

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
November 28, 2022

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

Absent with Notice: M. Barnes; N. Rossi

Guests: Julie O'Connor (Dir, Research Communications); Tim Stemmler (Interim VPR)

I. UPDATE ON INDIRECT COST RECOVERY AND RESEARCH STIMULATION

Stemmler provided an overview to Policy regarding use of F&A/Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) funds allocated to the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) for research stimulation. A substantial number of departmental chairs have written a letter asking for a reallocation of F&A funds back to the school, departmental, and PI percentages received before the OVPR research stimulation fund was created.

Stemmler provided an overview of how these funds have been used and the existing communication problems in ensuring that faculty across the university are aware of OVPR's prioritization in the funding of initiatives. OVPR's Research Strategic Plan aligns with the university's strategic plan and is intended to expand initiatives across local, regional, and global societal challenges, and leverage strengths across disciplines, colleges, schools and centers at the university. The OVPR's focus is on supporting the entire university, especially in building interdisciplinary research strengths, acquiring large R01 and training grants, and the development of enabling technologies, infrastructure and workflow systems that support scholarly activity. Stemmler noted the expansion of research awards from FY'17 (\$235M) to FY'22 (\$288.4M), while acknowledging a boom year in 2021 (\$320.1M) that has not been replicated.

Provost Kornbluh asked for the explanation of the decline. Stemmler said it is not clear. There were numerous applications for COVID grants, many of which were not funded. The university lost several faculty with substantial grants (e.g., Fei Chen in pharmaceutical science; Tracie Baker in medicine). Khosla asked whether the decline is in numbers or funding amounts, and Stemmler indicated that he is gathering that information. The level of NIH funding has remained steady. Beale noted that corporate grants are substantially down. O'Connor pointed out as well a significant decline in clinical trials at the Karmanos Cancer Institute (KCI).

Stemmler noted that inclusion of KCI research data with Wayne State University had substantially benefited the data: the university's separate awards for 2021 were around \$200 million. Beale added that the accounting change benefited awards totals but did not represent new research award activity. Stemmler also expects that the university's awards will decline next year with the loss of the \$20M annual funding for the Perinatal Research Branch (PRB). The PRB continues through January, so we are requesting additional funds to support the biobank to prevent the loss of samples (5 million are from international sources considered non-essential by the PRB because they generally lack back-up data, but 3.2 million are from Detroit and especially important to our mission). There is an ongoing discussion about ownership of the samples and

funding to support the freezer arrays. The IRB provides that only PRB researchers can use the samples, but NIH does not want to retain the samples. This is an amazing biorepository we do not want to lose. The plan is to have 18 months of support from NIH and then continue the biobank in a reduced form that is open for university researchers.

The decline in corporate research awards was significant: from \$117,676,078 in 2019 down to \$53,979,368 in 2022. Kornbluh asked if there was a sense of the cause. O'Connor said that discussions with the IT person who compiles this information and Gail Ryan (AVP Sponsored Program Administration) indicate it is related to KCI numbers. Kornbluh pointed out that the numbers for 2022 include \$30M in pandemic relief money from the state that is also going down next year. Stemmler agreed to look into this and gain a better sense of where these numbers come from.

Linda Beale asked if there was a number for about how much goes to SPA. Stemmler pointed out that sponsored research includes not only SPA but also compliance, which is a source for research and training advancement. He did not have the amount that goes to SPA; however, he did provide a chart showing the change in distribution of indirect cost recovery revenues that took place in December 2014. The central pool dropped from 57% to 49%; the departments' share dropped from 11.5% to 8%; the school/college share dropped from 7.5% to 5%; the OVPR research stimulation fund grew from 10% to 24%; and the research facilities funding grew from 7% to 9%. Beale asked about the source of funding for research CORE expenditures that are covered by OVPR and the president's office. Part comes from research stimulation funds, part from the president's fund, and part from the General Fund.

Stemmler noted that there was \$34,309,407 in ICR in 2021, and the OVPR allocated a net amount of \$6.8 million for research stimulation after about \$2M payable annually for expenses for clinical trials. Beale asked where the clinical trial expense is accounted for in the budgeting system. Stemmler indicated it is unclear, but it is paid directly from ICR funds and never comes to OVPR. Beale questioned whether the amount is consistent year to year, and Stemmler responded that it varies depending on the number of clinical trials.

