

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
December 12, 2022

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

Absent with Notice: P. Khosla

Guests: Jessica Herrington (WittKieffer); Arun Iyer (Assoc. Prof., EACPHS); Simon Ng (Prof., ENGG);
Melissa Runge-Morris (Dir., IEHS); Kristin Taylor (Assoc. Prof., CLAS)

I. WITTKIEFFER DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENTIAL CHARACTERISTICS

The search firm WittKieffer will be working with the Presidential Search Committee to help find the next president. WittKieffer consultant Herrington worked on the Dean of Engineering search last year, and her colleague, Zach Smith, worked on the provost search and is leading the presidential search, but was unable to attend the Policy meeting. Herrington's goal was to gather information regarding Policy members' desired characteristics and hoped for accomplishments of a new WSU president. She asked the group to comment in particular on the following questions: What are some of the big agenda items for this individual? What will success look like five years from now? What will they have accomplished? What are the primary qualities, qualifications and attributes sought in the next president? What are the principal reasons for a qualified person to pursue this presidency? The firm will create a leadership profile.

Barnes thought it was important that whoever comes into the presidency have a faculty background with experience in the classroom to best support the university's goals as both a teaching institution and a research institution. Aubert gauged success as the president's ability to manage the administrative dysfunction that exists at the university, having the social skills to work with different groups effectively to move agendas forward and understanding the academic mission of the university.

One of Roth's greatest concerns is the commitment of a president to shared governance and an appreciation of the academic enterprise—a president who is well acclimated to academic culture, who appreciates what it is that faculty do and the kinds of insights that faculty have into the challenges that the university faces at all levels. In particular, the president should have an awareness of the role of the Academic Senate and that it draws faculty and academic staff from all parts of the institution who are able to provide perspective on what goes on daily in the institution. That's a set of perspectives frequently missing when it's just administrators making decisions.

hoogland has been in academia for 30 plus years and expressed her concern with the corporatization of the university, which includes a focus on quantitatively measurable information but tends to disregard qualitative measurement. Student success is about numbers and not about whether students actually learn. There should be a focus on faculty and staff, who ultimately provide a good education or not so good education—an individual professor is able to allow a student to flourish. Increasingly, the focus is on students' well-being, and she wants a president who has a real interest in how the faculty experience their work here.

It is important to Simon that the new president understands our student body: we have a group of students who work full-time and try to go to school full-time and/or care for family. This is not a typical 18 to 21-year-old student body because many of our students have been cheated by K-12 and come to college woefully underprepared. We have to help them become prepared.

A key desired characteristic is valuing the role of faculty. Beale believes the new president's leadership style should be open and transparent, one that understands the importance of consultation with different constituencies and building ground level support. A number of the problems we have here are a result of decisions made at a higher level without that attention to building support from the ground up, which a real leader must do. Another necessary characteristic is an intellectual ability to recognize when facts on the ground and perspectives that are heard require modifications to approaches in order to build that kind of support. So many of the people who run for executive offices seem to have egos that get in the way of that ability to change your mind and take new facts into consideration. A final point would be a person who is able to value each of the different schools and colleges that are here: the president must recognize that Medicine is enormously important to research but cannot ignore other areas, such as Chemistry and Physics. Similarly, the health affairs schools (Pharmacy, Nursing, and Medicine) have special needs in terms of clinical and affiliation sites, but many of our other disciplines—e.g., Engineering, Theatre, Graphic Design, Law and English—also have special needs. The president needs to be someone who is good at picking their executive team members. That requires a good judge of character and competencies. It also means recognizing that a cabinet should consist of area leaders (just the vice presidents) without the AVPs that result in such a broad cabinet that there is no functional decision-making process. The president needs to be good at judging people's capacities and understanding that one person's strengths can complement another person's strengths, rather than trying to make all the decisions at the executive level, but being able to take that team and hear the points that come from all those different perspectives for making final decisions. That is an important leadership skill that a new president has to have in order to move forward, especially with the current situation in the School of Medicine and the current need for emphasizing our position as an R1 research institution and stimulating research.

