WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
October 2, 2023

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

Guests: Boris Baltes, Sr. Assoc. Provost, Faculty Affairs; Darin Ellis, AVP, Academic Affairs; Kelly Dormer, Assoc. Dir., Academic Affairs

I.   APPROVAL OF POLICY PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of the September 25, 2023 Policy Committee were approved as revised.

II.   REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Vice President for Research search: The VPR search is underway, and the search committee will be choosing airport interviewees this week.

Big data AI committee: Interim VPR Tim Stemmler sent out a notice about the creation of a big data AI committee. The Senate's ad hoc AI committee will continue their work. Linda Beale plans to meet with Stemmler to talk about the new committee. Provost Kornbluh added that this committee will focus on linking faculty doing AI/big data research, which is a different concern than addressed by the Senate AI committee.

Reassignment of standing committee appointments: Beale reported the need to move two Senate faculty members originally assigned to the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) to the DEI Committee (DEI) because it was the only committee meeting on a Friday, and they had clinical schedules that conflicted with the Wednesday times that the FAC was meeting. Policy agreed Beale should ask for volunteers to move from DEI to FAC.

Policy representative on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council: Steve Chrisomalis agreed to replace Brad Roth as the Policy Committee representative to the university's DEI Council for the 2024 winter and fall terms.

III.   REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Pay increase for non-represented employees: A notice went out about starting this year's process for pay increases for non-represented employees, many of whom are lower paid researchers. There is a 3% pool of funds available, and the goal is to complete this process so the increase will be realized in the December paycheck. Represented pay raises went into the August paycheck.

Board of Governors meeting: The president led her first Board of Governors meeting, held in McGregor. The administration will suggest future meetings return to the Student Center because it is larger and a more COVID-friendly environment.

University Towers: Kornbluh reported the administration is developing a two-year plan to return to full dorm occupancy. We likely will move most undergraduates away from University Towers in year one, converting two of the four undergraduate floors to graduate floors, then move to full graduate and professional occupancy in the following year. Placing freshmen and sophomores far from central campus is not ideal, nor is having freshman football players reside far away from

food areas. The professional schools believe there is a greater need for professional student housing, and this is the right place for those students.

Student Code of Conduct: Kornbluh has asked David Strauss (Dean of Students) to begin a process of looking at the Student Code of Conduct, which will come back to Policy for input, with the goal of ensuring we are appropriately protecting students from other students. Our current processes do not provide much protection to students and staff who feel they are victimized. For example, requiring disclosure of a complainant's name and confrontation between a complainant and the person(s) accused can be problematic. Strauss will compare our current Student Code of Conduct to other schools and come to Policy with some suggested revisions. Roth will work with Strauss on this project.

IV.   POTENTIAL SENATE PLENARY TOPICS

As Policy thinks about topics for plenary, Beale shared a potential list of topics suggested by various committees or interested parties. CIO Rob Thompson and the Internet Systems Management Committee discussed the new UROP portal, which is changing from UROPConnect to ForagerOne, though it likely cannot be ready until the December plenary, when it can be presented as an interactive demonstration where Senate members use phones or computers to try it out. The November plenary will likely include the medical withdrawal resolution discussed at this meeting. At either the November or December plenary, the Provost (or Committee Chair Rick Bierschbach) should likely lead a discussion of the issues and recommendations in the Provost's Ph.D. Committee report.

Another topic the Senate needs to address regarding opportunity for input is the updating and prioritization of facilities planning, from the most recent master plan. This should likely be organized for the November plenary with Davenport and CFO Dave Massaron, to ensure an early opportunity for Senate comments on priorities and areas of neglect. The university must schedule its deferred maintenance projects, and much of that has been coming to the Senate Budget Committee already decided and not allowing much opportunity for input. Kornbluh noted a consultant has been hired: the expectation is to hold various meetings with campus stakeholders. The consultant could facilitate the discussion about this at the November plenary. There is going to be a process over the next six months that will involve meetings with Student Senate and open forums. The goal is to get this done this academic year.

Chrisomalis suggested discussing plenary topics at the next Policy meeting, after ideas are generated from the October plenary discussion. Beale agreed regarding that discussion, but she would also like to hear from Policy and committee chairs about items that need to come to the agenda. Topics like the facility planning discussion must be arranged ahead of time.

Beale added that it is important for Senate members to be familiar with the deans and the VPs. Last year, Policy hoped to have Dean Ali Abolmaali (Engineering) speak but we could not finalize a schedule. Denise Taliaferro Baszile, the new dean of the College of Education, would be a dynamic person to invite at some point. Policy members suggested inviting Dean Abolmaali this fall but waiting until spring to invite Dean Baszile.

V.   REVISION OF MEDICAL WITHDRAWAL POLICY

Naida Simon, Ellis and Dormer discussed proposed revisions to the medical withdrawal policy.

Simon explained the current policy allows students to either withdraw from all or from no courses. The proposed changes allow a student with documentation from a licensed health care professional supporting their condition to drop some or all classes. Also, we have had a tiered

system of refunds: if a student gets sick within the first 10 weeks, they would receive a 100% refund; in weeks 11 and 12, a 60% refund; in week 13, no refund. A student would then come to the Tuition and Fees Appeals Board (TFAB) and petition for a full refund: that refund is always granted. Medical withdrawal cases are typically used for severe emotional and mental issues or cancer treatment. The updated medical withdrawal is reviewed by committee and, if approved, provides a 100% refund. The proposal builds in timeframes for committee responses.

