

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
May 9, 2022

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; P. Beavers; J. Fitzgibbon; M. Kornbluh; J. Lewis; N. Rossi; B. Roth; N. Simon; R. Villarosa; S. Schrag

Guest: Stephen Lanier, Vice President for Research

I. VP Lanier Presentation on Research

Lanier presented a research update anchored to the 2016 strategic plan previously shared with the Board of Governors and the Research Committee, outlining the university's research since 2013. He noted a significant increase in federal and state funding (by award dollars) that topped \$100M in FY21. He pointed out increases in research funding in FY21 versus FY20 (a total increase in federal funding of 13% that included a decline in NSF funding of 2.6%), in NIH (29%), NSF (94%) and other federal funding (156%) over a period of eight years, and a significant increase in state funding, indicating that all resulted from purposeful actions over several years. Lanier also mentioned two significant grants for FY22—a major programmatic grant in environmental health sciences across various schools/colleges and centers as well as a large instrumentation grant for upgrading our clinical research imaging platform. Beale noted that a significant increase reflected in the eight-year period resulted from including previously excluded Karmanos and certain clinical trial numbers rather than new funding.

For reports in the future, Rossi suggested to Lanier that it would be helpful to know the number of new versus continuing grants. Beale added that it would be useful to know what percentage of STEM faculty have not been funded in the last 5 years. Lanier responded that new awards were more thematically driven.

Internal programs to incentivize research included grant and manuscript writing seminars primarily run by a contracted group as well as by Denise Figlewicz, Assistant VP for Research, Enhancement and Development. Lanier explained that OVPR's emphasis has been on using funding to align with the university's strategic plan and includes several different internal programs.

The Grants Boost Program is designed for individuals who submitted a good grant without getting full funding. Grant Boost applications are peer reviewed and provide \$35 thousand. These are good for one year and proposals must be submitted within that year. Any faculty who submitted a grant and scored well but missed being funded are eligible. Reviewers generally come from the Karmanos Cancer Center, CLAS, and Engineering. Lanier has also brought in junior faculty that have been funded to be part of the review process. Beale asked what the total number of researchers funded in this way was last year. Lanier responded that OVPR usually funds five or six per round and last year there were three rounds (so 15-18 annually).

There is also a \$2 thousand award for graduate students who obtain external support.

Furthermore, Bridge Funding is available to individuals that were funded but were not successful in renewing their grants. This program was popular for several years, but recently the number of submissions decreased. There is no deadline: there is a rolling submission, so any time someone needs bridge support they can request it. Lanier suggested that four or five \$50 thousand grants were awarded annually.

A Bridge Funding II Program was initiated about three years ago to address the situation of faculty stuck at the associate professor level who no longer had funding, were good university citizens, were active in training, and had had research funding before. They may have had more than one grant, a Grants Boost, or Bridge Funding from OVPR but had gotten caught in the squeeze play with the reviewing agencies. There have been three \$100 thousand awards under this program to date: one in Pharmacology, one in Physiology, and one in Pharmaceutical Sciences.

Beale asked Lanier about the success of these programs and of the faculty being funded for grants. It would be helpful to see how OVPR measures the results of such funding programs--i.e., the metrics used. Lanier replied that it was hard to measure success because there isn't a specific expected outcome.

The Faculty Competition for Postdoctoral Fellows Program awards \$30 to \$60 thousand. Originally awarded only to U.S. citizens, there was a request to consider non-U.S. postdocs. Once per year OVPR opens a cycle to allow PIs to submit foreign applicants. Mark Kornbluh asked for the number of applications and whether some of these are funded below NIH standards for postdocs. Lanier estimated there have been 10 to 15 applications: funding is for two years with a per-year match of \$30 thousand from OVPR and \$30 thousand from the PI. Beale asked if the OVPR support is known at the time of grant application and how competitive the process is. Lanier responded that PIs usually already have a grant or other funds. There is a review committee made up of faculty from different schools and colleges that makes recommendations. About 75% of requests are funded.

The Arts and Humanities Research Support Program has existed for several years. It covers scholarly activity relating to book development or scholarly engagement within the community around the arts programs. This is a peer-reviewed internal and external process providing awards up to \$50 thousand per project. Lanier estimated maximum total annual funding to be \$200 thousand. He estimated that there are 20-25 applicants, with about 60% funded based on the reviews.

Beale asked if the Social Sciences Research Program worked the same way. Lanier explained that over the last few years, particularly during the pandemic, support of various social sciences initiatives was expanded in various ways. Denise Figlewicz, Associate Dean Claudio Verani, Dean Stephanie Hartwell and sociology professor Jeff Kentor launched a new program to focus in this area. There is a total of \$100 thousand available and the consensus among that group was to fund \$10 thousand per project.