Lewis echoed much of what members had said. It's important to have someone who really values the world of ideas and sees the university as a place for that, someone who's collaborative and values multiple perspectives and draws those perspectives into decision-making in a way that others can see. Success would be to have a vibrant campus life in five years, even for people who commute. Embracing the amazing mission of this university, which does set it apart, and someone who really understands the value of our being in Detroit and the possibilities it provides for research related to community interaction.

Rossi emphasized that we're in an age of DEI. Faculty and staff are more alike than different in their needs, and a true leader can enable us to see that and to see our common goal in terms of where Wayne State stands and what Wayne State can do. We can make an impact, and our student body, faculty and staff make us who we are. We make a bigger impact in society than schools that admit more privileged individuals because we make a difference for first-generation students. We are under-appreciated and under-supported, so we need a president that recognizes that. We need a president who truly listens and feels confident to ask for clarification.

Beale noted the important role of fundraising with multiple \$10-20M gifts being brought in annually and a much better understanding of the need to market this university for what its strengths are, especially its academic strengths and diverse strengths. Being in Detroit influences our academics and what we do and how we research. We seem to market ourselves more transactionally, in percentages and rankings. The underlying narrative about who we are as an academic institution doesn't seem to make it through in our marketing. The president should be good at telling our story to outside constituencies, whether they be people in Lansing, Washington D.C. or in Michigan writ large.

Policy members agreed fundraising was necessary to help address facilities and the issue of deferred maintenance. Barnes recommended someone who has their hands on the pulse of places where funds can be raised to make certain that the university is functioning as well as possible. Hoogland favors a female president. Rossi believes we need a president who will make us feel proud to be here and proud of who we are, and that will aid in recruitment and retention of faculty—i.e., somebody who believes in us and believes in Wayne State.

Herrington asked the Policy members to think about nominations and shared a public email address that will be used throughout the duration of the search (WayneStatePresident@wittkieffer.com). Nominations are helpful in recruiting candidates, especially those from underrepresented backgrounds (nominations are all held in confidence). She encouraged Policy members to share the email address with colleagues once a leadership profile is complete. Beale will share that with Policy to be promoted within their networks and share it with individuals as well.

Aubert noted the importance of considering the experience of nominees. For an institution of this size and complexity, Herrington explained candidates would typically come from large schools or colleges, serving as provosts or presidents. Typically, there are a few members of a presidential cabinet who might move up. Sometimes elected officials are nominated for presidential searches, especially at state institutions, but usually there needs to be an affiliation with the institution for those candidates to get much leverage. They sometimes see individuals coming from large government agencies (NIH and NSF). Again, there usually needs to be some connection to higher education or previous higher ed experience. Occasionally, someone comes from industry, but that's less common. Beale noted it takes an exceptional person to come from the business world into a presidency of a university and have the kind of understanding of what the academic enterprise is and the fact that corporatization is not exactly favored in academe. The ideal candidate would be someone who has a Ph.D. or other kind of terminal degree and was eligible for tenure here and had real academic experience—i.e., leadership experience as a provost or as a president at a somewhat smaller but still research-oriented institution.

Kornbluh did not disagree with Policy members' comments, but he added that no one currently in the administration wants crumbling buildings, administrative dysfunction or IT issues: the problem is we have limited resources. The university has suffered significant cuts, resulting in losses of staff while maintaining faculty. The president as CEO, Dave Massaron as CFO and the provost can manage the budget, but they cannot control budgetary allocations from Lansing or Washington, D.C. Philanthropy is too narrow here. The money side is an important piece, and nobody understands that better than the Senate's Budget Committee because they have more continuity than a lot of other people.

