WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
April 17, 2023

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

Guest: Richard Pineau (Chair, ad hoc AI Committee)

I.   AD HOC AI COMMITTEE REPORT

Pineau was invited to Policy to present the report from the Academic Senate ad hoc subcommittee on Artificial Intelligence (AI). He thanked Policy for entrusting him with chairing this committee and explained the work done over the past two months, recognizing committee members Stephanie Chastain (CLAS), renée hoogland (CLAS), David Moss (Law) and Robert Reynolds (Engineering) for their hard work.

Pineau described the committee's process in arriving at its preliminary report. The committee members began by reviewing the literature, finding many who consider AI damaging for education and others who consider it a wonderful addition. The committee then invited various university members with AI expertise and experience to talk with the committee and/or send information. Those included Veronica Bielat (University Libraries), who provided a variety of links and information, including a library guide; Academic Senate member Tamme Quinn-Grzebyk (Business), who uses an AI system called Jasper in her classes and provided insight on syllabus language and guidelines for faculty who may want to allow students to use AI; Tonya Whitehead (Assoc. Dir., OTL) and Sara Kacin (Asst. Provost for Faculty Development & Faculty Success, and Dir., OTL), who discussed the way OTL works on AI issues; and Nathan Chavez (Assoc. Dir. Academic Application, C&IT) discussed Canvas and the preventative measures C&IT is considering. Chavez explained that detection software for AI is limited and not very reliable, despite claims of being 98% effective. He noted that cost is a concern because the marketing of AI will put a premium on detection software. In addition, at least one committee member attended each of two university-wide OTL sessions held on AI: one was a humanities coffee hour that focused on AI in academic writing, and the other was an AI-in-STEM faculty panel on which Reynolds participated. Pineau noted that there was little direct discussion of the use of AI in STEM education at the panel.

Each committee member took responsibility for one aspect of the charge, and the full committee held discussions to address concerns and add/amend language. The report presents a set of recommendations for Policy consideration, both responding to issues included in the charge and some on issues raised in the course of the committee's discussions.

The following are the committee's recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The university should establish a first-year seminar course for incoming students to prepare them for university-level academic work, including critical thinking skills, and the understanding of what it means to be a university student. Noting the temporary suspension of the Wayne Experience requirement, the committee emphasized the need for an introductory seminar that would raise key issues such as ethics and academic integrity, study habits, writing effectively and reaching out to instructors for help.

Recommendation 2: The Senate plenary should approve a statement regarding the role of students, faculty and the university in dealing with AI's impact on higher education. This was admittedly the most difficult part of the report. It is important to make the instructor role clear: they must inform their students about the AI policies for their classes and make students aware of their expectations that students will read the syllabus carefully to understand the policies that govern academic misconduct norms. It is also important for the university to support both students and faculty as we navigate this significant and evolving change, whether through additional trainings or resources such as detection software. A challenge in developing any statement of policy is that information about AI continues to evolve rapidly.

Recommendation 3: The Senate plenary should vote to make additional changes to the Student Code of Conduct: (i) inclusion of an explicit reference to AI in definition 2.3 on cheating and (ii) footnote additions of definitions of collusion, contract cheating and the "other" category which is listed on the Dean of Students website but not a formal part of the Student Code of Conduct.

Recommendation 4: The Senate Policy Committee should support revisions to the Academic Integrity module created and launched by Pineau a few months ago to (i) update the module to include the Student Code of Conduct changes and (ii) to provide instructors several prompts from which to choose to add to the ethical dilemmas discussion board assignment. There are four prompts from which an instructor could choose, and these prompts can be amended by instructors to better reflect their discipline or their norms. The committee did not believe it necessary to have AI as a separate point since misuse is just a form of plagiarism or cheating in general. Pineau noted that if the Policy Committee thought it necessary to include points specifically dedicated to AI, that could be done by including them later or adjusting the introduction letter to let faculty know that they should likely have a conversation about AI usage.

Policy members had several questions at this point. Brad Roth suggested a clarification to the proposed Student Code of Conduct footnote language that would add "or other than as authorized by your instructor" after the "or" for collusion. Linda Beale indicated she would provide Pineau a few other minor edits for the footnotes.

