Wayne State University Academic Senate
Ad hoc Subcommittee on Artificial Intelligence (AI)
Running Report – Winter 2024

Subcommittee Background

Subcommittee members:
> Stephanie Chastain, Academic Advisor II, Psychology, CLAS
> renée c. hoogland, Professor, English, CLAS
> David Moss, Associate Professor (Clinical), Law
> Richard Pineau (Chair), Associate Professor (Teaching), Mathematics, CLAS
> Robert Reynolds, Professor, Computer Science, Engineering

The committee met on August 28, 2023 to review plans for our work. Subsequent meetings took place from January 19 – April 12, 2024.

We invited the following guests:

> David Strauss, Dean of Students – attended February 2nd meeting.
> Nikolina Dmitruchina, Assistant Dean of Students and Student Conduct Officer – attended February 2nd meeting.
> Carolyn Hafner, Associate Vice President & Chief Human Resources Officer – met with Richard on February 9th.
> Erika Jackson-Matthews, Director of Undergraduate Admissions – met with Richard on Febraury 12th.
> Rob Thompson, Chief Information Officer & Associate Vice President C&IT – attended February 16th meeting.
> Sherry Quinn, Director of Graduate Admissions – met with Richard on February 19th.
> John Rothchild, Chief Privacy Officer & Professor of Law – attended February 26th meeting.
> Veronica Bielat, University Librarian IV – attended March 1st meeting.
> Tonya Whitehead, Associate Director, OTL – attended April 5th meeting.
> Sara Kacin, Assistant Provost for Faculty Development & Faculty Success, & Director, OTL – attended April 5th meeting.
> Brooke Shafar, Educational Development Specialist, OTL – attended April 5th meeting.

The meetings took place on Zoom. The appendix contains the notes from all meetings, along with other documents related to our work.

_____

Based on our meetings with various university administrators, staff, and faculty, we offer the following report, recommendations for consideration and invite plans for our continued work. Note that some recommendations are a revised version of what appeared in the subcommittee's preliminary report in May 2023.

General Recommendations (by topic)

The recommendations provided here are broad and focus on several topics that emerged during the semester. Some require further discussion while others are more immediately actionable.

1. Trustworthy AI

   Throughout our discussions, we have noted concerns about the reliability and validity of the output produced by AI tools and systems. With many breaches of data privacy reported around the globe, we

are left with a sincere reluctance to promote or endorse AI tools and systems for our WSU community. During our conversations with C&IT's Rob Thompson, we learned that there are plans to develop an AI tool for WSU. In principle, this tool would be something our institution would develop, train, control, and finetune based on the needs of our community. The question is whether we trust this tool to do useful things at WSU. For example, if this tool provides students with answers to commonly asked questions, or as an advanced search engine for locating personnel, dates, etc., then this would be a positive use. If the AI tool is used to summarize identifiable data, there are serious DEI, privacy, and data security concerns. Moreover, how would one ensure the accuracy of the AI output? This question still requires a careful human analysis. In brief, we are not yet convinced that any AI tool or system produces trustworthy output and best efforts notwithstanding, great care is needed to learn more about how any AI tool or system will be used at WSU.

2. Privacy & Security

There remain very serious concerns about data privacy with AI tools and systems. Informally, students may subscribe to an AI tool, like ChatGPT, and not realize what rights they are giving up (e.g., tracking of browsing history, inputs into the AI tool, tracking of location by IP address). For faculty and academic staff, unintentionally breaching data privacy may bring with it serious consequences both for them and for the university. Understanding the terms of use that one is presented with when first signing up to use an AI tool or system presents another challenge, especially given the technical jargon and organization of the documentation. Therefore, concerns about predatory activity remain, especially for the ignorant student who may see that the tool can help save them time with an assignment, help with editing, or some other use. We therefore remain very concerned about the integrity issues related to AI tools and systems and strongly recommend exercising caution to anyone who is going to use these tools, regardless of their purpose.

