct and did not fit the description given to us by AVP Michael and bookstore manager Jodi Young. After an in-depth

discussion based on our research into pricing, poor quality of the purported “tutoring”, and the real potential that the program encouraged plagiarism, the Policy Committee was able to convince the university to stop the promotion of that program on campus. We have asked for notice to students who enrolled regarding the problems of using materials from the program for essays or homework but still have not heard from AVP Michael on that issue. We asked the Provost to provide an update at the last meeting.

First Day Access and now *Inclusive Access*—In the materials distributed to Senate members are included a memo on the Inclusive Access issue with its appendix showing an email exchange between AVP Tim Michael and Policy regarding the resurgence of a plan that had been discontinued after both the Academic Senate (and its various committees) and the Student Senate objected to the problems in *First Day Access* last summer, the likely lack of savings, and the ‘student capture’ that would occur with an opt-out program that was very difficult to opt-out of. We were astonished to see this program come back (as *Inclusive Access*) without any consultation whatsoever. We have discussed this, and sent the memo that you received, concluding that it would at best be possible to run a small pilot if (and only if) the conditions for the program were renegotiated to address various problems noted—ideally with an opt-in instead of an opt-out and with assurance of student savings and ability to print and clear notice to faculty and students about various matters.

2. Budget Issues

Budget Planning Council and Academic Senate Budget Committee (ASBC) Consultation—As you know, the Senate selects representatives to the university-wide Budget Planning Council (BPC). This year, the process was similar to last year’s process (other than the elimination of presentations from several key administrative offices and no information on the President’s plans for funding typically reserved to him for “strategic initiatives”), as were our final recommendations. Like last year, this year’s BPC recognized that there are two or three schools and colleges and divisions that are operating exceptionally well for the benefit of the entire university—Nursing and C&IT are examples. BPC also noted that several are not meeting expected standards—e.g., Marketing (where the focus on the President as the “brand” of Wayne State University, the de-personalization of the university’s websites, including the lack of identification of key staff or contact information, and the lack of interrelationship with S/Cs suggests a

broad-based problem that misses key needs of the academic enterprise), and OVPR (where continued problems with sponsored program administration inadequate accounting and other support for faculty researchers with grants, high investment in administrators, and an abysmal record in increasing funding to maintain our research status is particularly concerning given the increasing large amounts of funding—including indirect cost recovery dollars—that are allocated to the office). We had agreed to draft and send a report to the President that would be available to the university community. That report was drafted, and edits were suggested by the faculty members of BPC. There has been no distribution of a final report and no response to questions regarding the status of that report. There was less information shared with BPC this year regarding budgetary matters shared than in the past. Similarly, there has been less transparency in materials provided to the ASBC. For example, there was no background budgetary information provided this year on the proposed tuition increase for medical students (who in the winter 2020 term had to rely on “virtual” surgery clinical practice), and the discussion at the BOG meeting on that issue left several questions unanswered, including the status of the PEPPAP institutional adjustment account after 2018. Only after the BOG vote on medical tuition at Friday’s meeting did President Wilson accede to my request for information regarding past use of PEPPAP funding and (some) underlying information on the “loss scenarios” that President Wilson has referred to over the last month in projecting potential cuts for next year’s funding.

There was no consultation whatsoever with the ASBC regarding President Wilson’s major announcement (with the Mayor and other officials) of the “Heart of Detroit” program (that excludes residents of Hamtramck and Highland Park, which was of concern when Policy learned of it, and that is not a significant increase in tuition support although touted as such), the President’s video announcement that student fees would be cut, the recently released announcement regarding “free tuition” for a 3-credit course (the “Kickstart” program), and other matters. While the Policy Committee was supportive of the Kickstart program and other matters (though we would have suggested various changes if consulted), these were all decisions made without the required consultation under the BOG statute.

3. University restart subcommittees

As would be expected, the administration has been thinking about how to restart the campus.