Pramod Khosla suggested the first-year seminar proposal might also include discussion of skill sets for taking exams. He thinks students often lack the skills sets to use time management and properly prepare for tests. Pineau agreed and will include that under study habits.

Since the four scenarios in the fourth recommendation are each examples of cheating, Jennifer Lewis suggested a scenario be added there to illustrate using AI tools to enhance learning. Beale noted that the scenarios discussed are intended to represent ethical dilemmas, so Lewis's suggestion might fit better in a part of the integrity module that presents various legitimate uses of AI: for example, there could be a scenario in which the teacher has suggested using ChatGPT as a first draft that is then honed and edited to develop a better statement. Naida Simon recalled a situation where athletes who went on YouTube to learn how to do a calculus problem that was mistaught in class were accused of cheating when clearly it was legitimate learning. Lewis suggested a parallel is students' legitimate use of Khan Academy to clarify something they did not understand in class. Pineau indicated he could create a standalone section for assessing scenarios to determine whether there is something ethically amiss or not. That could be valuable for students.

Recommendation 5: This recommendation includes two different suggestions for statements to include in an instructor's syllabus: (i) syllabus language for instructors who choose to prohibit the use of AI tools in the classroom or for assignments, and (ii) syllabus language for instructors who will allow AI tools to be used. For those who will allow AI, Quinn-Grzebyk suggested syllabus language making clear that if they are having difficulties with class materials, they should seek help from their instructors. Pineau noted that in their conversation with OTL, Whitehead's original position was that instructors should not prohibit AI

use. The committee disagreed, noting that some instructors and classes might appropriately use AI and others not. Pineau noted that for introductory courses such as basic math skills, instructors will likely want it to be clear that students need to learn how to solve a simple linear equation on their own. After discussion, Whitehead revised her stance to say that instructors who prohibit AI use should provide their rationale in doing so in the syllabus. The report recommended a different approach to allowing use of AI in undergraduate and graduate courses, but for both undergraduates and graduates, the syllabus language makes clear that students should talk with their instructor to clearly outline their plans for using an AI system.

Recommendation 6: This proposes that AI discussion take place at both new student and new faculty orientations. The Senate has about an hour to present at the new faculty orientation, so it can provide context for new faculty to have a conversation with students about academic integrity and why it is important; how to create a classroom environment conducive to learning; and provide some resources about AI for new faculty, including the suggested syllabus language, as well as framing for assignments. A committee concern regarding the framing for assignments was the lack of helpful items for instructors: one is the syllabus language related to AI. Those attending the OTL-sponsored faculty panel were looking for ideas on syllabus language, framing of assignments and talking to students about the ethical use of AI.

Beale noted her concern that Whitehead stated, while reasons for misconduct vary, she thinks creating lower-stakes assessments is key. Pineau replied that Whitehead repeated similar statements that we heard in respect of the academic integrity module. Roth asked what her reason was for opposing an instructor's prohibition on the use of AI. Pineau said her statement was that students will likely be exposed to AI and using it in their professions. Lewis suggested that AI is an amazing resource, but it is reasonable to have conditions under which students use AI and others under which they cannot, so that the decision is nuanced. She suggested, however, that having different conditions for undergraduates and graduates might not be appropriate: it would be better to leave it to instructor judgment with some models of the kind of guidance that might be provided. Policy members agreed. Pineau had originally preferred one model, but members of the committee felt it was necessary to separate graduate and undergraduate. Either way, instructors should be free to tailor the syllabus language to their needs.

For student orientation, the messaging should be limited since there is always substantial new information for students to remember. The most important message is that students with concerns should read the syllabus to understand the applicable policies in their class and talk to their faculty member if they have questions. The committee suggesting having a set of resources that are easily accessible to students with a QR code, since a challenge at Wayne State is the difficulty in locating information. The appropriate place to fit this into student orientation would require additional conversation, perhaps between the Student Affairs Committee and DOSO.