3. Impact of AI on Education

This remains an area for further discussion and investigation. We have noted concerns from faculty about academic misconduct issues with AI, about syllabus policies, concerns that are shared by formal committees in departments, units, or divisions that have provided guidance to faculty on AI and teaching, and on the various uses of AI by faculty for teaching purposes. Academic advisors have been using AI to help drafting outlines for particularly difficult emails to students or to summarize de-identified data. Anecdotally, some students have used AI to write papers for classes (authorized or unauthorized), to draft emails to faculty, to edit papers, and so on.

Faculty who teach online courses face considerable challenges as there is no easy way to regulate AI use by students, who, in theory, do not have to interact with their instructor much, if at all. Finally, any sort of take-home assessment (e.g., take-home exams, quizzes, qualifying exams) need to be carefully rethought as AI tools and systems make cheating more tempting. We need to continue to think through and discuss best practices for teaching with AI, thwarting the use of AI, and AI & online courses, as these remain areas for critical exploration. Richard did provide some ideas in the report he issued from his time in the Teaching with AI course he took with Course Hero.

4. Educating our campus community about AI

This recommendation is perhaps the most actionable one. On the basis of several conversations with our campus partners, we feel very strongly that education on AI is important. We therefore recommend the following:

- A colloquium talk on AI and Privacy. This could be open to the WSU community, or tailored for specific groups, such as faculty, advisors, students. Privacy concerns remain a major issue for AI tools and systems and not many people take the time to carefully review things like the terms of service, nor do they realize what sort of information they are giving up when they elect to create an account. Furthermore, we need to be very cognizant of FERPA and HIPAA laws and how they apply to AI tools and systems.
- Faculty and staff need to make a point of trying out an AI tool or system so that they know how it works and what its capabilities are. Entering a low-stakes assignment, for example, can show faculty how the AI produces content and suggest something about its quality.
- Faculty need to clearly communicate their expectations to their students about how AI should or should not be used. This can be done with syllabus language and policies; general classroom discussions; demonstrations with AI to illustrate its use, shortcomings, output analysis, biases; guidelines on assignments. We consider it necessary for faculty to clarify to students whether AI tools that help with editing (e.g., Quillbot, Paraphrase, Grammarly) are permitted and to what extent.
- AI detection tools remain unreliable and academic misconduct remains an area of concern for faculty, especially those who strongly believe AI misuse has taken place but do not feel they have enough evidence to file with DOSO. We believe that all instructors have the right to downgrade students whose work is not fitting with the standards expected in their class, perhaps as marked against the assignment's rubric, and as a last resort, faculty can decide to downgrade or fail the student if unpermitted AI use is suspected. The absence of any discussion about academic integrity at all levels of the institution remains a major concern. One of WSU's values is integrity and yet we do not see that value (or any of the values) advertised or promoted. Dean of Students David Strauss suggested that orientation would be a good moment to discuss academic integrity and we agree, along with a first-year course. We furthermore encourage more discussions on the importance of academic integrity on a regular basis through orientations with majors, during advising meetings, during class sessions, and through use of the academic integrity module.
- Human resources and admissions have not noticed any major issues related to AI with applications. If any have occurred, they have been handled locally or not reported at all. We believe that HR and admissions (at all levels) should be cognizant of the possibility of AI misuse with cover letters and/or writing samples and prepare guidelines for handling such issues. One way could be to provide guidelines for using AI tools in graduate application writing samples. Another could be adding a question to an application as to whether AI was used in any way and to explain how.
- Training for faculty, academic advisors, administrators, librarians, HR, admissions offices is important because of the current trends surrounding AI and higher education. The OTL has offered several workshops and outreach opportunities for faculty to engage with one another. We need to make sure we are reaching all of our campus partners to understand their concerns and needs, and to keep them informed of campus-wide efforts to work appropriately with AI.

5. AI Support

Paid subscriptions for AI tools and systems offer users different experiences that result in perhaps better outputs and/or overall user experience. This creates serious equity challenges for those who cannot afford to pay for such subscriptions. We believe that if WSU were to acquire an AI tool or system, either institutionally developed or outsourced, equal access for all is important. We also have questions about the type of support WSU would provide for someone who may want to integrate an AI tool into Canvas, for example. We need clear guidance on the vetting process, implementation, and support of these tools.