The ICR amounts between 2006 and 2022 are revealing. The university did well in the early 2000s but experienced a substantial decrease for several years that resulted in the plan to reallocate the funds. The president was concerned about the declining number of grants and small number of large R01 grants and training grants, so a committee was established that evaluated the research enterprise, including allocation and use of ICR funds. The committee recommended allocating more funds centrally to support bigger initiatives. Beale noted that it was not clear that this educational policy discussion had come to the Senate Research Committee and Policy for consideration prior to adoption.

Kornbluh noted that when we compete with other universities for research funding, large grants are especially important. A university cannot grow research significantly with single PI grants. This change was designed to win training grants to support larger collaborative grants. OVPR can provide a list of the large grants won over the last five or six years to show how much better we have done with that purposeful strategy. Beale agreed it would be helpful to see specifics on the increase in those types of grants.

Another part of the reassessment of indirect allocations in 2014 was placing research cores under OVPR. That is coordinated with the research stimulation dollars which fund oversight and financial upkeep of the cores. To help promote cross-college collaborations, the interdisciplinary research centers/institutes (chartered under CIAC-II) were put under OVPR.

Stemmler provided a summary of results from the use of the ICR research stimulation funds, including the Center for Leadership in Environmental Awareness and Research (CLEAR), the Center for Urban Responses to Environmental Stressors (CURES) and the Population Health Outcomes Information Exchange program (PHOENIX). The CLEAR grant, directed by Melissa Runge-Morris (Medicine) and Carol Miller (Engineering), was heavily supported by research stimulation funds. We are one of three universities in the country that received a superfund grant clearance between the School of Medicine and the College of Engineering. The PHOENIX program, directed by Phil Levy (AVPR), was initially supported by OVPR and covers several colleges across the university. CURES, also directed by Runge-Morris, has a history of initially being supported by OVPR. There's an increase in overall funding and a lot of OVPR support for grant development. Grant-writing workshops provide interactions with companies that support those grants. The university is allowed to put in for two major NSF research instrumentation grants each year and has received two awards every year for the past four years: that success largely comes from working with the TCI company. These are always faculty-driven initiatives and OVPR puts in initial investments and provides matching funds to support them. The whole university benefits from these instrument grants, which usually go into the cores and are available for everybody to use. Stemmler also pointed out the importance of the increase in support for training grants: the number has increased from two to five since 2014.

In terms of faculty understanding, Beale recommended showing how the ICR money and research stimulation funds are used: it needs to be clear who makes the decisions about prioritization of funding and that it is not an individual decision subject to favoritism. There should be some sense, in individual cases, of what the OVPR support was compared to the total grant amount: that will help demonstrate the productivity of the research stimulation fund. Stemmler explained that this usually pays off dramatically over time. For example, a \$1M investment in an MRI in 2014 led to \$4M per year in grant funding (\$50M total). With this money, OVPR has been able to build the CORES. The same is true for NIH S10 awards: \$2M for a 3T MRI will help psychiatry, psychology, the Institute of Gerontology (IOG), biology and engineering. These are instruments that go into the cores and support all of those efforts.

There has also been significant enhancement in internal funding mechanisms across the university with the research stimulation dollars: \$100,000 for a new arts and humanities program as well as funding mechanisms for the social sciences and education. To provide an overview, Stemmler broke down the 2021 stimulation funds into the following categories: instrument expenses, institute/center expenses, faculty start-up/retention packages, research support, salary support, internal grants, training grants, grant writing support, software, additional costs. For example, instruments are a significant expense across the university: to be cost effective, some of this expense is paid through a funding mechanism as well as by the college and department. If the OVPR puts money into this, the instrument should be made available for everyone on campus to use. Stemmler is pushing for identification of OVPR-supported research across the entire university. A use network can be set up so that people know what instruments are available. Beale pointed out that Brian Edwards (Medicine) has urged this approach for a long time.

A substantial amount of the institute/center expenses in 2021 went to support the KCI interaction. Kornbluh pointed out that money was committed in grant renewal proposals and a substantial amount of the Provost's Strategic Fund is committed to KCI over the next five years as well.

