

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE  
November 21, 2022

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

Absent with Notice: M. Kornbluh

I. APPROVAL OF PC PROCEEDINGS

The November 14, 2022 proceedings were approved as submitted.

II. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Centers: Linda Beale met with Tim Stemmler (Interim VPR) to discuss the OVPR and presentations planned for Policy and the Senate plenary regarding research stimulation funds. Stemmler is also in the process of determining what he should be doing to help reorganize OVPR to establish better procedures.

They also discussed centers, given the ongoing lack of clarity and perhaps laxness of enforcement of the BOG statute. Stemmler has looked into the Center for Leadership in Environment Awareness and Research (CLEAR) and determined that it is a short-term center connected with a specific grant, so it comes under the exception in the BOG statute that does not require chartering. Beale noted her concern regarding the various “initiatives” created by Lanier and whether they should undergo center chartering. In particular, the Translational Neuroscience program, of which David Rosenberg is the director, has received significant university funding through OVPR and likely should be chartered as a center. Another concern is the Center for Urban Responses to Environmental Stressors (CURES) under Director Melissa Runge-Morris (Medicine). There has been a website for CURES as a center since Runge-Morris’s arrival at Wayne, but not charter. Although there is no provision in the statute that allows for a center with completely different objectives to be nested under an existing institute or center, Lanier indicated that CIAC II in its last review of IEHS approved treating CURES as a subset of IEHS. At this point, CURES has not received a renewal of its funding, so Beale and Stemmler agreed the issue needs to be resolved one way or another.

Other examples are not under OVPR because they are ostensibly single-college centers. One such example is the Center for Behavioral Health and Justice (CBHJ). Dean Sheryl Kubiak of Social Work received a temporary charter for CBHJ in May 2018, which Policy approved. Kubiak submitted a two-pager request for a permanent charter (dated May 16, 2019); it did *not* include a budget, a statement of faculty support or other expected items. In June 2019, Policy discussed Kubiak’s two-page request for a permanent charter and deferred approval until they received the budget and other information items. Beale has not yet found any information in the Senate records indicating that a revised charter request was approved at Policy. Another example is the Center for Emerging and Infectious Diseases (CEID) in the School of Medicine: it has been in existence for almost two years and has not even received a temporary charter. Policy received a request for a charter five months ago, requested a revised and more focused submission in a formal memorandum, but has still not received a revised submission.

Policy must consider how to deal with this problem. Beale recommended Policy continue to work with the CIAC I & II committees as well as the provost and VPR to ascertain the status of various centers and

push for appropriate chartering. At some point, it may be necessary to make a statement to the Board of Governors about the tendency for centers to come into existence without appropriate governance procedures.

Barnes questioned how to be certain something created just for a grant does not end up in perpetuity and indicated it might help to have a database including that information. Beale agreed OVPR should have an appropriate database so that it consistently recognizes grant-only centers and tracks end dates, at which time such a center should either cease to exist or submit a charter request to become a chartered center. Rossi had suggested that to Stemmler at the latest Research Committee meeting: here are the institutional grants and these are the ones that are chartered: it should be on a website and recommended with updating on a regular basis. Beale added that is an OVPR responsibility, but it is also Policy's responsibility to be aware of such centers as they come up. For example, if CLEAR is still around seven years from now, there ought to be somebody here that is aware of the history.

On the other hand, Rossi raised the issue of a grant not getting renewed or that may be up for resubmission: it is important to continue to foster those collaborations that occur. Hoogland suggested a commitment to evaluate those centers and perhaps reserve some funds to protect the infrastructure so all that work is not lost. Rossi recalled being on a review for an NIH grant at an illustrious institution that had been in existence for 35 years: it bombed, so there is no guarantee. Simon pointed to a lost TRIO grant (given to urban underrepresented universities): we wrote a poor grant proposal one year and we lost out for five years.

Beale noted that the process exists through both the provost's office and OVPR in terms of temporary support. Bridge funding is used to help foster grants as well as the temporary chartering process; in applying for a temporary charter, a faculty member generally is asking for some support for the initial year. Policy members agreed there should be transparency and avoidance of favoritism as much as possible in that process. Pramod Khosla recommended people know at the beginning of the grant that if it doesn't get funded, there is a period to renew rather than finding out at the end of the grant. Rossi questioned who sets that rule. Beale noted such a rule would be an educational policy likely initiated by the provost or OVPR. It is not clear that it would be economically feasible to guarantee bridge funding for all faculty grants ahead of time. We should seek more information on the way OVPR makes these decisions. Stemmler is coming to Policy next week to talk only about ICR research; he agreed to come back to Policy at a later date to discuss centers and what policies might need to put in place to track them and to think about these issues.