6. Future work

We have accomplished a great deal in the 4 months we have been actively working, but more work remains. The subcommittee would like to further explore the impact of AI on DEI and as well as on research. We also need to look more closely at AI and its impact on curriculum. Specifically, how and for what purposes do instructors use AI in their classes, questions about AI literacy, actions by instructors to account for or to thwart AI (mis)use, and online classes and AI. Also, we wish to further explore whether we need to be doing anything differently with the availability of AI (e.g., assessments, teaching). Finally, we would like to explore assistive technology, which may include AI, for those with disabilities, and its implications for instructors.

Summary of Observations on Presentations from Campus Partners

Based on our conversations with various campus partners, we present some observations, some linked to the recommendations above, for consideration. These observations are discussed in greater detail below and provide some future directions for the subcommittee into which to pursue its work.

Academics

- Observation #1 – Revised syllabi statement
  - Language about bias and copyright infringement has been added.
  - The syllabus needs to include an explanation of the ways in which AI may be used in a class and why (not).
  - Instructors need to clarify, in their syllabus statement, whether AI editing tools like Grammarly, Quillbot, Paraphrase, etc. are permitted as students may not consider them as AI, more generally speaking.
- Observation #2 – Academic Integrity
  - Academic integrity needs to be featured more prominently at WSU, especially since integrity is an institutional value.
  - We need to revise new student orientation to include academic integrity instruction and include it in any first-year course, along with ongoing conversations with students in subsequent classes.
  - We need to include some discussion on resources for academic integrity and its importance in new faculty orientation.
- Observation #3 – Courseware & AI
  - Faculty need to think very carefully about integrated AI tools in courseware, especially about their implications for instructional practices and policies.
  - Faculty need to learn all the aspects of the integrated AI tools prior to its use in the classroom. This should include the biases of the tools. This can be done with formal training, professional organization best practices, and informal discussions within one's department or unit.

Human Resources & Admissions

- Observation #4 – Human Resources

- We need to keep tabs on HR trends with AI misuse.
- Adding a question about AI usage on applications could be useful for understanding how applicants use AI.
  - We may need to provide guidelines for how AI should or should not be used in the application packet.
- More discussion is needed with using AI for data analysis.
- Observation #5 – Undergraduate Admissions
  - We need to provide guidelines for how AI should or should not be used in the application essay.
  - We could require a question at the end of the application that asks an applicant whether they have used AI in any way as part of the application and/or essay, and if so, to explain how and why.
- Observation #6 – Graduate Admissions
  - We need to provide guidelines for how AI should or should not be used in the application process, including the writing sample.
  - We could propose a change to the BOG statute that includes concerns about authenticity.

Computing & Information Technology (C&IT)

- Observation #7 – C&IT
  - We need to provide the WSU community with guidelines for navigating AI tools.
  - The Senate's Facilities, Support Services & Technology Committee needs to take up the discussion of developing, integrating, maintaining, and using these AI tools and systems specific to WSU.

Privacy Officer

- Observation #8 – Privacy
  - We need to develop a website dedicated to privacy tips, cautions, and information for the WSU community.
  - We need to educate our WSU community on the risks and benefits of AI tools, especially for students.
  - Continued monitoring is needed of AI integration with meeting recording tools such as Zoom and MS Teams, especially with regard to confidential information.

Libraries

- Observation #9 – Libraries
  - A colloquium talk or panel discussion on AI privacy issues would be a helpful in the effort to keep educating our WSU community on AI.
  - We need to ensure that our colleagues in the libraries are kept informed of the Senate's work on AI and provide suggestions for the AI research guide. This may extend to other campus partners.

Academic Advising

- Observation #10 – Academic Advising
  - We need training for advisors with AI. Specifically, guidelines on how to use it, cautions and implications, and guidance for helping students navigate their use of AI in classes.
  - The development of a referral system for student questions about AI would be helpful.
  - We need to better educate our students about AI and advisors can play a role in this, whether through reinforcing academic integrity principles, guidance on navigating course policies, or cautions against predatory AI tools.

Link to a running list of GenAI tools with information about their cost, pros, limitations, and other notes.

What follows is a more detailed discussion of the observations outlined above, along with suggestions as to the subcommittee's future work.