Beale asked Stemmler to describe the process for determining which center deserves additional help, assuming the idea of providing help will generate a return on investment in terms of additional grant funding. Stemmler indicated he receives many requests and tries to meet all their needs. For example, the IOG needed an administrative assistant. Because IEHS/CURES did not

get a grant renewal, they have to adjust their staff. The two centers share about half the time for this individual.

Faculty start-up and retention packages can be costly, and EAPCHS is a big one. Beale assumed there is always conversation between the provost and OVPR on this issue. Kornbluh said the colleges in general pay the largest piece, the provost's office pays a portion, and OVPR pays a portion. Beale asked whether a faculty member hired in the institute is always given a departmental home. Stemmler said that OVPR ensures they have a department, though they will not be 100% in the department. There was recently a significant hire in physiology for someone with two (possibly three) NIH grants: this person will have a home base in physiology and be in an institute, so physiology will pay part of their salary.

There are many initiatives across the university that need research support (\$1.31M in 2021). Stemmler pointed out the Human Research Protection Program. Clinical human research needs oversight and it is generally expensive. Beale asked for an explanation of the One Health initiative, which received \$150,000 from OVPR. It appeared that it perhaps should have been done as a chartered center (perhaps with a one-year temporary charter to begin), so she wondered at what point such initiatives should become centers. Stemmler said there is a \$50M grant in the works, which will be split across multiple schools.

Beale also requested more information on the \$120,000 for Faith Community research and its outcomes. Stemmler indicated that it is linked to the City of Detroit work done by Hayley Thompson (Medicine). O'Connor added the IOG also has a good connection with the faith community—especially with elder citizens with whom they work—so they have suggested One Health could be a part of IOG. Beale asked whether they are expecting a major grant. Stemmler explained there is an IEHS connection but also Peter Lichtenberg and his IOG unit are building a network to provide information for the elderly community. O'Connor agreed with Beale that it would help to have outcomes from the past year for the Faith Community research. Kornbluh explained that DEI is a major part of the National Cancer Institute's funding for this cycle. This funding was tied to KCI, which is closely related to the community, and this may have also been promised in our original agreement and long letter of promises to KCI.

This is one of the places where Beale questions how decisions are made and how OVPR decides what to support. About 70% of the research funding at the university comes from the School of Medicine and they have many great initiatives that bring in funding. We want to support them, but we also want to support every college across campus, so there is a difficult line to be drawn. Beale suggested that the OVPR funding process could require an annual report from supported projects specifying how funds were used and outcomes. This would be helpful to those faculty who have questions—they know there are significant ICR funds in OVPR and want to know how they are used and what accountability there is.

Stemmler noted that this concern also relates to the Translational Neurosciences Initiative, which was a priority of the School of Medicine and has gotten significant funds over the past few years. The OVPR put in about \$18M over the past six years to prop up that initiative. Stemmler said it is a major initiative and is something the medical school wants and, arguably, we need, but it raises the concern about funding amounts. Beale suggested that Policy invite David Rosenberg to give a presentation about the work of the Translational Neurosciences Initiative.

Stemmler discussed salary support and pointed out the large amount of salary funding (\$331,000) that went to psychiatry: those decisions were made because of priorities from the School of Medicine. This is one-time funding for these objective-based bonuses. Beale presumed these

salary funding requests come with a recommendation from the department chair and dean. Kornbluh agreed, noting direct discussion with the department chair, the dean and the provost's office. He also pointed out the oddity that the psychiatry department chair was one of the signatories of the letter complaining about ICR funding allocated to OVPR.

Internal grants have been supported by the research stimulation funds through bridge and boost grants. There is also support for arts and humanities grants.

Beale noted that faculty had pushed for those arts & humanities grants. There was considerable frustration expressed to VP Lanier that announcements did not include the total amount available for awards, eligibility requirements or even information about who makes decisions. She suggested it will be important for that award to have a budgeted total and award range. Stemmler said the availability of bridge and boost grants are announced across the entire university through email, but perhaps that is not the most effective way to make the announcement. Beale recommended a page on the OVPR website that is easily findable with clear information about internal grants available. Stemmler confirmed there is a website, but it is not easily found. He has been the director of the cores for two years and even he cannot easily find the cores website. OVPR has one person who covers website communications: O'Connor is the only person who covers OVPR's website information, and while marketing helps develop the website, they do not manage it. As interim VPR, Stemmler plans to make it a priority to improve communications and the website. Beale suggested it would be helpful to list the total number of grants in each school and college for each of the categories to provide a sense of the number of faculty supported. Stemmler will try to break it down per college before he meets with the deans tomorrow, since he knows they will want to know what their school/college received. It will be a challenge to break that information down because the training grants and instrument grants cover multiple colleges. This is the utility of having a centralized distribution of the funds.