Regrettably, begun by the President on April 16, this process has been very top-down. Although Provost Whitfield asked Policy to provide two Senate reps for the Academic Restart committee, that was the only one of the many committees that asked the Senate to name representatives—Judith Moldenhauer and I were selected by Policy to serve there. You’ve received lists of the committees with their memberships. In each case other than the Academic Restart, any faculty serving on the committees were selected by the Chairs, with President Wilson’s explicit instruction that Chairs should pick any faculty they wanted to serve and his refusal to ask the Senate to provide academic staff and faculty representatives (relayed by a complete lack of response to our memo to him asking for Senate representatives). This attitude towards Senate representation was also conveyed directly to me by Rebecca Cooke in a telephone call Friday morning. The Policy Committee memo had asked that, at the least, the Finance Committee should have a Senate representative. Rebecca Cooke informed me Friday morning that the President had explicitly directed her to pick her own representative rather than go through the Senate.

Until the BOG meeting on Friday, as noted, the President had not been willing to share with the Senate leadership any of the underlying budgetary information on which the central administration is making decisions. This was an intentional snub of academic governance and one of the reasons that we chose to restructure this final meeting to allow the Senate, in our Q&A, to ask questions and raise concerns about the restart process.

And finally, some further good news:

The Senate has worked closely with the Student Senate which has shown a proactive stance on various issues, from their support of our push on the bookstore issues to their resolution addressing the need for academic support on sexuality studies to bathroom access for transgender students and an Acknowledgment of the Three Fires Native American nations’ grant of land to WSU. I congratulate the Student Senate on the collaborative approach they have taken on these issues.

When Ms. Beale concluded, Mr. Parrish commented that he believes the administration’s lack of consultation with the Academic Senate is quite serious. He does not understand why President Wilson does not consult with the Senate about the appointment of faculty and academic staff to the committees that are developing policies for the return to campus in the fall. He suggested that

the Senate take action on a motion of censure of the President with respect to his lack of consultation that has been a problem for a long time. For example, President Wilson has not met with Ms. Beale for a year. The only power, Mr. Parrish said, that the Senate has is censure in response to the President’s lack of consultation. Mr. Parrish indicated his willingness to make a motion of censure. Ms. Beale agreed that it is an important issue, but suggested that any motion of censure be made as new business after the scheduled agenda items.

B. Proceedings of the Policy Committee

The Senate members received the Proceedings of the Policy Committee meetings of February 24, March 2, March 16, April 6, and April 20. They are attached to these Proceedings as Appendix C.

IV. YEAR-END REPORTS

The chairs of the standing committees of the Senate reported on the work of the committees they chaired.

A. Budget Committee

Paul Beavers chaired the Budget Committee. He stated that the committee would hold at least two more meetings this academic year. At one meeting the committee will consider proposals for tuition for the 2020-21 academic year. The other meeting will be held on June 15 in preparation for the Board of Governors meeting on June 19. Implementation of the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget model has been delayed until fiscal year 2022 because of the uncertainty of the budget due to the coronavirus and the shutdown of the university. RCM is a living revolving model being developed for WSU. The issue about funding for graduate assistants was addressed. Funding for graduate teaching and research assistantships that had been in the Office of the Dean of the Graduate School was moved to the schools and colleges, but it will be identified specifically as support for assistantships.

Mr. Beavers believes the university will have to cut the budget between \$13 million and \$20 million for next year. The university should have a long-term budget plan that allows adjustments to be made. The administrators on the Senate Budget Committee agreed this should be done, but it requires more trust between the faculty and the administration. There has to be more openness, more consultation, and a greater commitment to shared governance because

dealing with the budget one year or one crisis at a time is not adequate. The Budget Committee also expressed concern about the frequent and costly uses of consultants for work that should be done in-house. Members believe we need to maintain our research standing more effectively. Mr. Beavers was disappointed that he was unable to arrange a meeting with Jack Sobel, when he was the Vice President for Health Affairs and Dean of the School of Medicine. He hopes to arrange a meeting with Mark Schweitzer when he assumes that position.

B. Curriculum and Instruction Committee

Mr. Roth chaired the CIC. He highlighted some of the activities of the committee. Involvement in certain decisions gives faculty and academic staff the opportunity to “look under the hood” of proposals giving a different take on issues. One example is the way the university bookstore promoted certain projects they tried to sell to our students, in particular, the Bartleby Learn program. Members of CIC did a great deal of work getting information about the program. They found that not only does the program not do what it promises but it also lends itself very easily to academic dishonesty. The committee succeeded in getting the university to drop its relationship with the program and to discontinue promoting it on the university’s website.