Academics

Observation #1 – Syllabi Statement

> **Update (February 2024):** Note the syllabus language prohibiting the use of AI, specifically the rationale highlighted in yellow. It is important to draw attention to this language since explaining to students why AI use is prohibited is seen as a best practice. For the syllabus language permitting AI usage, note the highlighted text in yellow regarding copyright and bias in AI that was added.

Faculty need to decide whether AI can be used as a supplement, teaching, or support tool for their students. We propose two different syllabus statements, one for faculty who prohibit the use of AI, one for faculty who will allow the use of AI in their class, but within distinct parameters. We furthermore draw a distinction between undergraduate- and graduate-level courses. The key difference is that, in cases where the use of AI is permitted, undergraduate students may use AI as a support tool, whereas in graduate courses, the use of AI must be approached with more caution since such usage in scholarly publications is prohibited, at least for now, and depending on the journal. The inclusion of such statements is the instructor's decision.

Special note: Instructors may wish to clarify the extent to which online editing or grammar tools may be used as some contain AI embedded elements. Examples include Quillbot, Paraphrase and Grammarly, among others. Generally, when students see that AI is prohibited, they will consider that to mean generative AI (GenAI) tools and not editing or grammar tools.

For instructors who will prohibit the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools/systems in their classes:

> I am here to help you to be successful in my class and am happy to meet with you to discuss any course assignments, study strategies, and other academic matters. I want you to be able to think critically, be analytical, and be creative in your work in my class. Since the goal is for you to develop your critical thinking skills, ideas, and critical perspectives on the class materials, the use of any artificial intelligence (AI) content creation tool/system (e.g., Jasper, ChatGPT, Bard, etc.) is not permitted. Using AI in any shape or form will constitute a violation of the Student Code of Conduct and may subject you to charges of academic misconduct. If you have difficulty with an assignment, contact me, attend office hours, and/or seek support out from the Academic Success Center, [or any other resources instructors consider helpful, e.g., tutoring center, peer mentors, and so on.]

> Instructors may want to provide a rationale for prohibiting the use of AI, by discussing it in class or by adding language to the syllabus statement.

For instructors who will allow AI usage in their classes:

Undergraduate classes

> The use of artificial intelligence content creation tools/system (e.g., ChatGPT, Jasper) is permitted in this class on certain conditions.

> 1. You consult me first on your plan for using AI with the assignment. I may offer you an alternative approach.

2. You need to explicitly state at the beginning of the assignment when, why, and how you have used AI. This includes the prompts you used to generate the results. You also need to specify what elements of the AI generated text you have used.

3. If your AI output includes data/information, you are responsible for verifying their accuracy and providing the source(s).

4. Be aware of the potential biases of AI tools. AI tools are trained on data, and this data can reflect the biases of the people who created it. As a result, AI tools can sometimes generate biased content. Be aware of this possibility and be critical of the content that AI tools generate.

5. Respect Copyright: When using AI for research or content generation, be aware of copyright laws and intellectual property rights. Always give credit to the creators of the content you utilize.

6. If I detect AI plagiarism in your assignment, you will be found to be in violation of the Student Code of Conduct and charges of academic misconduct will be imposed.

Graduate classes

The use of artificial intelligence content creation tools/systems (e.g., ChatGPT, Jasper) is permitted in this class on certain conditions.

1. You consult me first on your plan for using AI with the assignment. I may offer you an alternative approach.

2. You need to explicitly state at the beginning of the assignment when, why, and how you have used AI. This includes the prompts you used to generate the results; you also need to specify what elements of the AI generated text you have used.

3. Documenting AI's use in an assignment is your responsibility. Please note:

   o If your AI output includes data/information, you are responsible for verifying their accuracy and providing the source(s).

   o AI-produced text is prohibited in most scholarly literature. AI cannot do your work for you. Furthermore, AI cannot be used or credited as a re(source) in any scholarly work.

   o If I detect AI misuse (i.e., undocumented use) in your assignment you will be found to be in violation of the Student Code of Conduct and charges of academic misconduct will be imposed.

   o Be aware of the potential biases of AI tools. AI tools are trained on data, and this data can reflect the biases of the people who created it. As a result, AI tools can sometimes generate biased content. Be aware of this possibility and be critical of the content that AI tools generate.

   o Respect Copyright: When using AI for research or content generation, be aware of copyright laws and intellectual property rights. Always give credit to the creators of the content you utilize.