Beale asked Lanier if he thought faculty were aware of these programs and if applicants were selected by deans or chairs to be put forward to OVPR. He said department chairs actively encourage their faculty to apply. His office sends listserv announcements to the research community. When asked if he gets many applications from the medical school's clinical departments, Lanier said he does not. Rossi suggested that the communication is broken since clinical faculty who should be engaging in bona fide research are not aware of these opportunities. Additionally, the listserv announcements on how to write a grant do not appear to be working in her department. She recommended there be more thought put into the communications about research opportunities, including more ways to let potential researchers know. Except for Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Cancer Biology, and Oncology, many departments are languishing; but these opportunities could help. Lanier admitted he was not sure how many of the medical school's clinical faculty are currently engaged in research. Rossi noted that they will not be engaged if we don't encourage them to be engaged. Clinical faculty can contribute insight into what is important to investigate, and they can assist those investigators that have the knowledge, skill, and cutting-edge information on how to address those questions. She suggested it would be important to foster that kind of collaboration if the medical school is going to flourish. Now is the time to plant those seeds.

Beale asked Lanier to provide an overview of the various sources of funds available to OVPR and the ways those funds are used to incentivize and support research. She noted the 2013-14 change in the allocation of F&A/Indirect Cost Recovery funds with 12% going to a "research stimulation" fund that goes to OVPR as well as about 5-6% that used to go to departments and principal investigators now going to his office. She asked Lanier to provide specific information on how that F&A research stimulation funding is used. Lanier responded generally that resource allocation was done to align with the deans and chairs, with the strategic plan, and to nurture thematic growth, recruitment, infrastructure renewal, enabling technologies, training grant support and larger programmatic grant development. The research team has about \$6.2M and \$1M of that goes to the Cancer Center as part of the affiliation agreement as contractually obligated. There are also internal support programs. Beale noted that a specific breakdown would be helpful. She recalled several recent Budget Planning Council reviews when the group was informed that the \$1M to the Karmanos Cancer Center that had been allocated to OVPR had been paid out of central administration rather than OVPR funds. Lanier stated that the affiliation agreement was established when President Wilson came on board: originally, the School of Medicine used its F&A dollars from cancer work to pay directly to the Cancer Center. With the change, the \$1M was equally shared between OVPR and the president, but that gradually

changed. Lanier indicated he believes that OVPR now pays \$750K. He also indicated the NCI designation begun two years ago as part of the renewal strategy resulted in an increased commitment of a total of \$1.5M for the Cancer Center. \$1M of that comes from OVPR and the remainder now comes from the medical school. There is also a significant amount of cost sharing for equipment grants. NSF and NIH grants have been submitted for shared instrumentation, with about \$8M awarded over the last three or four years. Most of those grants require some institutional match. He noted a recent award of \$2M for a new 3T MRI, which has an institutional commitment of \$1M.

The other area is \$1-2M per year in recruitment. Beale asked if this included the I-Bio recruitment expenditures. Lanier indicated there are no new I-Bio recruits going forward, but there are still financial commitments for recent recruits.

Another required investment, he said is infrastructure which also varies from year to year. For example, he committed \$1.5M to the \$7.5M renovation of the Scott Hall vivarium.

Beale thought it would be helpful to have a clear understanding and asked Lanier for a spreadsheet that shows the last four years' F&A monies that have come to OVPR for research stimulation and how that fund has been spent each year.

Kornbluh explained that Beale's questions reflect the fact that faculty in general do not understand how indirect cost money is being used. He and VP Massaron have recently visited each school/college and heard complaints about elevators, heating, and budget cuts. Units with research-active faculty are unhappy about the split and how little they receive: without clearer information, they do not see how the money is used to benefit research, so there is a gap here between what is being done and how it is being communicated to faculty. Beale asked Lanier for specific information regarding the allocation of F&A funds, so Policy can share it with the Senate members to help them to understand this issue. The question faculty have is how that F&A funding is being used to stimulate research. Villarosa added that lack of information has led to a trust gap.