Other recommendations extend beyond the committee's charge. Recommendation seven is to continue the conversation, with AI remaining on standing committees' old business agenda for frequent updates. Recommendation eight deals with the need for instructor support, such as the syllabus language or detection software. Recommendation nine suggests certain university priorities, such as a Provost's Office start-of-term announcement via campus email at the beginning of every semester reminding instructors about the academic integrity module in the Canvas Commons available to download, as well as the other resources that exist such as the Student Code of Conduct, the syllabus template and CARE reports. AI detection remains elusive though C&IT is monitoring the available tools. They are not now very reliable. Beale asked what is known about the costs of AI detection software. Pineau assumed it is costly but did not have specific information. AI developers are allowing free use and acquiring data from that use, so they will also develop detection software and likely charge a hefty licensing fee for it.

Chavez reminded the committee that when Wikipedia came out, many people assumed it would damage academia, but now it is part of the regular routine. AI might develop similarly.

The committee drew attention to the use of AI in admissions and hiring. The literature suggests that people often input resumes into AI for critique or development of a cover letter. It is not clear how this should be handled by hiring committees or by committees assessing student writing samples for student admissions.

ChatGPT originally included no prompts, but now there are notices that information produced may be inaccurate. This raises a related privacy concern. The university community should be aware of the potential for inaccuracies and the privacy risks in using AI systems. Pineau noted an article discussing AI's response to a prompt that resulted in a list of several individuals with statements of false charges. According to that article, AI (or the owners of the AI) cannot be sued. What do we do if members of the university community get such output? Beale agreed this is a real concern. As we know, misinformation spreads rapidly through social media. Faculty must be alerted to this issue of providing data and the potential distortions and misuse of that data.

Beale thanked Pineau and the members of the committee. She requested this report be labeled preliminary to allow Policy to have further discussion. A resolution will likely have to wait to go to the Senate plenary for a vote in September, but the report can be shared with Senate members before then to invite comments on the recommendations and Policy can urge the administration to act on some of the suggestions, such as student orientation, immediately.

Noreen Rossi asked whether the professional schools that require personal statements are examining whether they are done by AI. Provost Kornbluh is not aware of such checks. He shared that he recently asked ChatGPT to write his biography and it produced an interesting result—both in what it said and what it got wrong. If this waits for the Senate to pass in September, he can share the committee's suggestions about orientation communications before the beginning of the semester.

II.   APPROVAL OF PC PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of April 10, 2023 were approved as revised.

III.   REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

VPR Search: President Wilson has asked that the search for the vice president for research move forward. The provost is meeting with the search consultants from Anthem Executive later this week and a finalized advertisement will be sent out. The prospectus will be revised to indicate that President Wilson is retiring, and the university will have a new president in place who will participate in this search.

IV.   REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Department of History Statement: In light of the social media controversy around Professor Bill Lynch's (CLAS) alleged transphobic tweets, the history department sent out a carefully worded statement of support for trans students that does not mention the professor. *The South End* had a rather inflammatory piece on it on Friday: Beale thinks they do not understand the free speech issue. Khosla reported there was a small demonstration at the undergraduate library Friday with about 50 people, a lot of swearing but nothing more. renée hoogland was troubled by the letters and supportive statements because there are also statements being sent out confusing the situation regarding Professor Steve Shaviro (CLAS). Danielle Aubert noted that Shaviro's statement was made the day before an event happened where a gender critical person who opposes trans people spoke and was shut down by trans activists. Shaviro's

statement came out the day before but was circulated the day after and was picked up by the anti-trans movement. The two incidents of Shaviro's statement and Lynch's statements have thus been connected in an awkward and weird way. hoogland agreed these discussions are distorted and do not reflect the situation accurately.

Building Coordinators: Beale pointed out that Pineau had mentioned the building coordinator problem as an aside about the difficulty finding needed campus information. This is an issue she discussed with Rob Davenport (AVP, FP&M) and the facilities people before: often faculty do not know who the building coordinators are in the different buildings. She wondered whether there is a simple way to make that information easier to find. Pineau's experience came from finding a STEM classroom door locked at the time for his class. It was evening and he could not find anyone who could assist: he had no idea who the building coordinator was. When he called the WSU police, they told him they do not unlock classroom doors anymore, but they finally agreed to come open the door. When he later checked with the Facilities personnel, he was told that Student Services was the building coordinator, though they may not be accessible in the late evening. He was also told that building coordinator information is posted all over the STEM building, so he toured the building with Facilities personnel to look for those postings. There were none in prominent places where people would look. Beale suspects this problem occurs frequently: when someone wants to report a problem, they do not know to whom to report.