We also feel that providing guidance in the syllabus is essential and suggest that perhaps the syllabus template include a header where an instructor may state, explicitly, their policy on AI for their course(s).

Additionally, once the revised Student Code of Conduct language has been approved (See recommendation #3 from the preliminary report), that can be updated in the Canvas link with the other University policies. Some

instructors may prefer to explicitly state the university policy on academic misconduct in their syllabi to draw student attention to it.

Observation #2 – Academic Integrity

From our conversation with Dean of Students David Strauss and Student Conduct Officer Nikolina Dmitruchina, academic integrity must be featured more prominently at orientation for new faculty and new students. Moreover, conversations about academic integrity need to be taking place in the classroom.

Since this work is outside the scope of the Subcommittee for AI, we believe the Senate's standing committees should take on this work, namely Faculty Affairs, Students Affairs, Curriculum & Instruction, DEI, and Policy.

- Development of a University Honor Code:
  - Academic integrity needs to be at the center of our work. Discussion about creating an honor code was mentioned and the subcommittee supports such a conversation. Dean of Students David Strauss indicated that the Student Senate has discussed this and would be on board to help.
- Discussion about academic integrity
  - We need to feature academic integrity more prominently in and around the university.
  - Orientation for new faculty and new students are great places to begin the conversation. DOSO suggested that for faculty, they need training on academic misconduct procedures during new faculty orientation. Additionally, ongoing conversations about academic misconduct procedures can be accomplished through information sessions delivered to individual departments and units.
    - We believe that faculty are best suited to speak with new students about academic integrity and acknowledge that having them do so at numerous orientations would be a big ask. It may be prudent to provide some support for doing so. The content would also need to be collaboratively designed.
    - Alternatively, we could identify key courses we know all students take to incorporate academic integrity more prominently.
    - We also need to consider this conversation for transfer, graduate, and international students.
  - Use of the academic integrity module and/or its amending to suit instructor needs. Prior to the start of each term, we believe the Provost's Office should send an email to all instructors reminding them about the resources that exist (e.g., syllabus template, academic misconduct procedures, CARE report, academic integrity module, etc.).
- Precedents for academic misconduct issues should be developed to help faculty who encounter cheating and other issues. Currently, DOSO provides little in the way of formal recommendations for action against a student who stands accused of academic misconduct. Instead, they reiterate the procedures, and the faculty member is left to make the decision and provide the sanctions. Providing some hypothetical scenarios with appropriate sanctions could help faculty in their decision-making. With AI-related issues, Dean of Students David Strauss said he thought faculty were being too lenient on students and felt that tougher penalties should be imposed to really get the message across to students. Whether that message is given to faculty who encounter cheating with AI remains unclear, but certainly a precedent could help.
- DOSO has seen misconduct issues arise because, according to students, they are stressed, do not have time, etc. to complete the work and are too embarrassed to ask for an extension and/or speak with their instructor. How can we better balance compassion with enforcement of course policies, like those about cheating?
- What role can academic advisors play in this discussion?

Preliminary report recommendation #6 restated:

Conversations about academic integrity should begin as soon as both students and faculty enter WSU. The Academic Senate has a platform to present such information at new faculty orientation. It is unclear, however, what would be the best way to inform students about academic integrity at orientation, especially since there is a great deal to take in at the beginning of their academic career. We therefore have kept the number of "talking points" for students low, while recognizing that more thought is needed on how information on academic integrity should be provided. Ideally, faculty members take on this task themselves.

Recommendations for Faculty Orientation
- It is important to have conversations with your students, regardless of the level of courses you teach, about academic integrity.
  - Discuss why maintaining academic integrity is important in one's work at WSU.
  - Discuss challenges and temptations and how to deal with them
  - effectively.
  - Use the academic integrity module in Canvas Commons to help your students understand academic integrity and how to avoid misconduct.

- Messaging is key.
  - Students need to see you as someone who is there to help them to be successful in your class.
    - Discuss what students should do if they need help on your assignment(s).
    - Discuss what students should do if they are unable to turn in the assignment on time.