School of Public Health: Beale and Hoogland reported on a School of Public Health Exploratory Committee meeting that concluded to draft a memo stating the general need for such a school, the general consensus that it would be good if Wayne State can create such a school, with statements of the supportive rationales and the potential problems (i.e., not just a yes or no vote). Beale explained the significance of the proposition: it will move dollars from CLAS and Medicine to a new school that will require a significant administrative infrastructure and high salaries (because faculty currently in medicine will be encouraged to voluntarily move to the new school, and medicine's expectations of higher salaries than the current public health people in CLAS receive will require some equalizing of salaries to avoid second-class citizens). Moving into the school is a faculty individual decision: it probably will require paying bonuses and increasing salaries to an equitable level. There are many resource issues here, as well as questions about timing since a number of faculty hires will be necessary and decisions about what areas should be developed as concentrations and doctoral programs. Beale agrees it would be good if we can manage it, but it is not clear where the resources will come from.

Academy of Scholars Selection Process: Beale suggested inviting the current head of the Academy of Scholars to Policy and discuss the selection process and how people are added to it: there's been concern

that it is just a small group that clones themselves (mostly CLAS) rather than a transparent process of soliciting nominations and having the people that are nominated be in some way screened by people with expertise in that area. Roth said the problem is not that the people are not vetted but that there is not a systematic way for people to become nominated: the department chairs do it but often are not aware of the call for nominations. It ends up being insular by default. Individuals are not supposed to know that they have been nominated, so faculty candidates do not participate in that process. That is nice because there are so many awards for which faculty must apply, with the result that not receiving the award feels like disrespect. The exclusionary character is inadvertent: the head of the Academy of Scholars simply does not have access to the range of people who should be in a position to nominate.

Foundation Meeting: Beale reported on the recent Foundation Board meeting, which she attends as a member of the Board (there is representation from administration, the BOG and the Academic Senate). The Board is attempting to bring in new Board members who are potential significant donors. Beale's understanding is that the usual expectation is for members of a university's foundation board to be people who are likely to give a million or more dollars. The primary topic of the meeting was an update on the new investment manager (Common Fund) and the concomitant changes in policies (including allowing more notional principal contracts, swaps and private equity than before). The only investment not allowed is a direct investment in tobacco (there may be indirect investments in tobacco through various mechanisms, however). Should this university be invested in oil and gas and real estate master partnerships, which tend to favor development rather than sustainability and to favor the wealthy? It's something to think about whether we would like to voice an opinion as the Senate.

Graduate Council: Beale reported on the major outcome of the recent Graduate Council meeting: the proposal for a master's thesis continuation zero credit like there is for the doctoral dissertation. When students complete all requirements other than the thesis (including the initial registration for the thesis), they can register for a zero-credit master's continuation and be charged only the registration and student support fee (about \$370 instead of \$1500). This should encourage candidates to complete rather than drop out because cannot afford to continue.

The GradCAS was also a part of the discussion. Graduate Dean Bryant-Friedrich still thinks it is a good idea. She does not like the idea of fee waivers, yet there are quite a few departments in schools and colleges that want to be able to waive the fees for students.

The graduate school is also considering whether to propose block tuition for graduate courses. It is not clear how that would work. Graduate tuition is higher than undergraduate tuition, in part because there are much smaller graduate classes taught by experience tenured faculty. Most graduate students can pay one way or another. Hoogland was concerned about the undergraduate block tuition as well, since many students work 40 hours a week or have families. Beale pointed out that the graduate situation is different: once a student commits to a graduate degree, there are fewer credits that are spread out over time. It was acknowledged that it would be a different proposal to consider, and Beale suggested Policy start thinking about it as well. Simon was concerned that employers may not pay for that.

#### IV. COMMUNICATIONS AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

- A. Article XXX Replacements for Tiye Green (Law) and Christine Powell (Student Affairs) on the Academic Staff Professional Development Committee

Policy members reviewed the Academic Staff Professional Development Committee slate and chose Mary Grenfell (CFPCA) and Emily Reetz (CLAS) as replacements.

- B. Article XXX University Research Grant Committee Replacement for Lauren Kalman (CFPCA)

Policy members reviewed the University Research Grant Committee slate and chose Julie Novak (CFPCA) as the replacement.

#### C. Distinguished Service Professor Committee

Policy members selected Michele Ronnick (CLAS), Kypros Markou (CFPCA) and Brian Edwards (Medicine) to serve on the Distinguished Service Professor Committee.

#### D. December 7 Academic Senate Plenary Agenda (Draft)

Beale invited new deans Hasan Elahi (CFPCA) and Ali Abomaali (Engineering) to present at the December plenary, but neither was able to adjust his schedule. Beale will reach out to Dean Sheryl Kubiak (Social Work).