Barnes was not opposed to having a president who comes from government because his previous university appointed a Clinton cabinet member who was very successful as president. The most successful presidents in terms of fundraising are usually people that have been in government positions. Aubert pointed out organizational issues being a problem at Wayne State long before the current president. We need somebody who understands how to manage an organization.

Kornbluh anticipates a 5% budget cut next year, and questions what he could possibly do that's not going to make this worse? CLAS, for example, has a dysfunctional administration because they've given up staff over the years. It's the largest college at the university and they are not able to handle paperwork correctly. We have to rebuild the staff in the college and that takes money. Without the money, we face hard choices. Every big business in the country has been shrinking staff since the 1980s and replaced them with efficiency. We've shrunk our staff but haven't built the necessary functional systems. Whether or not there are budget cuts, money will go into buildings. The scale of need is a significant challenge.

Aubert disagreed with the comment that staff suffered to hold faculty steady, noting that the bargaining unit that represents faculty has gone from approximately 2000 to 1700 over the last few years because we have lost both faculty and academic staff. Kornbluh replied that he had been provided numbers showing that the tenure-track faculty was not shrinking, a concern he had when he started the job a year ago. Beale suggested that the tenure-track numbers have been going down. Hoogland agreed: when she came to the university, her department had 53 full time faculty but now has only 27. Kornbluh added that CLAS now has the Department of Public Health, so it's not clear that tenure track faculty have declined across all of CLAS. Beale pointed out the relatively new Department of Public Health has only one full professor, one associate professor and three assistant teaching professors—i.e., two tenure track and three teaching faculty.

Simon does the apportionment determined by the Senate bylaws. In 2014, we had 88 senators, but this year we have only 76. In 2015, we hired 45 new advisors, but she does not know if we still have the same base number plus the additional 45. That's one of the questions Beale has because it was a Ron Brown initiative to hire 45 (15 at a time) for three years. Roth commented that advisors are complaining that they're increasingly overworked and overburdened with additional tasks. Barnes pointed out CFPCA scholarly lines are now taught by adjuncts.

II. APPROVAL OF PC PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of December 5, 2022 were approved with edits.

III. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Mellon Foundation Grant for Detroit Center for Black Studies: The university is receiving a \$6M grant from the Mellon Foundation to support Black studies, allowing the hiring of 30 humanistic scholars whose primary research, teaching, community engagement and student engagement is with the African American community. This grant will pay for a significant portion of 30 faculty members' salaries over the next four years. It is not permanent in that regard, but it is a way to make an impact in a short time. There will be a press release from the university next week. In January, a press release will explain that this is part of a cluster hire of 50 faculty members. As of September, the university has a total of 49 self-identified Black tenure-track faculty members; this work will double the number of self-identified Black faculty members over that time period. It is the provost's personal goal not only to diversify the faculty, but also to change the curriculum and research agendas—not simply adding a course on Black poetry or Black political leaders, but hiring people who think differently about the core curriculum in their disciplines. Some hiring was done last year, so the new faculty who will be here in the fall will start planning a Detroit Center for Black Studies. It will be a Wayne State institution but will reach out to people who do Black studies widely, at least in southeast Michigan, if not across the whole state. Approximately \$1M of this grant money jump-starts the center and provides money for research for educational programs to get it going. The Mellon Foundation understands we will ask for a challenge grant of endowment in three or four years (we'll ask them for \$10M and we'll raise \$10M).

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Academic Integrity Letter: Beale shared a draft of the academic integrity letter that will go out on the faculty and academic staff listservs so they can consider including it in their syllabi.

Lunch with the President: Beale was invited to lunch with the president last Friday and described the meeting as interesting. There were ups and downs in the communication because she shared that he had been extraordinarily disrespectful of the Senate and that had been problematic. There was an understanding that moving forward, they would both make an effort to communicate better and hopefully

it would be workable. It was not an adversarial meeting, though there were important things to be said in that context.