- If students confront you with personal or life challenges, fill out a CARE report at doso.wayne.edu and/or refer them to support services, such as:
  - Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS)
  - Academic Success Center (ASC)

- Make sure that you explicitly inform students about the forms of academic misconduct that are listed in the Student Code of Conduct.
  - See doso.wayne.edu for the student code of conduct (Article 2) for a specific list.
  - Check the syllabus template for specific language.

- Consider the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in your course.
  - Include a syllabus statement on the use of AI
    - Will you allow students to use AI to help them with assignments? Within what parameters?
    - Will you use AI as a teaching tool to show students the limitations of its use, benefits, and drawbacks?
    - Will you ban the use of all AI in your class?
  - Frame assignments so that students are not likely to be able to use AI (if prohibited) to generate responses.
    - Consider prompts that are precise, clear, and specific.
    - Avoid yes/no questions and instead aim for open-ended questions that may involve multiple perspectives and interpretations.
    - Explain assignments, provide suggestions for how to work on them, and the criteria for evaluation.

- Consult colleagues, explore pedagogical research in your discipline, reach out to the Office for Teaching & Learning (OTL) on best practices in creating assignments.

Recommendations for Student Orientation

Key message:

Faculty are the first people for students to contact if they have problems with academic work, e.g.:.

- inability to complete the assignment on time;
- misunderstanding expectations of the assignment;
- having trouble starting the assignment;
- having difficulty managing priorities for other obligations;
- life getting in the way of being able to complete the assignment;
- overall standing in the class with grades, attendance, etc.

Other messages:

1. Students must be encouraged carefully to read course syllabi for policies, deadlines, expectations, and to ask for clarification when needed.
2. Students need to recognize that they are responsible for their learning.
3. Students should be provided with a list of campus-wide resources (with short descriptions) to deal with problems ranging from mental wellness to academic achievement. This information might be usefully made accessible with a QR code that links to relevant webpages.

Observation #3 – Courseware & AI

Faculty have been contacted by some publishers who are offering courseware with integrated AI tools. The premise that these tools are being marketed with include things like: students spend more time in the courseware with the tool, the AI offers simpler explanations, the AI is a 24/7 tutor for students, and more. This is concerning for many reasons. Below are a list of questions that the Subcommittee Chair sent to a textbook representative from Pearson, who contacted him about an AI tool. This set of questions can be used as a guide by faculty who are approached by similar marketing efforts:

- Will this feature be optional and have the ability to be turned off? Will this impact the cost of the courseware?
- Is this AI only limited to mathematics, or can it do other things like write papers, etc.?
- Is the AI only limited to helping students with that problem it's on, or again, can students access it as a standalone AI to help with other mathematics problems, perhaps those from a take-home quiz, homework, etc.?
- If students are using the AI for other problems, etc., are they cautioned about instructor's intellectual property rights?
- The flyer you gave me stated that the AI "draws from trusted Pearson content". Trusted by who?
- Do you have an honor code that students read prior to using the AI?
- What if an instructor has a policy against using AI, are students advised to always check with their instructor about using AI?
- Are students cautioned not to enter personal information?
- What if the AI teaches or guides students differently from the instructor?
- Who developed its "teaching" practices? How was bias controlled?
- How do you ensure the AI is not using copyrighted material from other sources?
- What sort of, if any, terms of services will students need to agree to in using the AI?
- Privacy issues with AI remain a concern. Is that a problem with this AI?

- The flyer states: "Breaks down course material and provides a simpler explanation if a student gets stuck on a concept?" Simpler than what? The instructor? (If so, I am highly insulted). And if it's a simpler explanation than what was previously offered, why not make all the explanations simpler?
- The flyer states: "Provides guided practice for greater clarity and understanding that students can apply to exams and more challenging problems." Again, greater clarity than what?
- The flyer states: "Students who used the AI study tool spent more time in their courseware...". I think that is obvious. But I am not sure that we can definitively say that the AI is/was the reason that students were spending more time in the courseware.

The chair also added the following:

> Ultimately, if a student has an issue with a math problem, I want them to contact me, their instructor. That's why I am here. I know the answer to this statement will be: Well, are you available at 2 am? No. I prioritize my 8 hours of sleep and make sure my students know too, and I encourage them to get their 8 hours of sleep. To my knowledge, no complaints were filed with my chair that I am responding in the morning to emails sent to me at 2 am.