### III. REPORTS FROM LIAISONS

Facilities, Support Services, and Technology (FSST) Committee: Barnes reported on the FSST Committee meeting held last week. Rob Davenport (AVP FP&M) and Ashley Flintoff (Dir. Planning & Space Mgmt) presented the capital outlay plan: they recognized the fact that FSST and Policy should have received it early enough to consult on priorities. Thompson gave an in-depth presentation and analysis of the buildings with deferred maintenance, and a clear plan as to how they will be addressed. There is a lack of staff: middle management positions are vacant and it has been difficult to hire. Beale pointed out that part of the problem may be contracts or other restrictions on maximum pay for certain positions, so that Human Resources will not allow retention increases.

Danielle Aubert provided an update on the temporary closure of the Welcome Center due to rodents. Employees wrote a letter to the president, Davenport and Laurie Clabo (Chief Health Officer) requesting the building be closed. The problem began end of summer and four workorders have been submitted since August. After abatement efforts, Thompson did a walk-through Friday afternoon, yet on Friday night an employee sent a photo of another rat in the building. The next day an announcement went out that the building was closed for maintenance purposes and will remain closed through the 29th. Employees are concerned what kind of steps are being taken to remediate this problem. If chemicals are being used, employees are concerned about returning to the building within a week. The president is scheduled to hold a Thanksgiving Day parade event in the building, which adds concerns about proper cleanup.

A few years ago, there was a bed bug problem in the School of Medicine and remediation included weekly inspection reports that were available to everybody. Barnes thought it would be helpful to have a website to easily track work orders. The upgrade to the maintenance system dashboard may help. Old Main went for a month and a half without water. Although there were rumors, nobody informed employees how the problem was being remediated. That lack of communication is part of the problem. Beale said Policy has been talking about this for several years. Communication must be better in terms of what the problems are and what the resolutions are: there ought to be a website where that information can be easily found. Barnes suggested they start using the Cherwell system that C&IT uses.

Like the problem with the center data updates, Rossi believes the people in C&IT should have somebody in charge of maintaining websites for various units. Barnes confirmed the websites are under marketing, not C&IT. Beale said the Marketing and Communications office has produced poor templates for websites: information is hard to find; names of people are missing, and much of the information is not up-to-date or accurate. Roth questioned if there was an effort to depersonalize websites. Beale confirmed

that the template appears to be designed not to tell anyone who does anything, making it more difficult to know who to contact or how to hold the right office accountable.

Rossi questioned if there something preventing units like Davenport's or chairs to supplement salaries. Beale believes it comes under the definition of the role and the maximum salary provided for that role. Rossi asked who sets maximum salaries. Simon said the various unions set the terms of the contract. Aubert noted there was a job fair co-hosted by the university and the City of Detroit two weeks ago with 75 openings to be filled. The university's drug testing requirement was waived that day because it slows down the hiring process. Although AFSCME handles the custodial and ground staff, the university spent \$500,000 in four months last year when they brought in outside contractors to do the grounds. That money could have gone toward salaries for full-time people.

Rossi noted that the medical school has gone through multiple chairs in the last five years: it feels like a revolving door. They negotiate very well for themselves but not for their departments. Does that happen at the presidential level, too? If so, the BOG should think about tying compensation to the good of the university, not just into his or her pocket. Beale said it appears many administrators here receive golden parachutes; even if they are fired, they often receive up to a full year of paid leave with no output requirement. Most of the chairs throughout the university receive large salary increases to serve as chairs and then keep most of that when they go back to faculty: that becomes very costly over time.

Beale will email Davenport for an update on the Welcome Center and communications he's providing to employees. His response will be shared with Policy members.

Student Affairs and Curriculum and Instruction Committees: Simon reported the SAC and CIC held a joint meeting. Lewis described it as a productive meeting with presentations from financial aid and Transfer Student Experience (TSE) pathways. Both groups came with worthwhile presentations and the meeting was well attended in a hybrid format. Cathy Kay (Sr. Dir. Financial Aid) provided a list of available scholarships and explained eligibility and retention requirements. She also discussed the various Last Dollar in Tuition awards. Simon noted that scholarship information has been a mystery. When the consultant report becomes available, Kay agreed to come back to SAC and discuss it. Beale requested the presentations be shared with Policy.

Faculty Affairs Committee: Hoogland reported on the Faculty Affairs Committee's discussion of potentially drafting a memo that brings attention to faculty needs as a result of the pandemic and the overall increase in workloads. Many are concerned that the university appears to focus solely on students' wellness, wishes and preferences without realizing that there are no students without faculty. There needs to be something more than a "thank you for all your hard work these past few years". Faculty are not asked about their well-being. The minimal raises faculty receive are not satisfactory, especially since most agree that teaching has become harder.