Multi-factor Authentication: Beale reported the multi-factor authentication email should be sent out soon. She and Bob Reynolds had both suggested changes to Rob Thompson who tried to take those changes into account, but the announcement didn't quite work. The email told faculty about multi-factor authentication and how it works. Duo Mobile will still be used with Global Protect VPN, but everything else (Canvas, STARS, Academica, etc.) will go through Microsoft multi-factor authentication. The change will not take place until January 3rd, so it's important to get the notice out now rather than during the holidays. In response to a question, Beale indicated she would double-check with Thompson regarding whether people will still be able to get into Canvas without multi-factor authentication, but her understanding was that they cannot.

V. IEHS/CURES

Melissa Runge-Morris joined Policy to discuss the charter renewal document from the CIAC-II committee for the Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (IEHS) and the self-study for this year. Policy members had questions related to the incorporation originally of CURES as a center in 2014. They understand the use of a center for a particular grant, but in the last renewal (2016) it was decided to include CURES as part of the name of the chartered institute. Beale understood that there was one re-application for the grant that came through, but it has not yet been awarded with a recent re-application. Runge-Morris was notified by NIH that it was pending council review in January. Receiving a score back depends upon the money available at the level of NIH. If it is not renewed, she will resubmit it in time for the April 19, 2023, deadline. Beale questioned what happens if the CURES grant is not renewed, so that the name CURES that is connected with the grant would no longer have a grant connected to it. She noted that the description of CURES as a center is different from the description of IEHS as an institute with a different focus, goals and people that are served. If CURES remains in the title of the institute and those CURES-specific activities continue, would there essentially be a center nested within IEHS? If so, that is not covered by the Board of Governors Statute. Beale noted that CLEAR is a new grant-related center, also under IEHS. She asked Runge-Morris to explain what would happen in that circumstance, and how the Policy Committee should view what the institute is doing regarding those two specific grant-related center titles.

Runge-Morris explained the initial name of the IEHS was the Institute of Chemical Toxicology (ICT) in 1987. After many years, they were successful in getting their first P30 environmental health sciences core central grant from NIEHS called Molecular and Cellular Toxicology with Human Applications. It was decided that the ICT name should be changed to reflect a greater emphasis on environmental health as it progressed, because times change and over time there is an importance to understand how environmental chemicals affect people. The chartered institute changed the name to the Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. They were successful through those years and the P30 center grant had a different name with a different director. It lasted about ten years and Runge-Morris became director in 2008. Their challenge was to think about ways to find external support for IEHS as a research-intensive institute. Between 2008 and 2012, IEHS had a faculty grant, but they lost the previous director and the institute was on the chopping block. The charter was renewed around 2012, and the institute went through a rocky period when the previous director left and the faculty felt disenfranchised in a building that wasn't a part of Wayne State. In order to have a greater visibility in the environmental health sciences field, they applied for central grant funding. IEHS succeeded in 2014 to get the CURES center grant. One is the P30 Environmental Health Sciences core center like CURES, and they recently received a superfund research program P42 grant (CLEAR), also from NIEHS, which merges biomedical and engineering scientists' work together along with the community, educators and other faculty to get a better handle on environmental threats to health.

A center that is a center for the purpose of a grant is allowable under the statute, although it's considered to be short-term –i.e., for the term of the grant. Beale questioned why the CURES name was put in the name of the chartered institute—the issue Policy is trying to understand is what would happen if the current grant renewal process is not successful. Would IEHS use other financial support to keep those same CURES activities going? If so, that would make the CURES center look like the kind of center that requires a charter. Runge-Morris responded that would not be a problem. The CURES center is a grant that does not require institutional backing. They currently have a no-cost extension for CURES and it needs to be renewed. The institute does not hire faculty or do merit reviews on the CURES grant. The reason CURES was included in the name of IEHS came from the desire to recognize the core mission—looking at the urban environment of Detroit and understanding environmental health threats within our urban environment. Runge-Morris explained going for these high-stakes grants provide the opportunity to create effective teams that lead to transformative gains in the field, like the CLEAR grant that works with engineers who are not in IEHS and are not faculty, and collaboration makes it possible—by definition they must be transdisciplinary in order to answer some questions of the field. Steve Lanier urged that we include CURES in the name of the chartered institute to capture that broader mission meaning.