Stemmler discussed accountability: all internal awards run through a faculty-driven selection program. For the arts and humanities, there are eight faculty who do reviews. For social sciences, there are 12 chairs who do reviews. The decision on what to fund is made at the school/college level, and Stemmler is included in these discussions at a different level. MRI proposals are reviewed and selected by the research deans. The bridge and build grants go through chairs and are submitted to the VPR for review, who then discusses the priority with the chair. The postdoc fellowship goes through the graduate school, not OVPR.

Stemmler agreed with Beale that OVPR needs to dispel misperceptions people have by making the facts available. At the Senate Research Committee meeting, a quarterly newsletter was suggested. More frequent communication is not necessarily beneficial because people get flooded with emails, but a few targeted emails coupled with an easily found website that includes important information will help. He also plans to increase communication with the college research teams, research deans and core/center directors by meeting monthly instead of quarterly. There will be better oversight of who is making decisions for expenditures beyond the deans' and the chairs' essential input. He has also put together an advisory group: Noreen Rossi (Medicine), Alan Dombkowski (Medicine), Jeff Kentor (CLAS), Nora Fritz (EAPCHS). It was important to include faculty members, not administrators, because administrators have their own agenda and faculty members provide a different perspective. The advisory group will meet quarterly and can provide a report to the Academic Senate. Beale believes an understanding of the budgets and where the money is spent is critical and cannot be done without good communication.

Kornbluh suggested that colleges and schools do not pay enough attention: it is the deans' responsibility to talk to their associate deans and share information with their chairs. This

presentation is focused on how OVPR supports research. There might be another place to list all the resources available for humanities. For example, the Humanities Center and the provost's office give out significant funding every year to support humanities research. Stemmler suggested this information should be linked through a coordinated message. Beale agreed with the importance of a link on OVPR's website that lists additional funding available under other offices, and similar cross-references from the provost's office. Faculty often tell her they feel pressed, and they spend time searching for information and get frustrated when they cannot find it. Danielle Aubert commented on the effort made in CFPCA to make such information readily available with deadlines and other information.

II. APPROVAL OF PC PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings for November 21st, 2022 were approved as revised.

III. THE WAYNE EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT FOR GEN ED

Kornbluh received an email from the GEOC committee asking to suspend the requirement for the Wayne Experience (WE). Policy members have been concerned about the WE course. Beale questioned whether it should be terminated or suspended.

renée hoogland reported on the discussion in the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to initiate a program in reading, writing and critical thinking for incoming freshmen. Across the disciplines, faculty reported students' minimal levels of reading, writing and critical thinking skills. The FAC always envisioned the WE course to be something meaningful for students, but it has not met that expectation. The Writing Center is inclusive, but it is peer-supported. The FAC felt strongly that faculty should be teaching students to read and write. They also believe it is important to be taught within the disciplines. Students are struggling to read and to think conceptually, especially after the two years of the pandemic, and most faculty are struggling to get their students up to the needed level. The FAC is considering writing a proposal to start a unit with a faculty fellow designation for volunteering a certain number of hours per semester or per week. Faculty across disciplines would commit a fixed number of hours per semester and perhaps receive one course release for that semester to work one-on-one with students to improve their reading or writing skills and/or in tutoring sessions with groups of students to get them ready for 5000-level classes.

Naida Simon suggested this focus is also needed at lower levels, mentioning her experience in past years working with at risk nursing students. She found students were literate, but not prepared to read at the higher college skill level.

Kornbluh agreed with hoogland: doing this within a discipline is best practice. It is also the only way to make it affordable. If there is strong support for this proposal, he would support a faculty coordinator or committee organizing this for lower-level classes.