As Ms. Beale mentioned, the Inclusive Access project also was promoted by the bookstore in the previous academic year and was brought back. The committee repeatedly pointed out that our librarians have expertise in these matters and have strong views about them. Unfortunately, it appears that the Associate Vice President for Auxiliary Services Tim Michael has looked more to the manager of the bookstore who is a Barnes & Noble employee rather than to the expertise we have at the university. One of the key roles of the committee is to advocate for a faculty role in these kinds of decisions.

CIC is looking into the processes for grade appeals, in particular in the case of academic dishonesty. A revision to the student code of conduct will be necessary. The code of conduct includes details of the processes for appeals in cases of academic dishonesty. Faculty need to be kept informed and have input in matters where faculty have changed grades or dealt with cases of academic dishonesty. The committee has begun looking at the interdisciplinary hiring initiative put forward by the Provost to find out the cost of the initiatives. The committee has a

minor role in various bodies including the General Education Oversight Committee on which Tom Fischer, a member of CIC, serves. CIC is involved in the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program. During the summer the committee will continue to deal with issues related to restarting the university.

C. Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee

Robert Reynolds chaired the committee and reported on the issues it addressed this year. The process of getting paperwork through the university has been slow. This year the infrastructure was improved so students could access knowledge and information in a timely fashion. They standardized the format for shared data and access to data in terms of the different roles or identities people have and the related security issues. Traditionally data is acted on in a particular department or office. When it is done it is sent away and there is no real concern about what happens next. Mr. Reynolds thinks one of the key things to do is to change the flow of data from a particular office to others that might use the information in a standardized way.

The software systems on campus are being standardized. We have had at least three software systems for room scheduling that are not necessarily compatible. The university bought a new system called EMS that consolidates scheduling across campus and has artificial intelligence components that allows scheduling to meet the needs of different teaching styles. There has always been a tendency to improve the online presence of the university because of its central location. In some sense, the pandemic has enhanced that feeling and there now are many more opportunities to do that. For example, the university has purchased a site-wide license for students, a Zoom license, and has made an arrangement to get organized use IDs for faculty. A docu-sign system has been set up for interactions with people outside the community. There is a system for online tours and consultation with incoming students.

Dean of Students David Strauss told the committee that there has been a big increase in cheating in the winter term. Almost all the students in one chemistry class turned in the same answers on an exam.

Mr. Reynolds ended his report by stating that the university is adapting to online teaching and that he encourages it to continue.

D. Faculty Affairs Committee

The chair of FAC, renee hoogland, mentioned some of the issues on which the committee worked this year and that may be on their agenda next year. First was the issue of grade appeals and academic dishonesty that was mentioned by Mr. Roth and Mr. Reynolds. The second issue pertains to LGBTQ+ life and academic programming. The Student Senate adopted a resolution asking the administration to invest resources to expand programming to support LGBTQ+ diversity and inclusion. The Faculty Affairs and Policy Committees supported the resolution. However it is very difficult to maintain momentum for this project during the pandemic. She commented that it is very easy to ignore relatively small programs and to cut their budgets so they fall by the wayside.

The committee met with Brandy Banks, Title IX Director, Nikki Wright, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Office of Equal Opportunity, and Linda Galante, the former Associate General Counsel. They are working to develop a policy regarding consensual relationships among faculty, staff, and students. In addition to a policy, they want to create more awareness of the seriousness of sexual and gender-related offenses and misbehaviors and the need to work toward a cultural shift around sexual violence, harassment, and bullying.

The FAC discussed the report of the ad hoc committee on academic transparency. It supported the recommendations and added its own recommendations. One recommendation is that the Provost Office report annually on the uses of data analytics prior to the start of contract negotiations between the university and the AAUP-AFT.

The committee members looked at the final report of the 3N Committee on Online Learning. It is informative but it did not address questions about best practices and policy conflicts between deans' offices and the university administration or the larger question whether students are getting what they need in broad emergency remote teaching.