Rossi pointed out that building coordinators are usually 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. people and are not available to assist if there is a problem for an evening class. Kornbluh explained this was a problem with both the STEM building and State Hall because there are no academic departments there. He chose to use the leadership in the Student Center, which manages a building that is open variable hours, to manage the spaces in those two buildings. State Hall will be "smarter" than the STEM building by having swipe cards rather than brass keys.

Aubert stated that she knows the building coordinator for 5057 Woodward: he did not even know he was the building coordinator. hoogland recalled that shortly before the pandemic she had left her keys in the bathroom on a Friday afternoon. When she went back to the building, the police arrived in minutes to help her retrieve her keys. There must be a way to get access to buildings after hours. Kornbluh explained that the police chief had apologized for the Pineau incident: it was not clear why the dispatcher responded that way. The response should be exactly as hoogland experienced—the police will come right away. WSU Police will also escort anyone to their car after dark. Beale noted that some time ago she had needed an escort from FAB to her car in the parking structure opposite the law school in the middle of the night when a severe thunderstorm hit: she was first told that the police no longer provided such escorts, but they relented when she pressed for assistance.

Graduate Enrollment: Beale had shared recent enrollment information with Policy members and noted that masters and PhDs continue to be down. She asked whether the provost thinks these graduate numbers will improve. Kornbluh explained the PhD enrollments may reflect more continuing students and less new students: there is no reason to believe PhD enrollments will be significantly different next year. Engineering still believes it is on track to bring in 300 more master's student next year. He expects Social Work to be up as well. The only area yet to turn enrollments around is Business.

Rossi pointed out that Medicine's master's enrollments have gone down considerably. The class she teaches now has 35 students: it used to be 110 students. Part of it is the BMS program now has competition with some of the local schools that put up their own. However, she was told by one of the instructors and one of the chairs that some of the undergraduates were counseled to apply elsewhere. Additionally, we do not market very well. We are pathetic about that in terms of going to the other colleges to market our programs.

<u>Member-at-large Election:</u> The Senate member-at-large election has concluded. hoogland (CLAS) and Rachel Pawlowski (Honors) were elected to three-year terms. The alternate is Tamara Bray (CLAS).

V.   <u>FIRST-YEAR SEMINAR PROPOSAL</u>

As a member of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), hoogland reported that a discussion had taken place last semester about the number of faculty struggling with getting students to a level where they need to be in order to begin doing the work for their classes, especially in terms of conceptualization, writing coherently, knowing what the difference is between stating something and formulating a claim with supporting evidence and analysis. This issue occurs across the board, not just in the English department. FAC concurred that it might be very useful to have a first-year seminar in reading, writing and critical thinking, as done at various other universities.

hoogland met with FAC members Patricia McCormick (CFPCA) and Elizabeth Stoycheff (CLAS) to draft a proposal. Although it should have gone to Policy first, hoogland was so excited that she sent it to the provost first. She thinks the proposal would be a great way to address the problems they have also discussed in relation to AI and cheating, because part of what students would learn in a course like this is that they do not learn from copying and pasting, buying essays online or letting AI do their work. They can learn about the joy of learning, which is central to a seminar like this. Students who test at an adequate level could opt out if they want to.

Jane Fitzgibbon was concerned that transfer students also have a lack of understanding of these topics. Simon thought it might depend on whether they were transferring from a four-year institution or from a community college. She explained a professor had reached out to her to check some of his students: he gives weekly quizzes with 10-to-15 true/false questions that one group of his students turn in after two minutes. Simon confirmed that most of these students were either freshmen or transfer first-semester students who were on probation after fall semester.