Rossi noted the institute can have many P30s that will dissolve and reinstitute with different titles. The confusion lies in having CURES in the title. Beale considered having CURES in the name of the institute implies that it is an ongoing center, not necessarily supported by a specific P30 grant, and that raises the problem of being a nested center under an institute center, which is not permitted under the statute. Runge-Morris did not believe there was a problem with the IEHS/CURES name adopted during the last re-chartering and renewal process. Even if there were no CURES or if there was a CURES grant funded by NIH, it's just a name that stands for Center for Urban Responses to Environmental Stressors that provides a better description than the name Institute of Environmental Health Sciences that indicates we're concerned about environmental health concerns in the urban population, dense environment, and it functions according to the guidelines of centers and institutes at Wayne State. Rossi pointed out that it is easier to get development and philanthropy with a name that has a ring that people will remember and believes that was the goal of adding CURES to the IEHS name. Policy members suggested perhaps the C in CURES could be changed from “center” to “collaborative” or “consortium” to avoid the confusion.

Kornbluh would like to see more advertisement about IEHS: it has a long history of success and should be appreciated from an institutional perspective. Runge-Morris pointed out three new P42 grants awarded this term to Yale, Columbia and Wayne State University.

VI. UPDATE FROM SENATE REPRESENTATIVES ON THE 3N P&T FACTORS COMMITTEE

The Senate representatives on the 3N P&T Factors Committee were invited to Policy to provide an understanding of the kinds of issues coming up for discussion and the direction the group is taking. Iyer, Ng and Taylor provided updates on the important issues in the working groups. Walter-McCabe (Social Work and Law) was not able to attend the meeting but provided Policy an update on the DEI issues discussed.

Taylor reported on the subcommittee looking at the teaching factors and the collaborative research factors, which had concluded that the teaching factors didn't need to change. Their efforts focused on factors for research and collaborative research, drawing language from Florida International University and University of Memphis that described collaboration that is associated with research productivity, and incorporated some language about adhering to unit, department and disciplinary norms. Language around the idea that collaboration should happen across institutions has also been proposed. Beale questioned if this was just an elaboration on kinds of research activity that should be considered or is it in some way

being emphasized as a part of the requirement of research that it be collaborative? Taylor responded that it is not being emphasized as a requirement of research. He explained they have created a forum in which research can be independent and must demonstrate leadership and notoriety in the field of study, or research can be collaborative with leadership and collaborative research efforts evaluated based on the unit's disciplinary arm. It is set up so that both can be considered factors for tenure and promotion. In the committee discussions, that was the important point to make. The path for tenure and promotion with independent researchers is very clear but there didn't seem to be enough scaffolding in the P&T factors as written to support scholars who work across disciplinary silos. They wanted to make sure that that was included in what was proposed.

Beale raised the issue of scholarship that also has an element of activism, advocacy or public interest and questioned if that had been discussed in this group. Taylor said it had not been discussed: and of the current teaching factors they believed there was enough room to allow that kind of activity, so it did not warrant a revision.

Aubert appreciated the emphasis on collaboration as being very helpful for her college (CFPCA) because this has been an issue for people in the arts: so much of that work is collaborative and is mostly visible when interacting with people, not necessarily at other universities, but other institutions like art museums. Barnes agreed they can't work without collaboration fields. Taylor explained the rationale behind it: they were really trying to accommodate the stretch research that happens after tenure, but also wanted to be sensitive to generational differences in academics. They proposed new language in those factors in a way that accounts for those generational differences and how faculty collaborate.

