

Wayne State University Academic Senate  
Curriculum and Instruction Committee  
October 23, 2019 – Meeting Minutes

Present: Brad Roth (Chair), Kelly Dormer, Peter Henning, Thomas Fischer, Sandra Oliver-McNeil, Richard Pineau (Secretary), Stella Resko, Yang Zhao, Ali Salamey.

Liaisons: Paul Beavers (Policy Committee), Darin Ellis (Administration), Basel Berry (Student Senate), Pramod Khosla (AAUP-AFT)

Absent with Notice: Juliann Binienda, Robert Harr, Manoj Kulchania

Absent without Notice: Frank Koscieski (UPTF), Elizabeth Drake (GEOC)

Guests: (Attended the joint meeting at 2 pm with the Faculty Affairs Committee) Boris Baltes, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs; David Strauss, Dean of Students; Nikolina Camaj, Conduct Officer, Dean of Students Office

---

The meeting began at 1:34 pm.

- I. Appointment of *Ad Hoc* Recording Secretary was made with Richard Pineau agreeing to record this meeting's minutes in the absence of Juliann Binienda.
- II. The September 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes were discussed. Yang Zhao made a motion to accept the minutes, which was seconded by Stella Resko. The motion passed. Brad asked for one amendment namely part V, #1; Paul Beavers rather than Stella Resko was a volunteer for Darin's committee. A correction to Tom Fischer's name was also made on part III, item 3.5.
- III. The Committee discussed the charge presented by the Policy Committee. Brad suggested prioritizing the list of items. In particular, item #5 proposed by the Student Senate still requires careful thought. The cheating issue still remains a problem. Richard raised an issue with Barnes and Noble and their promoting a program for students called bartleby.com. The motive is to get students to buy a subscription for an *answers on demand* service. The Provost was shown the advertisement at the Policy Committee Meeting this week. The next steps to be taken will be discussed.

Suggestions were taken from the committee on what our next project(s) should be. Yang commented that cheating still needs to be discussed in the context of technical needs and workload changes required to enforce such changes. This could mean hiring extra proctors or assistants to help monitor during test taking. Brad noted the expense, intrusiveness, and other challenges associated with additional precautions.

Richard raised the concern about what message is being sent to students with advertisements like bartleby.com, especially if such advertisements are placed on books. Sandra raised the concern about maintaining the importance of integrity in our courses. Concerns were raised about the bookstore's use of the WSU student listserv to send such advertisements.

Brad suggested inviting a bookstore representative to talk about these concerns. Ali suggested inviting the WSU administrator responsible for contracts, etc. to also talk with the committee about this relationship with the bookstore.

Basel suggested that students will find ways to cheat. To combat cheating on exams, he suggested having students placing their personal items at the front of the room and then take the exam. For online assignments, he suggested having instructors write questions and post on Canvas. This may result in less cheating. Sandra commented that this feels like treating everyone like a criminal and this is undesirable. She urged that we need to better educate our students on what cheating is. Tom added that he did not know what bartleby was and looking on the website he is surprised at what is offered for students. Yang brought up Chegg.com and their 24/7 support for projects and assignments.

IV. Committee Chair, Brad Roth provided updates on a number of projects.

Pramod will present at the next meeting about the 3N committee. Brad will also discuss the UROP at some point. Things are in limbo as a committee was also formed in parallel with the Senate's UROP committee, by Senior Associate Provost Monica Brockmeyer. How both committees are to work in sync is to be determined.

V. The Curriculum & Instruction Committee (CIC) joined the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) for a meeting to discuss grade appeals, and appeals from downgrades for academic dishonesty. In addition to both committees, the following guests were in attendance: Boris Baltes, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs; David Strauss, Dean of Students; Nikolina Camaj, Conduct Officer, Dean of Students Office (DOSO).

FAC Chair renée hoogland welcomed members of the CIC to the joint session. Both committees had been working on this project and felt it necessary to meet together to discuss them. renée said that it was not clear where faculty stand in the grade appeal process and referenced the presentation by Dr. Mejabi. She also cited the work the CIC is doing on the electronic cheating issue and acknowledged that it remains a concern by many faculty.

CIC Chair Brad Roth pointed out there are two pathways for reporting academic misconduct and what remains to be fully elaborated is faculty's role in the appeal process.

At this point, Dean Strauss provided an overview of how academic misconduct is reported. He began by pointing out that the Student Code of Conduct was last revised in 2006. There was one amendment in 2017 which stated that students could not use course work from a previous class without the consent of their instructor. In terms of the reporting process for academic misconduct, Section 10.1 of the Code was tedious for an instructor to follow. DOSO has acquired a conduct management system called Maxient which allows for easier reporting on the part of the faculty member but also a connection with Banner so that such reports are kept in a student's file. This also includes the Wayne CARE reports. It is noted that some instructors handle academic misconduct without following the Code of Conduct and this presents a number of problems.