E. Research Committee

David Kessel chaired the committee. He said that the report would have been different if he had given it in February. He sent out a survey asking about research before and after the coronavirus pandemic. COVID-19 is likely to be a game-changer. At one time NIH and NSF funded any reasonable proposal. Now a proposal has to be in the 10 to 12 percentile. Graduate school used to be the goal of most scientists because jobs and tenure were likely. Today it is a risky business and the goal of many science students is shifting to medical school or law school and other opportunities that are not as precarious as hoping for grants, jobs, and eventual tenure. It is not clear how we will get our research programs back on track. Mr. Kessel consulted with other institutions from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to Stanford University. The institutions are trying to deal with the situation and they all seem to be making it up as they go along.

Even before the coronavirus problem many research operations were at risk. The university can't even keep the Scott Hall cafeteria open. Perhaps it is just as well because no one is currently there. Mr. Kessel wonders if eventually lunch carts and vendors will be wandering through the hallways. It will be a challenge to get research efforts moving again without risking infection of the faculty, students, and lab technicians. The committee met once by Zoom with Vice President for Research Stephen Lanier. The committee will meet again on May 8 to discuss options.

F. Student Affairs Committee

Ms. Simon, the chair of the committee, presented the report. SAC met seven times during the academic year. The first meeting was a joint meeting with the Facilities, Support Services and Technology Committee. Senior Associate Provost for Student Success talked about replacing EAB with STARS 2.0. The university is moving to a new system named iPASS, Integrated Planning and Student Success. Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management Dawn Medley and Senior Director of Financial Aid Catherine Kay met with SAC and talked about the new admissions software called SLATE. They told the committee that the 30% tuition discount for the spring/ summer term is permanent except for students who have the Heart of Detroit scholarship. That program only covers tuition for the fall and winter terms.

Interim Dean of the Graduate School Ingrid Guerra-Lopez and Associate Dean Sharon Lean talked about recruitment and retention of graduate students. Patrick Beirne, the bursar, informed the SAC about the work his office performs. Cheryl Kollin, Senior Director, University Advising, and Catherine Bernas, Associate Director, University Advising, informed the committee about the Excellence in Academic Advising (EAA) Project which is a standards-based assessment process to promote excellence in academic advising. The project is collaboration with the Gardner Institute and the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA), the professional organization for academic advisors. The last meeting of the year was a joint meeting with the Faculty Affairs Committee about inclusive access. One of the issues with this program was the lack of consultation with the Senate. Ms. Simon noted that the university administration does not have to accept the recommendations of the Senate but they are supposed to consult with the Senate on academic issues. The SAC celebrated the holiday season with a potluck lunch.

G. Elections Committee

Ms. Simon also chaired the Elections Committee. They conducted five separate votes this year. The election of the Policy Committee took place at the September meeting. Senate members voted for faculty to serve on the Faculty Hearing Committee Panel and academic staff to serve on the Academic Staff Hearing Committee Panel using the election system on the Get Involved platform. Four faculty and four academic staff were elected to the panels. The same system was used for the member-at-large election but there were several problems with the system. Rachel Pawlowski, Honors College, and Bill Volz, Mike Ilitch School of Business, were elected to three-year terms as members-at-large. Ms. Simon informed Dean of Students David Strauss and Ricardo Villarosa, Academic Advisor IV, in the Dean of Students Office, about the problems. She hopes the problems will be solved before next year's election. In a separate election, Linda Beale was re-elected by acclamation to her third year as the Senate President.

Ms. Simon stated that votes against two attacks on academic freedom were very difficult. The Senate resoundingly deplored the actions of Caroline Maun, Chair of the English Department, and Stephanie Hartwell, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. The Senate censured Dawn Medley, Associate Vice President for

Enrollment Management, and Daren Hubbard, Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice President for Computing and Information Technology, for their actions. Ms. Simon said that the overwhelming support of those motions made her very proud to be a member of the Academic Senate.

Ms. Simon thanked both committees for their work this academic year. She specifically thanked Richard Pineau and Marisa Henderson for counting the ballots on the vote for academic freedom. They are not members of the Elections Committee but stepped forward to count the ballots.

The year-end reports are attached to these proceedings as Appendix D.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Provost Whitfield thanked the faculty for their efforts in moving classes to remote. He has talked with universities across the country. He puts Wayne State in the top 10% of institutions because there were conversations and consultation with faculty. Most of our colleges had an extra week to prepare for the transition. He understands the challenges that people have experienced. He knows people who have lost multiple family members in this time. While we can be positive and think how we can move forward we must acknowledge that this is a difficult time for everyone and that our successes do not come lightly or easily.

