

Wayne State University Academic Senate
Curriculum and Instruction Committee
October 24, 2018 – Meeting Minutes

Present: Brad Roth (Chair), Jeffrey Grynawski, Victoria Dallas, Thomas Fischer, Jane Fitzgibbon, Robert Ackerman, Robert Harr, Richard Pineau (Secretary), Michele Porter, Yang Zhao

Liaisons: Paul Beavers (Policy Committee) & Nancy Welter (UPTF)

Absent with Notice: Juliann Binienda, Thomas Killion, Darin Ellis (Administration), & Abraham Hussein (Student Senate)

Absent without Notice: Donna Kashian, Meghan Courtney (AAUP-AFT)

Guests: Gina S. Shreve, Ben Mejabi, (both from College of Engineering) & Jodi Young (General Manager of the Wayne State Barnes & Noble Bookstore)

The meeting began at 1:33 pm.

- I. Appointment of Session Secretary was made with Richard Pineau agreeing to record this meeting's minutes.
- II. The September 19th Meeting Minutes were discussed. There were corrections to the typo of the letters in item 2 and to the correct spelling of Jane's name in item #5. Yang Zhao made a motion to accept the minutes with these changes, which was seconded by Robert Ackerman. The motion passed.
- III. The Committee next heard a presentation made by Associate Professors Gina S. Shreve and Ben Mejabi from the College of Engineering on Academic Dishonesty. Yang introduced his colleagues and reminded the group of the discussion that was held last academic year. He explained that both Gina and Ben have been at WSU for at least 25 years and have all worked to curb cheating in their classes. In the College of Engineering, there are a lot of electronic exams that are used and cheating is a concern.

Ben began the presentation with an explanation of the context which cheating occurs. He cautioned that there was not a lot of data-driven research on cheating and that most of what he has to support his case is anecdotal evidence. He discussed how grade inflation has been the culprit behind why students cheat. The basis is a *customer service* model of education where students pay money for their education and then they get their degree. Students want higher grades, regardless of cost. He felt that the major factor in cheating is the culture set by administrators and teachers for academic integrity. Students feel there is the expectation for easily earning a passing grade and if they feel this is not going to happen, they resort to cheating.

Robert Ackerman asked who overrides faculty decisions in the event a failing grade is assigned. Ben explained that the administration which ranges from the Department Chair to that college or school's

Dean. At least this is the case in the College of Engineering. If a student appeals their grade, then the college becomes involved in the process.

Gina presented two cases of cheating that she has had to deal with over the academic year 2015-2017. The first occurred in a freshmen class, BE 1200, where a GTA caught students plagiarizing an assignment. The second case was when a GTA was telling her stories about how students in a graduate-level course was cheating. The students were caught by the instructor who did not file a report but instead allowed the students to complete a “do-over” assignment. The GTA was angry about this outcome.

Gina was curious as to the statistics related to cheating that DOSO encounters term-to-term. How many cases? How rampant? And what were the outcomes, in the aggregate?

Tom asked for clarification on the process with DOSO involving the final outcome for students when a report is filed. Gina explained that possibly due to FERPA Rules, instructors are not privy to this information.

Robert Ackerman asked what types of students are cheating? That is, are they high achieving students? Low achieving students? Student athletes? Who are they? Yang found in his experience that most borderline students cheated in his classes.

Ben presented a case of cheating which occurred in his IE 4420 course over the winter 2018 term. In his class of 22, he found that 12 students were cheating in two distinct clusters. He used a fingerprint algorithm which showed that cheating had occurred on the assignment. His stated syllabus policy was a failing grade. He followed the DOSO policy for reporting the incident and received a follow-up call from a DOSO official who helped him craft the due-process letter for the students. Sometime later, Ben was summoned by his Department Chair and in what he described as a hostile meeting, was berated for not being in his office during office hours which was the motive to why the students cheated. Ben pointed out that on the same day, there was a graduation ceremony for the students in the college, a number of whom were in Ben’s class and were caught cheating. A committee was formed to investigate this and Ben was not allowed to present his evidence nor his case. He wrote the Dean who responded but backed the Department Chair. Ben also noted that the Department Chair demanded his grade spreadsheet and manually changed the students’ grades. Ben would like to see some appeal process for faculty.

The recommendations that Ben and Gina have are as follows:

1. There needs to be updates to the due process procedures. In particular, more balance for all parties involved.
2. DOSO should publish statistics related to the number of cases of cheating reported and their outcomes, in aggregate.
3. A forum dedicated to best practices should be held to raise awareness, share strategies to combat cheating, and to dialogue about challenges.
4. A campus-wide study should be conducted on cheating and the factors contributing to cheating.