Aubert liked the proposal but questioned how it fits with the General Education requirements. hoogland responded this would be a new first-year requirement separate from the Gen Ed program that is partly a response to the failure of the Wayne Experience option. Beale suggested perhaps this could be a substitution for the currently suspended Wayne Experience course. Roth pointed out it would increase the credits for Gen Ed program from one to three credits. hoogland did not think it was a bad idea because there will be a 12 to 18 credit flat rate tuition. Aubert reminded that the number of total Gen Ed credits is critical. In graphic design, they are attentive to the number of credits they have to work with. She pointed out that the rigidity of the syllabus template is a similar problem: often these ideas originally make sense but get carried out with too much content. She wondered if there could be themes. hoogland explained FAC considered it important to have the structure of the syllabus in place for any version of the course, allowing faculty to choose whatever materials to teach within the context of the skills to be worked on for the first four weeks, gradually integrating reading, writing and critical thinking. You cannot force faculty to teach classes that they do not have expertise in and that they are not interested in teaching. This is a skill-oriented class. Reading, writing and critical thinking skills are valid across all disciplines and are useful and necessary across all disciplines. The basic structure of the class would be the same for every field because it is skill based, not content oriented. Aubert mentioned that she regularly receives emails from students in composition classes asking what writing genres graphic designers use (i.e., books or articles). Graphic designers do not use field-specific writing genres that are different from other fields, so it's a difficult question to answer. This is an example where the instructor is trying to teach skills, but it morphs into something different. hoogland pointed to the description. To read with comprehension is the first requirement. Then writing would come into that, but they could do annotations, for instance, and then gradually begin to also analyze things once they acquire more critical thinking skills. In the final four weeks, all of that will come together.

Beale thought it might help to have a week-by-week syllabus available. She would like to see what that would look like. For example, academic integrity is an important module, and students need to learn how to study and take notes. Would that be part of this? If she were a professor trying to determine what she was expected to cover, she may have some uncertainty about what that central syllabus looks like and whether, for example, the first week she would want to do an academic integrity module. hoogland explained the syllabus has not been developed yet. This is just a proposal for the class. She agreed the syllabus will require hard work and input from different directions in order to make it work for everybody, but the overall framework is clear.

Lewis agreed every student should have to take this first-year seminar. Because it is not currently required, the question is whether there is a way to treat it as one of the current Gen Ed courses rather than a different one that has to go through the Gen Ed approval processes. This is what our Gen Ed courses ought to be like. Can it be pitched as fulfilling an existing Gen Ed requirement? hoogland responded she did not know what the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) would think about that. She does not care how that is resolved, but thinks it will compensate for the failed Wayne Experience course.

hoogland asked whether the seminar must be approved as a new part of the Gen Ed program or may in some way serve as a replacement/substitute for the Wayne Experience course. Beale noted it cannot be a replacement because it is more credits, which would apparently require a Gen Ed modification. Kornbluh understood the concerns here: how to get this to work within the undergraduate majors without overburdening the majors with too many credits. In honesty, he does not have at this point enough of a command of the details of the Gen Ed curriculum to answer the question. Policy could agree that this is a good proposal and try to refine it to make it work in the requirements in way that does not increase the burden to graduates with majors. It probably makes sense to look at the Gen Ed curriculum to see if that is possible. Lewis suggested it might be treated as a substitute for the intermediate composition requirement. hoogland disagreed, noting that it is not a composition class: that would likely be confusing to students because those 1010 classes are very different.

Simon thinks this should go forward if a way can be found to do it. She has fielded multiple faculty complaints about students not being able to do college-level work. If we offer it, we have to offer enough seats for all students to take it in their first year. That was one of the problems with Wayne Experience and has also been a problem with English 1010. A student who cannot write and cannot get into English 1010 (the remedial class) will not successfully write a term paper for the Gen Ed requirement—it is a domino effect.

hoogland explained there would need to be a coordinating faculty member who should be adequately compensated for the work, as well as multiple faculty members who opt for teaching the seminar from different departments. Rossi recommended it be emphasized to the faculty who do this that it is the skills, not the particular discipline, that they are using as a framework. hoogland agreed: the coordinating faculty member should be someone who is well versed in teaching reading, writing and critical thinking skills as such. The faculty who teach it will be supported and given feedback by that coordinating faculty member. That is a big task for that faculty member, so they must be compensated.