One of the critical pieces for the budget at public institutions is the importance of enrollment. There is a lot concern and many predictions about enrollment. Typically at this time of the year we feel pretty confident about fall enrollment, but the Provost is not at all confident what enrollment will be. Currently undergraduate enrollment is up 10% but graduate enrollment is down about 40%. We have to find innovative ways to bring graduate students back. Many other universities look twice as bad as we do and their enrollment may get worse. Enrollment may worsen for us also but the Provost thinks we have some ways to preserve our edge. We are in the most populous area of the state and we may have an advantage if students want to stay close to home. The Enrollment Management staff is working tirelessly to reach out to prospective students to make sure that they not only come to orientation but that they enroll for the fall. We have a new program called Kick Start where during the summer students take one of the three-credit courses that are known to contribute to longterm student success. Students take the course online and commit to coming here in the fall. Within 48 hours of the announcement of the program, 464

students responded. The CARES Act provides help for students, also. One part of the act focuses on students; the other part focuses on other aspects of the institution. In fewer than 40 hours 2,217 students applied for about \$350,000 from the CARES Act. Also, 381 emergency grants were given to students who did not qualify for the CARES money. The university is trying to help students who have been particularly adversely affected by COVID-19 and not eligible for the CARES money by providing assistance from the federal government through the university. If students are having financial problems, Provost Whitfield told people to make sure that students contact Financial Aid for assistance.

The implementation of RCM is being delayed until FY 2022. It is in part due to the pandemic. But it is also so we can make some revisions to make it a success. The delay will give us an opportunity to talk about some of the policies and practices as well as what the budget looks like under our current incremental budget process and what it would look like under RCM. Our academic leaders will have an opportunity to look at the budget so they are confident they will be able to manage the RCM budget process.

The Academic Restart Subcommittee will try to host a webinar next week to share some of their ideas with other members of the university. In her report, Ms. Beale said it was hard to say that you will focus only on academics because academics are connected to everything at the university. However, each element of the restart process is so large that it is necessary to have multiple subcommittees. The subcommittees are starting to share some of their deliberations so each committee can be informed about how to put forward their plan. The plan of the academic restart subcommittee will be flexibility because there are great differences among colleges. We need guideposts about what the different opportunities are. There will be a university-wide discussion next Wednesday to get as much information as possible. They want to hear faculty's individual circumstances that would not fit into the flexible plan. Academic units will make decisions about how they will be able to start. Our intention is to re-open in the fall, but re-opening comes with a lot caveats. A one-size-fits-all plan will not work for an institution of this size. We have to work together to be successful.

Mr. Beavers asked the Provost about the status of the searches for a chief financial officer and for a dean of the graduate school. Provost Whitfield said that the Board of Governors reviewed the top candidates for dean of the graduate school and authorized the hiring. The administration has contacted the candidate. The pandemic has interfered with the search for chief financial officer. It is difficult to hire at this time. The

search has been postponed. Rebecca Cooke, who has been serving as interim chief financial officer, agreed to stay a little longer.

COVID-19 has impacted the university, but not as much as some other institutions. One thing in our favor is our not having a Division 1 football team because of the amount money invested in Division 1 and the income from the television rights that they will not receive this year. Wayne State partnered with Corvias to manage housing. That may have saved us about \$10 million. We do have significant losses. We do not have the income from housing people who participate in various summer programs that we have had in past years.

Mr. Villarosa asked the Provost to clarify the hiring policy during the pandemic. Some people think there is a hiring freeze. The Provost reviews offers to hire academic personnel and the President reviews offers to hire non-academic personnel. Provost Whitfield stated that if an offer to fill a position had been made prior to the pandemic that will not be rescinded. He has reviewed several cases for the President. If a position is open but it is not critical to the university's mission, the Provost will not approve the request. The administration is focusing on the academic mission. They are asking people to be very thoughtful about hiring because hiring will have huge implications for next year's budget and we will have to make difficult decisions. Responding to a question from Ms. Beale, Provost Whitfield said that before denying the posting of a position, he asks the unit how critical the position is before making a decision.