In terms of reporting, under section 10.1A's guidelines, a faculty member may issue a sanction up to a failing grade in a class for a student who is caught cheating. Students are afforded due process and are provided with a formal letter letting the student(s) know they have been accused of cheating and what

their rights are. Under section 10.1B, a formal charge is made against a student which then appears on their official record. A section 10.1A charge is not formally reported. Students are able to appeal a 10.1B charge and which can involve the Dean of the school or college, or his/her designee. DOSO does not rule on academic misconduct issues but rather handles the initial investigation (which includes interviewing both parties, obtaining any evidence, etc.).

Pramod asked if any statistics are available on section 10.1B charges. Dean Strauss indicated he did not have specific numbers but the most issues surrounding this charge involves master's theses and doctoral dissertations.

The FAC Student Senate member asked if students could appeal a section 10.1B charge. Dean Strauss said this was possible and involves a panel.

Amanda asked how we are educating students on cheating. Dean Strauss said that there is no comprehensive training for students. He thought it may be a good idea to include it as part of the Wayne Experience First Year Seminar class. There still remains the question of how to educate our transfer students. renée added that many departments handle such matters internally, such as with the Department of English. Dean Strauss made it clear that we have to be quick, punitive, and hard with our handling of cheating so that students know we are taking it seriously.

renée referenced Dr. Mejabi's presentation and the concern that the instructor was not allowed to explain himself and details pertaining to the case he was involved in. The Chair had acted as the Student Conduct Officer. Dean Strauss pointed out that this was a misnomer -- there is only one Student Conduct Officer -- but that the Chair can investigate matters how they see fit. No formal process exists for faculty to appeal and the Chair can refuse faculty input. To help remedy this, individual schools and colleges or even departments could come up with policies that give faculty more of a role in the process.

Brad asked whether, if a Chair overruled a Section 10.1A charge, a faculty member could then submit a Section 10.1B charge. Dean Strauss said yes they could. No statute of limitations exists.

Boris added that the policy has nothing about faculty being able to appeal a decision rendered by the Chair.

Nikolina reiterated her role in the process for a Section 10.1B charge as merely conducting the investigation about the incident and then sending the information to the corresponding Dean of the School or College the incident took place in. Darin added that students can choose between a panel or the Dean for the final decision.

Boris reviewed the grade appeal process with everyone. First, a student has an informal conversation with their instructor about the request. If a resolution is not reached, the student may make a formal request, in writing, to their instructor. If no agreement is reached then, the matter moves to the department chair (or assistant dean) who may choose to have a committee review the request and offer a recommendation. The Chair may support the student's request, even with instructor input, and can manually override the grade if needed. If the Chair does not support the request, the student can appeal up the chain of command as needed. Schools and colleges do have policies on the timeframe for such appeals.

Ewa commented that there is a need for a policy that protects the faculty member in this process. Brad added that it is not good if a Dean overrules a faculty member for matters of convenience, for example; faculty need a role in this.

Boris made the point that there cannot be a continual appeal process as this will keep going. renée added that faculty need to be a part of the process.

Dean Strauss showed members a flowchart outlining the Section 10.1B reporting and decision process. Stella asked whether this chart could be modified to include the Section 10.1A process. Dean Strauss said this was a nice idea and would work on it. Amanda asked if the flowchart was available for students. Dean Strauss said it is available on the DOSO website. She also asked if the grade appeal information is available. Dean Strauss noted the link on the DOSO website which sends the viewer to the Provost's website with links to the different Schools and Colleges.

Dean Strauss mentioned the dilemma that occurs if, for example, a College of Engineering student is caught cheating in a Liberal Arts & Sciences class. Which Dean gets the case? His position is that the Dean of the School or College where the course is taken gets the case.

Juana asked about how the investigation aspect is handled in both options. Nikolina commented that she investigates the matters in both options by talking with all involved parties (student and instructor). She cautioned faculty who engage in a discussion with students during this time as there is no negotiating. renée asked if a faculty member could rescind their charge(s) to which the answer given was yes.

Dean Strauss next showed members what the report looks like on the receiving end using a sample. He also made it clear that his office does share information with departments if noticeable patterns are emerging with students or with a specific student. As such DOSO can advise faculty to submit a Section 10.1B charge if needed. He also added that the Department Chair receives a report once any charge is filed.

Yang asked how we would work to ensure faculty had a role in the appeal process. Brad clarified a faculty member's role in the panel under a Section 10.1B charge, but asked what a faculty member's appeal rights were in a Section 10.1A case where the Chair rules against the instructor.

The FAC Student Senate member asked for clarification on Section 10.1C. Dean Strauss said that this is probably not needed since we do not have short-term programs. It is apparent that the Code of Conduct needs to be revised. The current delay surrounds the Federal Government and their Title IX regulations. There is also a pretty lengthy approval process for the Code of Conduct.

Boris added that there is an email that will go out to all instructors reminding them of the process for academic misconduct.

Brad asked how amendments to the Code would be handled. Dean Strauss said all of the necessary consultative bodies (Student Senate, Academic Senate, etc.) would be asked to provide input but the primary updates would be handled by the Office of the General Counsel.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 pm for CIC members. FAC members remained for the last portion of their meeting.

---

Next meeting: Wednesday, November 13, 2019 at 1:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:           Richard Pineau, Senior Lecturer, Mathematics