Roth definitely sees the need for this. The challenge is to figure out how to staff it. Having been the Curriculum and Instruction Committee chair during Gen Ed reform, he believes it will be extraordinarily difficult to renegotiate that. It was an armistice. Aubert also supports this initiative. In terms of moving it forward, finding a person to serve as faculty coordinator is essential. It should be someone who has a vision for how this should be carried out, but not all faculty have the required skills. Khosla pointed out that GEOC meets on Friday. He is on the committee and could get some input from them. Beale

suggested waiting to do that: the way Gen Ed works is problematic here, so Policy should have a firmer view of how to work with it before bringing it to the GEOC.

Lewis pointed out that adding a requirement to the curriculum is a significant obstacle. That is why she suggested that calling it a composition course that could substitute for other composition courses already in the Gen Ed requirements might be a way to include it. Beale thought that adding a new course that could fulfill the composition requirement would likely itself be treated as a change to the Gen Ed requirements: that is why Policy needs to develop a full strategy before taking it to GEOC.

hoogland will talk to Darin Ellis (AVP) and report back to Policy. In the meantime, she will review the documentation on the Gen Ed website to consider possibilities.

VI.   CENTER FOR EMERGING AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES (CEID) CHARTER REQUEST

Beale discussed the responses to Policy's questions about the Center for Infectious for Emerging and Infectious Diseases (CEID) charter request and noted a few items of concern. The response noted that no additional MOUs are needed because the existing curriculum continues to use the existing MOUs. She questioned how that is a center activity rather than a School of Medicine activity. The response reported a single new contract for $300,000, along with the expectation to have more contracts rather than MOUs. A detailed budget with revenues and expenses was not provided; instead, a projection of steadily increasing revenues from testing and a list of potential grants for which faculty associated with the center may apply was included. The Lande building is operated by the university, so that is a facility cost that is part of their budget, even though there is a statement that some renovations apparently will be done under their Sapphire grant. Beale reported that Wael Sakr (Dean, Medicine) told her that this budget had the input of Thane Petersen (Vice Dean, Medicine). Additionally, there was no statement about the facilities cost that the university provides. Beale noted further that if they were just a college center, there should be a letter of support from the appropriate college faculty committee, but they have not provided such a letter of support from Medicine's Faculty Senate Executive Committee. College centers are generally not cross-disciplinary; however, Paul Kilgore's appointment as associate professor is in the School of Pharmacy, not in the School of Medicine, and he is central to their planned vaccine activities. Marcus Zervos is an administrator at Henry Ford, with only a small fractional-time appointment in Medicine as assistant dean of WSU Global Affairs. In conclusion, Beale noted that the application still seems incomplete and that it should be chartered under the CIAC-I provisions rather than as a college center.

Rossi recommend that the CEID faculty should talk to Larry Grossman, head of the Center for Molecular Medicine and Genetics. That is a real center and perhaps he can give them some pointers on how to write the document. Kornbluh suggested Beale talk to VP Research Tim Stemmler about this problem. Under our rules, this center should fall under OVPR. Beale agreed to reach out to Stemmler to discuss how to ensure this center gets underway appropriately.

VII.   DRAFT AGENDA FOR MAY 3 SENATE PLENARY

Beale reported that the May plenary agenda appears finalized. Mark Gaffney (BOG) has agreed to provide an update on the presidential search.

VIII.   REPORTS FROM STANDING COMMITTEE LIAISONS

SAC re transcript holds. Simon reported that the SAC met last week to discuss the transcript hold memo from CIC and passed it unanimously. She spoke with Rob Thompson (CIO), who did not realize that the undergraduate and graduate transcripts were linked. He agreed to contact Ellucian (the company that runs Banner) to see if they can unlink them. She also inquired with Kurt Kruschinska (Sr. Dir., Registrar) to

see if there is a policy in place to release a transcript if a student needs it for employment. He confirmed there was such a policy at one time, but now a student must agree to a payment plan and be up to date before the university will send a transcript to their employer. Simon pointed out the bachelor's degree was earned without debt to the university. Kruschinska is in favor of releasing the transcript and made a proposal to Pat Beirne (Dir., Bursar), and he is waiting for the counterproposal. Simon then called Beirne and got him to say he would release the transcript to the student in this particular case.