VI. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

President Wilson joined the meeting.

Ms. Beale asked him to address budget expectations for the 2021 fiscal year. The President said that we have an advantage over some other universities because our fiscal year begins October 1. The fiscal year for other state universities begins July 1. They have to make assumptions about enrollment. We have a longer time to plan. The administration is developing several scenarios for what develops. We will have to make a decision about tuition early. The more certain we are about tuition the more likely we will reduce the summer melt. President Wilson favors not increasing tuition for the 2020-21 academic year. Unless students are fully on campus he does not expect them to pay more if they are not able to have the full campus experience. Most of the President's colleagues across the U.S. are leaning in that direction. Of course, we will have great financial consequences that will affect faculty and staff as a result of that

decision. In making the decision we have to carefully weigh the pros and cons.

The President had sent a message to Ms. Beale indicating that he was considering a 0% increase in tuition. In the message, he mentioned that it would be necessary to layoff or to furlough some employees. Ms. Beale asked which groups of employees would be targeted. Would it be the lower paid employees or the group that some people refer to as administrative bloat or overkill? President Wilson said that, although the details have not been finalized the discussions have been that furloughs would be tiered so higher-paid individuals would have to take off more days than lower paid individuals. The lowest paid employees would not be furloughed. The administration is not proposing layoffs at this time. Layoffs would be a last resort. The President would consult with the Senate Policy and Budget Committees in making the decision.

Mr. Roth asked about the staffing of the restart committee. It is a matter of concern, he said, that the Academic Senate had not been consulted about the staffing of the restart subcommittees. Of the several subcommittees, the Senate was asked only to appoint two representatives to the Academic Restart Subcommittee. The Policy Committee believes the Senate should have broader representation on the subcommittees. The faculty who were asked to serve on the other restart subcommittees were not faculty put forward by the Academic Senate and, therefore, are not answerable to the Senate because they were selected by the administration. This has caused considerable consternation to the Policy Committee.

President Wilson suggested there was a misunderstanding about the purpose of the restart committee. He instructed the chairs of the subcommittees to select people whom they thought would be most helpful from the standpoint of content for their areas with the only exception being that there should be faculty representation on each subcommittee and student representation chosen by the chairs as appropriate. The research and public health committees are informing all the other committees, mainly because they deal with circumstances on the ground from a health perspective. Those committees are made up of faculty with the exception of one person. The housing subcommittee is large because we need to have our retail partners participate. The idea is to have content experts on the subcommittees. The committees are not intended to be constituency based. The groups are to make recommendations based on the thinking of the people who are most qualified in the various areas and from the various groups. Other groups will need to provide input. After the umbrella committee has completed its preliminary work and advised the President, he'll talk to

various groups and the Provost about the specifics of the recommendations. Then we'll decide what to do. Someone had to start the early deliberations related to the content of the specific areas. The chairs of the committees were asked to select whom they thought would be most helpful to their work. The President only meets with the chairs, not the other committee members. After further discussion the committees would get input from other groups/committees such as the Policy Committee, the Council of Deans, department chairs, and the Student Senate.

Ms. Beale stated that she understood the President advised the chairs of the committees not to seek Academic Senate representatives but to ask whomever they wanted. Ms. Beale pointed out in a memo to the President that Policy Committee's concern is that faculty who are asked to serve by administrators are not representing faculty and academic staff, and that most of those faculty on the committees are also administrators. They do not represent the faculty and academic staff in the same way that someone selected by the Senate does, meaning that Senate representatives try to check with the Senate constituency to determine views, ideas, and concerns and to take that information to the committee. Shared governance is an important part of how this type of process should work. In particular, Ms. Beale said, the Senate cannot be treated the same as the Council of Deans and the department chairs. The COD and the chairs are administrators that the President consults in the course of administrative decision-making. Shared governance in which the President is expected to consult with the Academic Senate to hear the views of faculty and academic staff well before making decisions is a different process. The groups who meet regularly with administrators have access to information that the group that represents faculty and academic staff does not have. Ms. Beale said the President's action appears to be a snubbing of the academic shared governance process. The Senate would like to add Senate representatives to each of the committees selected by the Policy Committee.