Several members had questions:

Vicky asked why the Dean and Chair did not want to investigate in Ben’s situation. Ben said that he felt it was a numbers game for graduation.

Robert Ackerman asked what rights exist for giving failing grades for cheating. Ben said that student can fail the class, but there could be other implication or consequences depending the case. Nancy commented that students can appeal the grade as well which can complicate matters.

Brad pointed out that there is a process for disciplinary action through DOSO and the Department Chair serves as a witness when the due process information is given to the student. Ben pointed out that his Chair was involved because he served as the Student Conduct Officer.

Gina and Ben left the meeting.

- IV. The Committee had a presentation by Jeff Grynawski and Jodi Young, General Manager of the Barnes & Noble Bookstore on campus. Jeff reminded the committee that many students do not have their materials, namely their textbooks, by the first day of class. This presents a number of challenges to both the student and the faculty member.

Jodi presented on the First Day Textbook idea. The motive behind this initiative is affordability and accessibility. In a study, it was reported that 58% of students do not have their materials for the first day of class. Among that group, 28% cannot afford to purchase their materials. Consequently, faculty have to wait 7-14 days to really get into the class while students delay getting their materials (for a number of reasons such as financial aid, affordability, etc.).

This idea behind the program is to offer textbooks online below market value, as required by the Department of Education. Access to the materials is given through Canvas which is very easy to do for both the faculty and students. As required by the Dept. of Education, students have to be given an *opt-out* option. Richard asked who chooses to opt-out with such a reduced price. Jodi said that 0.03% opt-out. The cost for the course materials (i.e. textbook, integrated content, etc.) is included as a separate fee that students pay with their tuition.

Jane raised the concern that any fee assessment must go through the Board of Governors (BOG). Jodi agreed and said that meetings pertaining to this project have been well underway with a number of administrators already on board. Whether the program is piloted will be up to the Provost and the President.

Robert Ackerman questioned why Barnes and Noble (B&N) would want to even entertain this program as they would lose money. Jodi said that B&N is a content deliverer and the shift that many publishers would move to under this model would be centered on print on demand services. As a result, there is an evolutionary process to work together: the bookstore, the publishers, & WSU.

In terms of implementation, there are not many barriers. The new scheduling site uses Banner 9 which clearly explains fees to students. Vicky asked if this would be easier for financial aid. Jodi said that this would not impact financial aid. It would directly impact the Bursar's Office in the event a student decides to opt-out as a refund would need to be issued to the student.

Brad cautioned that there would be a need to check with the State Legislature and the Department of Education regarding fee versus tuition charges for such a service. Vicky asked whether a student who

drops within the first 2 weeks would see a refund of this fee. Jodi said that students have through the census date to opt-out and refunds are issued for students who drop before then, just like it is with any other course.

Jodi discussed the importance of having a pilot of this program and that the President could choose to implement it with or without the BOG approval (depends on his decision to consult the BOG). Jane offered her enthusiasm to be a part of the pilot. Jodi said that she would run as many as needed but wanted two distinct groups: one with just an eBook, and the other with some sort of publisher integrated content (e.g. MyMathLab).

Tom asked if the bookstore would still receive printed textbooks. Jodi said that yes, print textbooks would still be available for those students who wanted them and they would be at reduced cost. Tom also asked whether the publishers listed on the slide were exclusive to the program. Jodi responded that the list was only the larger publishers B&N works with. She is working to get others involved and can do so through a “local agreement”.

Nancy asked how long students have access to the materials. Jodi said that it would depend on the course. Some could be applied to multiple terms if the course used the same textbook (such as with Calculus or a language).

Brad asked if both looseleaf copies of the text for \$25 and the online access to materials would be available. Jodi said yes, and the print copies would be offered by the publisher. He also asked if students could print from the eBook. Jodi said that publisher printing rules would have to be followed and they are very restrictive. Jodi pointed out that student savings average around 40% with purchasing the online materials and the actual textbook. Brad asked if Jodi could forward more information for other people who may want to learn more about this. Jodi said she would be happy to do so.

Vicky asked if the committee could see a cost comparison of books with current prices and the prices under the program’s rules. Jodi said she would work on that.

Jodi left the meeting.

V. In the matters arising discussion, Brad pointed out there would be a lot to discuss at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:18 pm.

Next meeting: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 at 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by: Richard Pineau, Senior Lecturer, Mathematics