

Academic Senate Curriculum & Instruction Committee
Meeting Minutes – Wednesday, January 26, 2022

Attendees:

Jenny Lewis (Chair), Meghan Courtney, Richard Pineau, Kelly Dormer, David Moss, Stephanie Chastain, Andrew Fribley, Pramod Khosla, Darin Ellis

The meeting began at a few minutes after 1pm.

1. Members participated in a check-in about ways to make the most of winter weather.
2. Members reviewed the agreed-upon norms for meeting and discussed ways to make relevant documents most accessible. We agreed that both Teams and email would be used for future documents to be discussed in a given meeting. There is now a Teams folder of documents relevant to this meeting titled "Materials for Jan 26 Meeting."
3. Updates:
 - a. Linda Beale gathered various comments on the Future of Higher Education report and consolidated them into a single document (available in Teams).
 - b. The current draft of the Strategic Plan has been updated based on feedback and will be discussed at the Board of Governors meeting this Friday, January 28. It is currently embargoed until that meeting. Members of the committee wondered about next steps for this document. D. Ellis said he is not sure, but he can ask. There was some discussion about why the updated document is currently private.
4. R. Pineau presented a draft lesson on academic integrity aimed and better communicating student rights and responsibilities regarding dishonestly, plagiarism, and cheating. He noted that this is the result of several years of discussion in CIC and other committees and is connected to updating the Code of Conduct. Draft available in Teams.
 - a. The committee discussed the best way to encourage use of this lesson. After explaining the Wayne Experience courses and their decentralized nature, Richard noted that most WE credits are earned through First Year Seminar courses (FYS1010 – Learning With the Brain in Mind) and he hoped that course would adopt this lesson.
 - b. The committee talked about the various challenges for student integrity ranging from pressure to succeed to ignorance of the expectations and/or consequences.
 - i. The committee noted they have witnessed student surprise when accused of misconduct and suggested the Code of Conduct could be more concise and limit the use of jargon.
 - ii. Other members noted that it may help for students to understand faculty and staff also follow these guidelines and face professional consequences if they are violated (See PubPeer and Retraction Watch).
 - iii. The committee discussed the utility of the quiz linked to the lesson document and agreed that it would be best to create a new learning tool. This tool might offer best practices and examples about when to cite (rather than focusing on what NOT to do) as well as exercises for students to practice understanding.
 - c. R. Pineau asked for ideas about how to get WE courses to start using this lesson. FYS1010 has over 60 sections so it is a great target audience, but they plan curriculum in spring and train instructors in the summer for fall courses. They have a curriculum council that reviews content each year.
 - i. GEOC could approve/push/endorse it.

- ii. Suggested that the libraries could help build a Canvas module that could be added by instructors.
 - iii. If we wanted it to be an expected part of curriculum GEOC would need to support that.
 - iv. D. Ellis noted that while many will see this as a good idea, some could take it as a challenge to academic freedom. Suggests a slow approach – developing a module, pushing for voluntary adoption, and approaching GEOC about adopting it as a learning outcome for more formal adoption. Notes that GEOC is not a part of Academic Senate.
 - v. Some discussion about looking into other widespread courses that may cover academic integrity - ENG1010, etc. – and where there might be overlap.
 - vi. Is there a similar effort to communicate this in grad courses? No, though D. Ellis sees this question as related to a longer-term effort to establish institutional learning outcomes. Noted that we are the body that could make such a recommendation.
 - 1. Agreed to keep this idea on our radar.
- 5. The committee discussed concerns about websites like Chegg and Bartleby as communicated by fellow faculty members (Exam questions posted on these sites and sometimes answered by paid staffers for a fee).
 - a. R. Pineau recounted his efforts to take down the WSU bookstore’s ads for Bartleby (it’s a Barnes and Noble product) after an investigation.
 - b. J. Lewis opened conversation about if/how we can address these faculty concerns.
 - i. Some committee members were concerned about faculty rights to the content – could they claim ownership and fight posting this way.
 - ii. Others noted we have a policy about misconduct, but it does not seem to be enforced in a way that stops this activity. Perhaps students could be asked to confirm their answers are theirs alone at the beginning/end of an exam.
 - iii. Some suggested a student committee to charge and punish cheaters would be a way to point out that cheating hurts students as well.
 - iv. Faculty could learn to be a bit more transparent so students understand when they are helping each other study v. when they are cheating on an exam.
 - v. Because these sites also offer things like study guides and explanatory videos, there is a gray area in their use to some students.
 - vi. Others noted that at this point in the pandemic so many parts of professional education have been made pass/fail that it is hard to say who is excelling and should be accepted into top residencies, etc.
 - vii. Agreed we would make a list of action items to address this issue consisting of categories (faculty-facing tools, assessment principles, etc.) Noted that there may be room for partnering with other groups like OTL and Academy of Teachers.
- 6. J. Lewis asked for feedback on Linda Beale’s latest draft of the Future of Higher Education report (posted in the meeting chat as well as on Teams).
 - a. Asked for CIC feedback by Tuesday, February 1.
 - b. Post comments in the document itself as comments (Review->New Comment) or email to J. Lewis.
- 7. Members discussed the schedule of upcoming meetings and agreed to shift the February meeting to the 16th. Exact time TBD but will be mid-day.
- 8. Meeting ended at 2:50 to allow some time to review this document.

Submitted by Meghan Courtney January 27, 2022