Rossi was concerned with the guidelines being clear for those in the School of Medicine, Engineering and allied health. The NIH, for example, has multiple PI grants. When a junior person is progressing and being mentored, how can they present themselves on their curriculum vitae when they're not a first author, the corresponding author or the sole PI? It is not just the factor language that is important, but also the template language for requesting outside reviewer letters, because their universities and colleges may be different (she has seen obtuse letters going out) and the individuals on the external panel tend to apply the guidelines from their own institutions, which is not on point. She advocates for that kind of thing, especially to protect individuals who do not have tenure. Beale agreed it might be worth crafting some language for the template—a sentence or two that covers the independent research versus the collaborative research aspect for the reference letter.

Iyer represents the DEI subcommittee with Walter-McCabe and chair Caroline Maun (CLAS) and was tasked with examining the current P&T guidelines to assess the gaps where additional DEI guidelines might be needed and to assess where the current provisions may be creating unnecessary barriers for faculty with diverse backgrounds. They reviewed recent evidence-based literature on the impact of P&T factors on a diverse faculty, including recommendations for best practices; multiple similarly situated universities' P&T criteria and their treatment of DEI; examined the current mission, vision and strategy documents for the university to ensure any recommendations would be within the goals of this university; created a table of language and topics identified within other university factors; assessed the different possibilities through the lens of Wayne State University priorities and vision; and provide recommendations to the full committee. They have not made a final decision on the language, but do have some recommendations. First, the factors should provide as much guidance as possible, rather than being ambiguous or potentially changing directions to applicants depending on the composition of each year's P&T committee. Second, the factors should explicitly allow the candidates to describe their activities to promote DEI for consideration by the P&T committee. The group thinks that the description of scholarship can be enhanced: in addition to describing scholarship as adding to knowledge and creativity, it should include scholarship concerned with advancing equitable practices and reforms in the professional, academic and local communities. Finally, consideration should be given to providing

educational programming to those involved in the P&T process regarding well-documented bias, including the research on bias in SET evaluations. There may be additional discussion of inclusive language in the upcoming full committee meeting, but at this time the subcommittee is not recommending a DEI subtrack like scholarship, service and teaching. After reviewing several universities, they didn't see specific DEI information as a separate track. It's incorporated within the documentation and some of them overlap with other recommendations that come from the other subcommittees, too. Therefore, it would be a good idea to heavily incorporate within the document but have some explicit language for the DEI.

Beale agreed with not having a required track or even statement about DEI. The heart of what DEI should be about is an individual sense of whatever ways you can incorporate DEI in what you do. She asked whether there was draft language for the suggestion that faculty could include descriptions of their DEI activities. They could raise concerns that it is a requirement unless very carefully done. Iyer believes there is some language within the document as to how that can be done but did not have the exact language.

Beale noted that scholarship about advancing equitable practices and reforms in the profession or in the community is part of the public interest issue discussed earlier with Taylor. Like any information about DEI in the factors, it must be very carefully expressed so that it does not become an obligatory statement rather than something that can be positively taken into account when included. Roth agreed that it is important how it is phrased in both of those instances: it needs to appropriately include mention that these are things that can be taken favorably into account but not require that people have incorporated a particular agenda in their own research that may not be compatible nor require some sort of ideological litmus test for someone to pass in order to fulfill the criteria for promotion and tenure. He regarded the existing language as fulfilling those criteria. Hoogland stated that there should not be a required DEI statement because it invites hypocrisy, rather there should be consideration for what it is that faculty can demonstrate in terms of objective factors.

Kornbluh noted that we are committed to building an inclusive campus that is essential to an R1 university in today's world. Incorporating that into P&T guidelines is not an ideological litmus test. Roth responded that he was not suggesting that it does, rather there would be ways of phrasing it that would create those problems that have been avoided. Beale added that some universities are requiring a specific statement on DEI from faculty, which she finds harmful. The provost believes that requiring a statement about building an inclusive educational institution is a good thing. Scientific funding agencies such as NSF require community impact statements in grant applications. Also, if we are serious about changing our culture, having that is part of the difference and should not be separated out from research, teaching or engagement.