Beale questioned what it means if we suspend the WE course, since there is a Gen Ed requirement. Will it be possible to create a decent course out of the existing course requirement, or is the suspension simply because the current course is not working? Kornbluh does not think one-credit courses are good. There's room in the curriculum for a three-credit course on how to succeed in college and move towards a career, especially for first-generation students that do not have support. hoogland's proposal is building blocks for supporting lower division students to become independent thinkers. That requires buy-in from the departments, not by adding faculty. He suggested making funding available (perhaps a semester stipend) for faculty to be part of a

steering committee to plan the suggested program. Faculty could do this better than the provost's office staff, which does not include many faculty.

Jennifer Lewis sees the same problem hoogland described in math and sciences—students do not have some of the basic skills expected. An alternative to having this be a standalone WE course is to integrate this into all the courses taught. The approach, at least in math, has been to figure out how to build in some of the critical thinking and foundational ways of approaching intellectual work in the science and mathematics in the early courses. hoogland assumed that every faculty member is already struggling to do this in their courses. The FAC idea is to create something new for incoming students. It could connect with what an individual faculty member does within their discipline, and would be impossible to coordinate that across the entire curriculum. She suggested connecting with the FIGs. From the math perspective, Lewis thought it would be hard to imagine a separate course preparing students for what we actually need them to be able to do. The early courses have to prepare students for work that students may formerly have been able to do when they arrived at college. Other universities do a WE course well, such as Cal State Long Beach, but Wayne's courses are not uniformly successful.

Beale pointed out that we are discussing three different things: i) a suspension of the WE course; ii) development of a 3-credit course that would cover similar topics to the WE course but not be mandatory for all students; and iii) a FAC and Policy recommendation of a faculty advisory group to further develop the FAC proposal. Beale thought the immediate problem is that WE has been required but has not been offered in sufficient sections for students to take it. Furthermore, for many students it was not of much use. The question is, do we agree with suspending it? And if we do, what does suspending it mean? Since it is a Gen Ed requirement that went through the Senate and the Board, she suggested suspending the requirement needs to go through the Senate and the Board. Kornbluh noted that if Policy supports the suspension and it is recommended by the provost, the Board is going to agree to suspend it. Policy agreed it would be good practice to bring this to the plenary session, as the Gen Ed requirements are done.

Kornbluh pointed out a national movement called Decoding the Disciplines that acknowledges that professors in different disciplines (say, English and history) think about issues differently. In order to do this type of critical thinking, we have to create a course that makes it more explicit for students.

Beale asked if Policy members agree that it makes sense to suspend it, given the fact that students are ready to graduate who have not been able to take the course. hoogland asked if it would be preferable to suspend the current requirement but substitute a better course. Kornbluh suggested the suspension be contingent on a mandate for an alternative within a fixed time period. Beale recommended doing a vote at the next plenary session that suspends the WE requirement. Kornbluh clarified there are good sections of the WE course, and it is useful for some students. We can say that we plan to consider both an optional three-credit course (that might be required for some students) and broader support for critical reading and writing.

Beale thought it would be ideal for the FAC to create a specific critical reading and writing proposal at their next meeting, perhaps by establishing a small working group to develop it. Naida Simon suggested the one-credit course still be available to a small group of students who really need it as an elective. Kornbluh agreed that some kind of course would still be offered for these students.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

New Interim Athletic Director: An announcement was made that Erica Wallace has been appointed interim athletic director for two years.

Ongoing Review of Compliance with BOG Centers/Institutes Statutes: Stemmler agreed to come back to talk specifically about centers and institutes. Beale noted that Senate records are not clear on various centers. For example, Policy approved a temporary charter for Dean Cheryl Kubiak's Center for Behavioral Health and Justice in June 2018. Dean Kubiak submitted a two-page request for a permanent charter on May 16th, 2019, which Policy discussed at a June 2019 meeting. Policy concluded the charter request was incomplete since it lacked sufficient budgetary information, a statement of faculty review and other necessary items. Policy therefore requested more information through the provost. Our records may be incomplete, but they do not show that the improved charter request came back to Policy. Beale asked whether the provost has a record of what occurred. Kornbluh suggested Beale send him the information so he can follow up with Kubiak. He has also spent considerable time nudging Wael Saker (Dean, SOM) regarding the Center for Emerging and Infectious Diseases (CEID) information that has not come back since our request for additional information months ago.