> I also think this feature feeds into giving students the right answer too quickly. There is an urgency to know whether one is right or wrong, now. Where is the progressive struggle of figuring things out? I know that many instructors like the automated nature of online courseware, me included. Having taught some upper-level courses, I see that students need to struggle, with the struggle of learning mathematics. That is part of the journey. I think that if we are to build perseverance in our courses, critical thinking, and a sense of pride in one's work, we cannot always provide so much support as students will find difficulty in the environments where that doesn't exist, like their jobs.

It is therefore important for faculty to be critical of such integrated AI tools and understand how they work, their features, and hwo it may impact the instructional aspects of their courses.

Future Plans

Look at curriculum and AI more carefully. We need to better understand AI literacy and the work that some faculty have undertaken regarding it. There may be a need to integrate AI literacy into certain curricula given employer demands and/or industry trends.

We also need to keep a careful eye on academic misconduct related issues with AI and continue to offer faculty alternatives to circumvent AI in student work.

Human Resources & Admissions

Human Resources

Richard met with Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer Carolyn Hafner on Friday, February 9, 2024. Carolyn provided an overview of the Human Resources (HR) process and noted it needs to be more automated. When she came on as AVP, her work began with assessing the hiring system which is fragmented. She said we need to hire people much faster than we do and we need to be more cognizant of competition among other institutions for similar jobs. All this to say, she has been working to consolidate the hiring process to make it more efficient, automated, and user-friendly.

In terms of AI, she wants to look at ways to implement it into our processes. Currently, we use a system called Cornerstone, which is a 3rd party vendor. This system was purchased prior to her arrival as AVP and was essentially "sitting on the shelf" when she arrived. With a price tag of $1.25 million, she thought it best to get it into use and understand its capabilities. The software contains 4 modules each focusing on a different aspect of

hiring. There have been some integration issues they are trying to figure out. The system, to the WSU community, is known as *Wayne Talent* and features the ability for one to upload their CV, in which the system will "read" it and automatically populate the appropriate fields in the application. Richard pointed out that is a form of AI, which Carolyn agreed. Ultimately, Carolyn would like to see the software upgraded to a point where standard template offer letters (which vary based on position type) are stored and all someone must do is click a few buttons and the applicant's information is automatically populated in the letter and the hiring manager just edits a few minor details. Equally important would be the integration of the background check software.

Richard asked about the security of this automation system and the server on which the 3rd party vendor stores its data. He pointed out that any AI integration will need to be trained on certain data and to what extent will we need to protect applicants' and employees' personal information. Carolyn said that Cornerstone has a strong security system and stores the data on their servers. A very small group of WSU personnel have direct access to personal data. To be clear, WSU's C&IT does not manage the data. Carolyn stated that any further AI integration will mean a renegotiated contract with Cornerstone to iron out the details like data privacy, integrity, security and liability. The original contract with Cornerstone did not have data security provisions and she made sure the current contract has such protections.

Richard asked what Carolyn would like to see with further AI integration. She said would like to see AI used to analyze trends in HR at WSU. Currently, it would take considerable time to gather and analyze how many people have left WSU, in which positions, etc. and being able to study these trends more carefully can help inform our HR-related practices. She indicated that the professional organizations in HR are looking to use it for applicant tracking. She thought it could also be used to redact self-identifying applicant info that may be the source of bias in hiring (e.g., race, gender, ethnicity, etc.), prior to an applicant's information being given to a hiring committee. Federal regulations require HR to ask gender and ethnicity questions, which are optional for applicants.

Richard asked about disclosing to applicants how AI would be used in the hiring process. Carolyn said she is all for full disclosure and felt strongly that there would be some language explaining how AI would be used in the hiring process. He also asked whether any departments, units, divisions, etc. have raised concerns about AI being used in applicant's cover letters, writing samples, etc. Carolyn indicated that she has not heard of any such issues but believes that it can be a problem. She plans to start asking about such issues with her hiring team. Richard shared a suggestion about adding a question asking applicants whether they used AI to fill out any part of the application and if so, to explain how. That information should be shared with the hiring committee of the department, unit, division, etc. Richard also talked about a recent application he filled out which asked him to answer a series of questions in a video about 3 minutes long for each question. He was shown the question in the HR system, given some time to prepare, and then allowed up to 3 takes. Carolyn was intrigued by the idea and would look into it. She is also open to further discussion about AI and HR.