Lanier said the other funds are in strategic program development to move the university toward large programmatic grants. Examples include grants in environmental sciences, which cut across multiple schools and colleges, such as the center grant for the CURES center. Beale had several questions about CURES. She noted that the university has a grant-supported Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (IEHS). CURES has been described as being a center established within the Institute, but CURES is quite different from the Institute, and it is not clear that it would satisfy the Board of Governors documents as being simply created by IEHS. CURES is focused on community-centered research and education. She believes it was given a temporary charter when Melissa Runge-Morris first arrived, but she does not recall that it received full chartering through CIAC-I or CIAC-II. Lanier suggested that CURES had undergone a full charter review five years ago and that it had been rebranded as IEHS CURES. He noted that Carol Miller from Engineering and Melissa Runge-Morris, the CURES director, have been working for a few years on a superfund proposal and were just awarded \$22 million over five years, pointing out how this cuts across multiple colleges. OVPR has provided up to \$100 thousand for seed projects to have preliminary information such as the Healthy Urban Waters and One Health initiatives. He explained that these large grants require institutional support that may be \$100 thousand per year for five years from F&A dollars to support pilot projects or may be a specialized piece of equipment for \$500 thousand that needs to be purchased. Another example of nurturing with seed money is a recent P50 grant, which is \$2 million a year for five years from the National Institute of Minority Health and Health Disparities and was awarded last September to Phil Levy in the School of Medicine. OVPR recently committed \$100 thousand per year for five years for Haley Thompson's initiative in health equity and community engagement with the very specific goal of moving toward a specialized center of research from the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities here in the City of Detroit. Beale asked Lanier what kind of internal field-specific advice or procedures for review exists in OVPR for approval of these kinds of grants. Lanier responded that he talks with deans, chairs of relevant departments, and faculty in that area, so that "everybody has a little skin in the game". When asked about a consistent review process established within OVPR, Lanier confirmed there is none.

Rossi commented that within the medical school, the perception is that there has been less investment in research in recent years. The change in how F&A is allocated is on the SPA website. In 2015, the schools and colleges received 7.5% of indirect costs, but now they get only 5%. Departments went from 11.5% to 8%. Investigators dropped from 7% to 5%. The central pool went from 57% to 49% and a new 24% “research stimulation” allocation was added that goes to OVPR. She suggested that some of these large grants should be decentralized to some extent, or at least they should have more regularized input from the researchers here. For example, the hypertension initiative touted by OVPR did not even include the five physicians who are certified by the American Board of Internal Medicine in hypertension. When proposals are being organized, it would be helpful if more effort were made to include people who have expertise in the area, especially in ones that have clinical outreach. People submitting grants should be made aware that there is expertise in many other schools, colleges, and departments that it may behoove them to consult.

Lewis noted it was important for Policy to understand the various factors that have contributed to research growth. As a research faculty member, it is upsetting to see more than half of indirect cost monies set in NSF or NIH grants float away.

Beale noted a frequent complaint about the university’s core facilities that we staff most of the cores with faculty with an attachment, rather than having permanent personnel there as most others do. People also complain that they must send their research to Connecticut or Michigan or Indiana or some other core facility that has an easier administrative format for engaging the service, quicker turnaround time, and a 24/7 ability to get answers to questions when there is a problem. We don’t match that. Faculty administrators also apparently tend to request co-authorship on work taking place on a core they run. Beale asked Lanier what he thought was possible in terms of addressing those concerns.

Lanier explained that the cores had previously been fragmented across the university, accumulating deficits, with no one paying attention to cost management. Just before he came on board, they had been consolidated under OVPR with budgetary oversight, expectations, and metrics tracking performance. There are a total of ten cores on campus and five of those are specifically related to Cancer Center support grants. They are reviewed every six months. About three years ago he took some steps to downsize the cores because he considered them too big, doing a poor job with declining revenue. He said there are two faculty that cover 100% of their salary externally for managing the cores or from the revenue. Cores under the auspices of OVPR may have a director and senior staff but no compensation. For example, Proteomics has salary distribution across the Cancer Center, CURES, OVPR, and EACPHS. The Lumigen Instrument Center has one director who is dedicated to that facility and part of her salary comes from OVPR and part from Chemistry. He acknowledged there is room for improvement and responsiveness. He would like to have standardized report expectations around reporting the service provided. As the management of the cores has matured, he has thought about having a central person that could monitor these types of things. A help desk could be put in place for \$75 thousand, built into the budget for the cores. In terms of faculty use of outside facilities, he believes there are many reasons. In some cases, there was dissatisfaction with the quality of the service. In other cases, he thinks people just develop affinities for external collaborators. Beale said it was brought to her attention from multiple faculty members that they would prefer to use ours but have found them to be non-responsive and not timely enough and asked Lanier if this has been addressed. Lanier said he is aware of the timeliness problem. Beale then asked how much of what is going on in the cores is covered by F&A funds, to which Lanier responded that \$3.1M is spent for the five cores under OVPR. That is subsidized across all the cores for about 41%, which is about \$1.4M. The other 59% comes from fees for service. When asked what that level of support means for how much of a say OVPR has in efficiency and timeliness, Lanier stated that he is in control. Beale requested Lanier also provide a spreadsheet that shows the core activity, funding, and expenditures.