There was also discussion of creating a writing, critical thinking, reading annex in the writing center: it should be independent of the current structure to help incoming students prepare for college-level reading, writing and thinking. Faculty would teach within disciplines—i.e., writing within engineering, writing within law, writing within English, writing within medicine. Money should be available to faculty who commit a certain number of hours per semester to work with students on their writing, reading and critical thinking skills.

Research Committee: Rossi reported on two Research Committee meetings. The October meeting focused on IRBs and expediting IRB reports for clinical research that is either expedited or exempt. The major complaint was that the website takes too long. Rick Zimmerman (Assoc. Dean, Nursing) could not attend, but he submitted his PowerPoint. Monica Malian (Dir. HRPP) and Amanda Jointer (Assoc. Dir.

IRB Administration) presented the changes: part of the delay in implementing changes comes from the time for agreements and then incorporation by the software company to ensure that any changes made do not change something to which they are linked. They have implemented some things, such as no longer requiring the statistics in power or the full protocol like a grant proposal; most of these are for students who are doing a small project, unlike an NIH grant to submit as a protocol.

Stemmler attended the November meeting to discuss ICR: It was the first time the committee learned where the indirect cost recovery funds were used. For example, recruitment packages, retention packages and the startup package for the physiology chair came from OVPR indirect cost recovery, not from the School of Medicine.

DEI Committee: Barnes reported the committee discussed the proposed bylaws amendments. Often only faculty are mentioned, and DEI would like to make certain that academic staff are included. Khosla said there was a proposal to create an academic staff affairs committee. DEI talks about inclusion, yet information from the Senate is usually focused on faculty.

Regarding snow days under the remote operations policy, Barnes said there was concern at the DEI committee around the idea of switching to virtual teaching and the inequity that could occur for students and various faculty. Beale pointed out that the provost reported students being very supportive of the remote operations policy and noted an underlying assumption of faculty flexibility. Khosla said the committee was concerned that disadvantaged students would be impacted because they may not have access to computers and communication may be difficult. Aubert added that the AAUP-AFT had done impact bargaining with Dave Massaron (VP, CFO) and Boris Baltes (AVP). One of the things that came out of Academic Senate was to make sure the instructor can determine whether or not to hold class. They also wanted to clarify that instructors might be a GTA or someone who's not the instructor of record on a particular day for a section: whoever is supposed to be teaching that day makes the call on whether or not to hold class. The language around that is clearer now. The other piece is around academic staff: language has been included that says supervisors will work with academic staff to determine how to get the work done. Staff should not be penalized if they do not have their laptop and are unable to work at home. The Welcome Center closure is a perfect example. That was closed over the weekend and employees were notified they had until 11 a.m. Monday to get their materials they needed to do their work. Now there's more flexibility for both the staff and the instructor to figure out how to work on a remote day.

Bylaws: Continuing the discussion of the Senate Bylaws, Khosla questioned whether there is a specific number of academic staff in the apportionment of the Senate. There is not. Simon explained that Athletics and Academic Affairs have academic staff representatives. Honors may have either academic staff or teaching faculty or both hold its multiple seats. The College of Nursing has elected only faculty. CLAS tends to have a mix. Medicine only has faculty. Khosla recommended this be part of a broader discussion. Simon agreed and questioned how to change the bylaws. The library system has three groups: the librarians, which are all academic staff; the archivists, which are all archivists; and the School of Information Science, which are all faculty. Each one of those sends a representative. In Academic Affairs, each unit can only send one because otherwise all representatives would come from a large unit. If somebody is serving on the Senate from Academic Affairs DOSO, nobody else from DOSO can run until that person is up again.

Roth questioned if the size of the Senate should be reconsidered to provide a larger membership. Beale believes the Senate should be expanded: the heads of the governance units within each school (including the Graduate Council) should automatically be members of the Senate. Instead of an apportionment, we might think in terms of a ratio of slots for faculty and academic staff based on the numbers of each status within the unit. We need something that handles the issue better if we continue as a joint group rather

than having separate representative bodies. Additionally, we need to build more Senate power. One way to combat lack of shared governance under future university presidents is by thinking about who our constituencies are and how our membership can reflect that. It means we need to enlarge the membership so we have people who can be active in the committees and do the work instead of much of the work that needs to be done falling on just a few people and perhaps not being done at all. We need a specific statement in our bylaws that the people who serve on university-wide committees are to be selected by the Academic Senate.

---

*Approved as revised at the Policy Committee meeting of November 28, 2022.*