Beale objected to treating DEI as a separate factor with equal standing for teaching, service and scholarship because it can be part of any or all of those. She likes the wording about the description of those DEI efforts: it should explicitly welcome scholarship that involves those kinds of inclusivity questions. That it is part of the fabric and orientation of being conducive to DEI. Rossi believes it should be in the teaching philosophy provided when faculty go up for promotion; embedded in the fabric of what faculty do in the teaching realm and research. At the School of Medicine, some of the departments do ask for a statement upon hiring.

Ng serves on the Ethics and Professional Behavior subcommittee chaired by AVP Baltes. They recommend professional and ethics guidelines be included as an overarching statement of expected faculty behavior and not as a fourth P&T factor, added to the final paragraph to section IV (Standard of Excellence) in the current factors statement at the bottom of page 4:

Consistent with the University's core values, faculty members are also expected to perform in a professional and ethical manner. Specifically, faculty should conduct all aspects of their role as a faculty member with honesty, integrity, responsibility, and accountability; and treat all members of the University community (e.g., colleagues, staff, and students) with respect and fairness.

This is intentionally generic so that it can apply to across the university. Initial discussions considered a matrix or very specific criteria for faculty to put in the P&T package, but they decided to leave it to the individual colleges to elaborate more if they require more demonstration of ethics and professional behavior.

When Beale first came to the university, there was an attempt to create a code of ethics that faculty had to follow that included things like not talking to anyone who was in any way connected with a company that had a contract with the university without reporting that discussion (with punishment, including termination, for any breach of any part of the code). It would have applied if your neighbor, for example, was hired but was an employee of that company, that you would have to report a conversation to the university. The Senate took the lead in objecting strenuously to the idea of imposing that kind of a code of ethical conduct. A significant problem with the university's proposals for such codes is that they are subjective. She is concerned this could be misused if included in the factors: if you put such measures in the factors that create a subjective standard, it will be hard to prove or disprove. That can easily lead to a biased result. We are all aware of instances where a chair or dean has personal animosity against a particular faculty member, and this kind of requirement in the factors can provide a tool for that bias.

hoogland did not see any problem with having a statement like this somewhere, but not as part of the factors. Faculty should be able to demonstrate through objective factors that they satisfy a standard of excellence. Beale agrees: while in principle we want to emphasize the importance of professional ethics, it is concerning to have such a statement as part of the factors' "standards". Barnes agreed it is subjective and thus problematic: he had been on a P&T committee where it was made very clear that they were trying to keep someone from getting P&T at all costs. He could imagine a chair or someone pointing to one event, saying this person doesn't satisfy this guideline. Aubert agreed the statement should live somewhere else.

Beale recommended Ng share the Policy Committee's concerns with the 3N committee. She summarized it as Policy seeing no way for a faculty member to demonstrate this part of an excellence requirement, yet there are many ways in which it can be used negatively by unit heads, whether they be chairs or deans or people on the committee who have a negative bias against that person. It essentially weaponizes ethics as something that can be used negatively against any target. Rossi was on the university P&T committee many years ago when a faculty member had been exonerated of an incident, and someone brought it up and it poisoned the deliberation. We do need to be cautious: how that will be handled is problematic and should be done equitably. Beale thinks it's important to point out the question: is this the place to say this if we want just a general statement about that?

Aubert believed the charge from the provost was to consider the factors through the lens of public scholarship and DEI, not ethics. Beale personally thinks DEI and ethics are important, but this is not the place to put new requirements. We have to be very careful that these things can't be weaponized against somebody by a person who is antagonistic, where it's really subjective and hard to demonstrate what your role has been in that area.