The Policy Committee made several suggestions for improvement, including adding the word "preferably" before "with a clinical experience background" for the Senate appointee and changing the word "should" to "must" regarding the inclusion of medical documentation or explanation. Committee members did not believe the deciding committee needed to include a financial aid person but suggested instead that there be a process to ensure that a student is informed about the impact of medical withdrawal on financial aid.

Dormer will include Policy's recommendations in an updated version. As an educational policy change, Beale suggested this will need to be put in the form of a resolution that comes before the November plenary for discussion and vote.

Kornbluh thanked Ellis, Dormer and Simon for working on this policy: it is an important, student-friendly reform.

VI.   FOREIGN INFLUENCE AND CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT POLICY DRAFT2

Roth included his comments on the draft shared with Policy. The difficulty is not really a wordsmithing question, rather a question of the nature of the "foreign relationships" that is targeted. The language inserted in the revisions beginning "for avoidance of doubt" is not really an avoidance of doubt problem, because there is no clear definition of the kinds of foreign relationships that are at issue. The word "personal" could perhaps be replaced with the word "collegial", except that may not be sufficient to reach the issues desired to be disclosed. The problem is that if you are an active researcher or involved with many people at one level or another internationally, it would be burdensome and difficult to disclose every single one of those relationships. Roth's concern is that if it is too open ended, then a faculty member can get called out later for having failed to disclose things that were not anticipated as needing to be disclosed. "Professional relationship" is murky.

Kornbluh explained that disclosure is needed primarily where there is more than a de minimis amount of money involved in a foreign relationship. There can be an exception for an honorarium under a certain amount. But there are people who take a joint appointment at another university, raising a question of whether intellectual property is flowing into the other university. None of the issues that must be disclosed are necessarily illegal, but disclosure protects our faculty from raising governmental concerns.

Beale suggested adding after "between a research and a foreign person or entity" and before the defined term "Foreign Relationship" an exception stated as ", other than a professional or collegial relationship involving research collaboration or symposia/conference presentations or other activities with honoraria or payments of no more than $2000, as well as mere personal relationship". She will send a revised paragraph with this language to VPR Stemmler and Provost Kornbluh.

VII.   MPSI AND CMMG POLICY MEMOS

Beale shared Policy's drafts of the Merrill Palmer Skillman Institute (MPSI) and the Center for Molecular Medicine and Genetics (CMMG) memos with Stemmler, who reported the MPSI

memo captured the key items he would comment on as well. He noted that his CMMG memo will include more specificity about the interdisciplinarity that is needed as well as the importance of hiring to fill the existing gaps in expertise.

Policy members agreed the broader language used in the CMMG memo about a major center grant would be appropriate to use in the MPSI memo as well. Beale will include "other center-focused significant grants" and send the memos out.

VIII.   BRAIN INSTITUTE REVISED CHARTER REQUEST

Beale believes the third version of the charter request addresses the issues. Institute director David Rosenberg will provide Policy with a job description of the co-director roles and the internal director roles. Policy agreed to a memo approving the charter request, assuming those job descriptions are received.

IX.   3N COMMITTEE TENURE-TRACK AND PROMOTION FACTORS RECOMMENDATION

Baltes shared with Policy a summary of written changes as well as the Word version of the 3N factors document that included recommendations from the 3N committee's subgroups. Overarching changes included incorporating gender-neutral pronouns throughout, consistency on the use of scholarship and/or creative activities and information on biases that can occur in SET evaluations. Language was also changed to accommodate the current practice of non-tenure-track external evaluators writing letters for non-tenure-track faculty requesting promotion. The 3N committee first did benchmarking by looking at factors from 21 other universities that had been updated more recently.

Policy members discussed three key concerns. The first was whether at least one external letter should be from a tenured faculty member for all appointments. The second was the redundant repetition of a similar sentence about evidence of DEI support in *every* place that the three factors were mentioned throughout the document, rather just in the places where there was discussion of the kinds of evidence that could be considered. Policy's suggestion was that the sentence be added only in Part III discussing evidence the candidate could including in the application and in Part V discussing evidence that could be provided to show that the candidate satisfies the standard of excellence. The wording for the DEI sentences should also be tweaked to take out the terms "support for" or "embodiment of" and make clear that it is allowing evidence of the applicant's DEI activities. The third was a suggestion to move the paragraph discussing school/college procedures currently included in Part II to the introduction, since that is where the collective bargaining agreement is mentioned as providing key information and a fitting place to mention departmental and school/college requirements that candidates and committees should be aware of prior to coming to the university-level committee. Beale will provide a summary of Policy's recommendations to Baltes after the meeting.

Beale also noted the document is not well organized to make it easy for someone who is coming in and thinking about tenure to understand what their responsibilities are and how it works: hopefully at some point, all of these factor documents will be rewritten to remove disorganization, redundancies and lack of clarity. Kornbluh appreciated that the 3N committee worked to add three valuable points to a convoluted and confusing document. He would support Policy putting together another committee to rewrite a more articulate version of this factors document. In the meantime, adding in these three areas of collaborative scholarship, community-focused scholarship and DEI work, and getting the gender pronouns out is a good step forward.

X.   NEW BUSINESS

Chrisomalis asked if there was an update on the grade appeal process. Beale explained that the topic now goes to the CIC and FAC for further discussion and recommendations back to us for taking to an appropriate plenary session for final approval.

Kornbluh is drafting a report on grades that were overturned last year. There were only four: two in engineering, for which the required explanation was provided, and two in education, for which no explanation was provided. He sent the education report back for an explanation and hopes to have the final report to share with Policy shortly.

Approved as revised at the Policy Committee meeting of October 9, 2023.