The President said what Ms. Beale heard about not selecting Academic Senate members was not true though perhaps what he said was interpreted that way. Ms. Beale said she had suggested someone for the finance committee and was told the person could not be appointed. President Wilson replied that he told the chairs that all committees had to have faculty representation and told them to pick the faculty they felt could be most useful from a content perspective. For example, most faculty do not know a lot about facilities. Ms. Beale said that when administrators pick faculty of their choice, those faculty do not tend to think of themselves as representatives of other faculty and

in fact generally may tend to take positions favored by the administration. That is different from the way that someone who is picked by the Academic Senate and is asked to serve as a representative of the faculty approaches the role. The Senate considers who would be appropriate representatives based on the issues that particular committees handle. When the Senate appoints people they are obligated to represent the faculty. President Wilson said there was no intent to snub the academic process. Accordingly, he agreed that the Senate could appoint Senate representatives to each of the Restart subcommittees. They would be welcome. Ms. Beale said the Senate would do so.

It appeared to Mr. Parrish that the President thought the chairs of the committees, who are administrators, understood academic governance and were qualified to choose faculty who are representative of academic governance. Mr. Parrish thought that was preposterous. Administrators choose people they know as administrators. The assumption shows a basic contempt for the principles of academic governance that are enshrined in the statutes of the Board of Governors. The Academic Senate represents academic governance and the President needs to show his commitment to those principles.

Ms. Hoogland thinks it is important to have disciplinary breadth in faculty representation on the committees especially on the teaching and learning committee because teaching and learning in the humanities is very different from the sciences. Ms. Hoogland's research is scholarship. She reads books and writes. Narrowing research to only funded research and teaching and learning only in terms of the STEM fields is problematic especially at this time when it is clear how important the humanities and arts are in our everyday lives. People are watching movies, listening to music, reading books, and painting, etc. It is important to push the significance of the humanities and the arts at Wayne where a lot of our students have very little cultural capital when they come to college. This may be their only opportunity to get some kind of liberal arts education. Too often the arts and the humanities are treated as marginal fun fields, but Ms. Hoogland believes they are crucial.

President Wilson said he fully supports Ms. Hoogland's comments about research. He has always advocated for the humanities and the arts. The emphasis on research on what to re-open, how to re-open, and when to re-open started with the Michigan Economic Recovery Council that is advising Governor Whitmer about re-opening. The three research universities have been informed by a group in the University of Michigan's Department of Public Health that is looking at it from a risk standpoint as well as other parameters. Everyone has been thinking about re-opening in the

fall. The three research universities thought individual research laboratories might open in the summer. After the research labs open the focus would turn to educational labs.

Ms. Beale pointed out that there are similar needs and concerns for the arts, sculpture, and performance. Provost Whitfield, Mr. Villarosa, and Ms. Beale had talked about the overlap that exists between research, teaching and learning, and facilities and IT. Each of the restart committees has to consider how to handle social distancing, large classes, laboratories and skill classes, and scheduling. Having input from faculty who talk with their colleagues across the university, perhaps in different ways than chairs and administrators, is a way to get a fuller perspective, a broader sense whether an idea will work or whether we completely missed something that is needed. That is how shared governance is supposed to work and why it is very important. When Vice President for Research Stephen Lanier met with the Senate's Research Committee to talk about the progress of the research restart subcommittee he had not considered an issue dealt with by the academic restart subcommittee. In addition to the question of whether individual research laboratories could reopen before teaching laboratories, there are important issues about providing protective equipment, whether we can provide means for social distancing and appropriate timing, adequate ventilation of the spaces, the needs of vulnerable faculty versus vulnerable staff versus vulnerable students. All of these issues will require resolution before we can make decisions about reopening.

The President said that he and the Senate differed only about the point at which the discussions would take place. His view was that those discussions could take place after the committees had done their initial work, but he understood and agreed now with Ms. Beale's viewpoint on this.

Provost Whitfield said that is how the academic restart committee is designing its work. They will take the straw man they set up to as many people as possible and talk about the ways they can use the framework to contextualize it for them but the other committees have to do their work first. All of the committees are very important but the one on public health is critical to implementing the other activities. The facilities subcommittee is important in helping to figure out how to operate the academic mission. There needs to be a lot of discussion across the university to get as many perspectives as possible. When the academic committee discusses their report with the President, they will be able to include the different perspectives.