Mask Policy: An announcement went out regarding changes to the mask policy and campus daily screener. Beale and Laurie Clabo (Chief Health Officer) discussed this. Because there would be no enforcement mechanism, it appeared the only thing that could be said is that faculty can request that their students continue to wear masks. The expectation is that most, if not all, students will do what faculty ask.

hoogland was confused as to why the mask policy was not retained, given the rise in cases. Beale explained Clabo's justification for changing it aligns with the CDC's current policy, and the Campus Health Committee complies with CDC. There are people that want it both ways, so it is difficult. Brad Roth commented that other universities, by and large, have gotten rid of the mask: it might have been better to have gone "mask optional" earlier and reinstate the requirement now. Beale agreed that it is possible we will have to reinstate it this winter if cases increase. Kornbluh believes there was a broad sense that we no longer had an active mandate in our classrooms. Most faculty had stopped enforcing it in their classes. Eliminating the screeners in the buildings will alleviate what was most upsetting for students, especially in housing. Simon noted the change to the campus daily screener: it merely gives a green screen for vaccination.

Senate Reps to 3N Committee: The 3N Committee on the P&T Factors is meeting in December. Beale received a copy of the recommendation for an ethics statement to be included. She noted a potential concern that this could be used in those cases where there is bias or even animosity between faculty and their chairs who are in the chain of tenure and promotion approval. She will share it with Policy to think about. Kornbluh suggested it be shared with the Office of General Counsel.

Welcome Center Closure: The Welcome Center remains closed while Riddler Pest works on eliminating the rats. There has also been external work done to secure the building. Aubert reported that Dave Massaron (VP Finance & Business Ops) and Rob Davenport (AVP FP&M) did a walk-through and saw no evidence of rats. Nonetheless, employees are still worried. Kornbluh suggested facilities did a poor job of communicating. This wasn't a Wayne problem: it was caused by a city demolition that chased rat colonies two blocks south. Facilities were aware of it and working on the problem, but they did not communicate that with those who should have been informed.

V. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Change in Athletics Leadership: Kornbluh discussed the change in leadership in athletics, which is an at-will position.

Searches: There are several searches underway. The College of Education will be doing airport interviews for decanal semifinalists the week after finals and plans to bring candidates to campus in late January.

A search firm has been chosen for the Library System decanal search, and the search committee, chaired by John Corvino, has been chosen. They hope to have a job description ready before the holiday break.

There is a more targeted search for the Enrollment Management position. Rather than having a search committee, applications will be reviewed for strong candidates as they come in. Policy will be asked to interview those candidates.

There will be a national search for the head of Housing and Auxiliary Services.

Aramark: Kornbluh and Massaron are concerned that dining services face a downward spiral. Students in housing declined during the pandemic; as a result, less food is sold, Aramark does a poorer job with the food service, and students do not want to eat campus food. We must figure out how and whether to rebuild our relationship with Aramark. The contract provides that we repay them certain sums out of future revenues that they spent up front when they were awarded the contracts. It may be possible to bid this out to another service provider who will take on that obligation.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS AND REQUIRED ACTIONS

A. December 7 Academic Senate Plenary Agenda (Draft)

Beale confirmed Sheryl Kubiak (Dean, Social Work) will present at the December plenary. Policy members determined the poll on the WE Gen Ed requirement should be conducted between Stemmler's and Kubiak's presentations.

B. Academic Integrity Letter (Pineau draft and Lewis comments)

Policy members reviewed the draft and made revisions. Beale will send the letter.

Kornbluh suggested that academic integrity should connect with the FAC proposal we discussed. We should talk about critical thinking and connect it to a disciplinary field to ensure students are taught the difference between original work and plagiarism. Aubert noted her concern re: having classes that do not center around substantive content. Hoogland suggested Pineau's module would be useful under the proposal to discourage academic dishonesty within the context of each faculty member's own tutoring group.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

Kornbluh is considering bringing a faculty member into the Provost's Office to act as an associate provost for academic affairs. He asked Policy members to consider this idea, suggesting that it be further discussed at an upcoming Policy meeting. He had lunch with Michigan's associate

provost for academic innovation who informed him that for every single associate provost there is a faculty member. Kornbluh only has two who are faculty members and would like to bring more faculty leadership into the Provost's Office.

Approved as submitted at the Policy Committee meeting of December 5, 2022.