Roth suggested that perhaps the Office of General Counsel should be contacted: this is indefensible. It is bad enough if we are talking about holding the transcript hostage for a degree that has not been paid for, but it is completely inappropriate to hold hostage something that has been paid for simply because something else has not been. He does not think that is legal. Lewis noted this student has missed two job interviews. Additionally, Moss informed CIC that this policy is being rescinded nationwide. Beale would like to know if FAC wants to sign on to the transcript hold memo and requested hoogland talk to Stoycheff about running that by the FAC via email.

FAC re SET responses. hoogland reported that FAC met last week, and Laura Woodward (Dir., Testing and Assessment) gave a presentation on the low SET response rates and teaching assessment.

RESEARCH re IRBs. Rossi reported that the Research Committee (RES) will meet on April 26 and has invited James Wurm (Sr. Dir., Academic Research Tech) to talk about computer policies. The issues with IRBs, especially expedited IRB protocols, have not been resolved so she has also asked Monica Malian (Director, HRPP) and Amanda Jointer (IRB Operations Manager) to return. Rick Zimmerman (Assoc. Dean for Research, Nursing) also raised several issues about expedited IRBs that need to be done. She has met with Philip Cunningham (AVP, VPR) and Stemmler to discuss how both companies (for the IACUC eProtocol, as well as the IRB protocols) are unresponsive in terms of changing their software. She cannot speak for the IRB on how quickly they put the request in because she does not have data on them. However, IACUC does put it in, and it has been very slow: they are considering moving to a different company because of it. It is disappointing that things can change only once a year when the amount of money that we pay for this service is substantial and it delays our ability to move on with clinical trials, student research and people getting their degrees because they cannot proceed. There are expedited IRBs that are not expeditious. That is the whole problem.

Beale asked whether the delays in IRB decisions are due to software or people delays. Rossi believes it is both. The people are pointing to the software, but there are also simply delays from failure to move things forward. Lewis agreed it is people. She has learned that you cannot just send forms off and think that they will get processed: you actually have to keep on them.

IACUC recently gave Rossi a comment on the last round suggesting she do two unnecessary steps, and they did not approve it. She took a screenshot of the message and shared it with Elaine Joseph (Assoc. Dir., Responsible Conduct of Research), who is running the IACUC, because the accrediting agency wants to know if there are inordinate delays and inappropriate denials. This was considered an inappropriate response by a reviewer. There should be a parallel for IRB so she will discuss that with Cunningham and Stemmler. She will include in the RES final report that this has not been resolved though it was the first thing on the agenda for this year. Beale offered to write a memo from Policy if it would be helpful.

Ad hoc DEI Committee and Bylaws Amendments. Roth reported there were three members of Policy at the ad hoc DEI Committee meeting last week. Most significant was the concern expressed that they are still in limbo because it has not been established as a standing committee because we have not moved forward with the bylaw changes. Of course, there is also some question as to whether we need to increase the size of the Senate in order to make it viable to do this.

Beale had expected to make the multiple changes to the bylaws needed to include this during the summer. Although there are other revisions that need to be made, including enlarging the Senate representation, she noted that we could put just the creation of the standing DEI committee on the May plenary agenda. Kornbluh added that the DEI Council, led by co-chair Monica Brockmeyer, has put together a proposal to be an official body advisory to the president. This was discussed in Cabinet and there was also discussion of the Senate DEI Committee. He recommended the Senate deal with establishing it sooner rather than later. Roth represents the Senate on the DEI Executive Committee and had asked Brockmeyer whether the document was ready to be shared with the Policy Committee, and she indicated that she would let him know when it was. He is not sure where that stands, but the DEI Council meets this week.

CIC Template Suggestions. Lewis reported the CIC is having their final meeting this week and an unofficial meeting in May, because there are people who feel like they have not gone through everything. The main goal this week is to finish a list of suggestions about improving the syllabus templates that are used all over campus. She anticipates being ready to share that report out from CIC for decision regarding next steps.

Approved as revised at the Policy Committee meeting of April 24, 2023.