II. Report from the Chair

Commencement Ceremonies. Kornbluh asked for feedback from Policy members who participated in the weekend’s commencement ceremonies. He noted he would like to bring the student speakers back in person and have live music for the national anthem and graduation march (including using the traditional “Pomp and Circumstance” for the platform party). Technology can be used better. For future commencements, he will ask for the cards to have a QR code for each student so their names can go around the arena and when they come up, their picture, name, and major will be displayed. Lewis said she was at two of the

commencements and thought the screens were very well done, the space was beautiful, and there was a good feeling throughout. The honorary doctorate speakers were fantastic. She did hear from many who thought it should not be scheduled on Mother's Day. Kornbluh said it cannot be done on a weekend without using the Sunday, and Villarosa noted there are too many working families to hold it on weekdays.

Kornbluh said the doctoral commencement on Friday was not very large, and the families didn't seem to have the same enthusiasm. He thought there was a value in doing them separately to recognize them but wanted Policy's feedback. Brad Roth thought it was good to have them separate out of principle because there is the focus on the specific category of person. Lewis said her doctoral students were on a cloud and it meant a lot to them. At the very least, Kornbluh thought a little more should have been said about them. Lewis added that the speeches should be about the students and some of the amazing things they have done, rather than about the faculty or administrators. Rossi agreed that it would be nice to acknowledge who the group is that is there. Beale suggested the alumni greeting came across as somewhat tone deaf, asking for money. Roth added that the greeting had a 2021 date. Lewis thought most universities end ceremonies with an alumni pitch. Kornbluh commented that the CFPCA name readers did an amazing job while many of the other name readers upset students by mispronouncing names: he suggested we consider professional name readers in the future. Simon pointed out a number of typos in the scripts given to those at the mikes.

III. Report from the President

Fall Enrollment. Beale announced that fall enrollment numbers are still low. Kornbluh said last spring there were two orientations early on to get students to register and this year there was only one, so the numbers may not be indicative of the fall. Admissions are up over 10% from this time last year. A unified calendar has been created to list the events for the entire year and will be available on July 1st.

CEID Self-Study and Five-Year Charter Memo. Marcus Zervos acknowledged receipt of the memo from Policy and said the directors would respond quickly.

Ad hoc DEI Committee. Policy will review the committee's recommendations within the next few weeks.

DFW Data in STEM Courses. CIC worked with SAC to generate a report that revealed 20% to 46% DFWs in STEM courses. Lewis said there will be additional data from Darin Ellis and an extended review. This will help determine what can be done to improve the experience in these courses for instructors and students in a way that is supportive and helpful.

VP of Research Search. The search committee will hold a first meeting next week, with the goal to complete the search by the end of the year. Steve Lanier will remain in this role until the position is filled, and he will stay on as faculty.

Humanities Center Director Search. Walter Edwards is stepping down as director of the Humanities Center at the end of August. Kornbluh will be appointing a search committee and requested Policy provide a Senate representative. The search will be internal, and they hope to fill the position in time for the fall semester. The goal is for the new director to honor Edwards' legacy and work with faculty to broadly envision what the Humanities Center could be in the future. Beale asked Policy members to think about someone to be on the search committee: a discussion will take place at the next meeting.

College of Education Decanal Search. Kornbluh asked Policy for a recommendation for the search committee.

IV. Communications and Required Actions

A. Consultation on a Provost Office Personnel Matter

Kornbluh consulted with the Policy Committee on a Provost Office personnel matter.

B. Policy Committee Meetings Summer Schedule

Policy members scheduled meetings for the summer semester.

C. Academic Senate 2022-23 Academic Year Schedule

Policy members determined the Academic Senate plenary session schedule: September 14; October 12; November 2; December 7; February 1; March 1; April 5; May 4

D. Detroit PEER Center in the College of Education

Policy will have a full discussion on this center at the next meeting.

V. New/Old Business

A. Emeritus Status Reconsideration at Faculty Affairs Committee.

Policy will review FAC's resolution for expanding the requirements for emeritus status. Beale has asked Bo Shen to provide more detail to make it clear what specific changes they are endorsing. Once FAC provides more detail, the issue can be put before plenary in the fall.

B. Senate Appointments to ad hoc Faculty P&T Factors Committee (Provost, Union, Senate)

Policy agreed on four people to serve as Senate representatives on the Provost's P&T Factors committee: Heather Walter-McCabe, Associate Professor in Social Work and Law; Arun Iyer, Associate Professor in Pharmacy and Senate member; Kristin Taylor, Associate Professor in CLAS; Simon Ng, Professor in Engineering. Danielle Aubert said she plans to further discuss this in the upcoming union meeting. The Provost's membership includes Sr. Assoc. Provost Boris Baltes, English Dept. Chair Caroline Maun, Professor and Assoc. Dean of CFPCA Loraleigh Keashly, and Professor Matt Lockhart in the School of Medicine.