Mr. Parrish noted that the President had suggested that administrative committees would formulate

proposals and the academic side would see them only after formulation. The point of shared governance, as several have said here, it that it is necessary for the academic side to be involved at every stage of the process. The Policy Committee was given the general approach that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology used, which is astoundingly different regarding consultation with the academic community than at Wayne State. Mr. Parrish suggested that President Wilson read MIT's approach.

Ms. Bray asked if there would be cost savings because the campus has closed. Responding to the comment that Wayne State had an advantage over other universities she noted that enrollment for the summer looked good. She would advocate that we advertise that Wayne State has excellent faculty and is an excellent value compared to our competitors. Some parents will not want their children to go far for college. They could take classes online from Wayne.

The President said the university has not saved money related to the closure because it was decided not to penalize employees due to campus closure. Everyone is paid whether or not they are on campus, and payroll is our major expense. We may have a small amount of savings because the usage of utilities is reduced. The expenses we incurred because of COVID-19 up to about three weeks ago were a little over \$9 million. We will lose additional money but he hopes the losses will be somewhat mitigated by strong enrollment. Ms. Beale added that because the university does not have many students in housing who would request refunds and since we don't own a hospital that is losing money because hospitals are not able to provide their regular services we are not losing that money that some other universities will lose (like the University of Michigan). Ms. Beale asked if the chief financial officer Rebecca Cooke could send the Senate the breakdown of the \$9 million and the President agreed.

Ms. Beale again emphasized the importance of having the academic side of the university involved in the discussions at every stage. She mentioned that we have had administrators who would not consult with faculty and for the President's information mentioned the situation where a vice president did not want to hear about the faculty's parking needs. That caused problems because he did not know how faculty use the parking facilities. The faculty, she said, will not know everything or have expertise about all the issues but they will consult with their colleagues and include that information in the committee processes. Some problems might be avoided with their input.

In response to a question from Ms. Binienda, the President said that Governor Gretchen Whitmer has been listening to the advice of the Michigan Economic

Recovery Council of which President Wilson is a member. MERC is trying to use evidence-based data to inform when opening campus is appropriate and what we should open. MERC has recommended that construction reopen based on data and on algorithms that classifies different kinds of work into minimal risk, medium risk, and high risk. President Wilson thinks the Governor will slowly open segments of the economy. To some degree her decisions will be based on MERC's recommendations. He thinks the university will generally follow the Governor's directives but if we don't think something is safe to do we won't do it.

Ms. Beale said that has been the guiding principle of most of the discussions in the Policy Committee and the academic restart committee and within the Research Committee. Some faculty who will teach online would prefer to teach face to face but they will teach online because it is safer for everyone. Faculty who teach face to face will have to be prepared to go online if there is a later surge.

Ms. Harr asked where people could find information about the opening of research labs. The President said there is a COVID-19 page on the university's website where there is information about each of the restart committees. As of May 6, each restart committee will post their internal working documents so everyone can access the information.

President Wilson said that all capital projects that were approved for funding have been rescinded. Ms. Beale thought the renovation of State Hall might proceed with the bonds the Board of Governors approved but that would depend on the university's liquidity and if the funds are needed for other purposes. The President said that about eighteen construction projects had been put on hold. Eight will start tomorrow and the rest will probably start next week. Provost Whitfield said that the STEM building has been delayed two months. Work on it will probably resume tomorrow. It may be able to open in the fall because the work was two months ahead when it was stopped.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

After the panel, the Senate moved to new business. Mr. Parrish asked that the motion of censure of the President be referred to the Policy Committee to discuss and to determine if they want to bring it back to the Senate.

Ms. Beale asked members who had comments about today's discussion to send them to her or, if they wanted confidentiality, to send them to the secretary who will forward them to Ms. Beale without identifying information.

Ms. Beale wished the Senate members well and thanked them for their service. Serving on committees requires a lot of work and it is much appreciated. The work of the Senators is valuable to the university.

The meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda M. Beale". The signature is written in black ink and has a fluid, connected style.

Linda M. Beale
President, Academic Senate