Observation #4 – Human Resources

- If AI is to be used in any aspect of hiring practices, it needs to be disclosed to applicants how and why it will be used. Also, how their data will be protected.
- Any contracts with 3rd party vendors for our HR systems need to include provisions for data protection, integrity and privacy, especially if AI tools are used in any way.
- Asking applicants to disclose whether they used AI in any aspect of the application process should be included in the application, regardless of their position, and provided to the hiring committee for consideration.

- Knowing whether hiring committees are facing issues with applicants using AI in their application materials is important. We would support keeping track of these issues.

Undergraduate Admissions

Richard met with Director of Admissions Ericka Matthews-Jackson on Monday, February 12, 2024. Prior to the meeting Ericka shared the following with Richard via email:

> Although we have not seen significant use of AI in the admissions process thus far, this issue is on our radar. This year WSU, along with 9 other state universities in Michigan, launched an initiative (MAAP-Michigan Assured Admissions Pact) which essentially provides a direct admissions pathway for students who apply to WSU with a 3.0 cumulative GPA or higher. Students who are admitted via the MAAP initiative, are not required to submit a personal statement. Further, each year approximately 50% of students apply test informed (submitting their ACT or SAT test scores and HS transcripts) and are not required to submit personal statements. Transfer students are admitted based on a review of their performance in college or a combination of college and high school performance as evidence on their official transcripts, and are not required to submit personal statements. The required questions on our application do not require essay responses, so the personal statements/essays are the context in which we receive written statements in the application process. Therefore, AI has not been a prevalent issue in the admissions process… yet. I meet monthly with the Directors of Admissions from all the 15 public universities in Michigan. We have discussed the AI issue, but as of yet, there has not been a widespread adoption of specific AI policies for admissions.

During the meeting, Ericka offered that the number of students submitting essays is quite small and prior to AI, students have been coached in composing their essays. Students can choose from one of two prompts to write their 300-word essay:

1. Wayne State University is a vibrant and dynamic community made up of people from a wide variety of backgrounds and experiences. In a 300-word essay, please tell us something about yourself that you think would make you an important member of the Wayne State community. You might describe your personal qualities or share an experience that was important to you.

2. Sometimes life presents obstacles to our goals that we must learn to overcome. In a 300-word essay, describe a time you encountered an obstacle to an important goal in your life and how you sought solutions to achieve your goal.

Currently, her staff does not have a policy specific to AI and she will check with other admissions directors at other institutions whether they have a policy or not. Currently, if AI is suspected in the writing of an essay, and the student is admissible to WSU, the high school counselor will be contacted to discuss the situation. If AI is detected for a student who is not admissible, then a note is added to their review. Ericka said that her office sees these instances as teachable moments.

Currently, her office uses AI only in the form of a chatbot called "W" which has preloaded answers in to that students can use. It is monitored by humans and there have been instances where students may have entered a swear word and the student's high school counselor is contacted, often to the surprise of the student. Her office has not used AI for any analysis nor does she think they will implement AI for analysis in the future.

In terms of the current climate, she will check with her equals at other institutions regarding policies and trends. She is considering adding a statement to the application that explains that the essay needs to be in the student's voice and supporting rationale. Richard suggested adding a question where a student may explain how they

used AI, if in fact they did. Whether a campus policy is needed for AI, Ericka does not think there is a need, at least not yet.

Observation #5 – Undergraduate Admissions

As part of the application for admission where students must submit an essay, either:

- Provide a statement as to the expectations for how AI should or should not be used in the composition of the essay.
- Have a required question at the end of the application that asks an applicant whether they have used AI in any way as part of the application and/or essay, and if so, to explain how and why.

Graduate Admissions

Richard met with Sherry Quinn, Director of Graduate Admissions on Monday, February 19, 2024 to discuss AI related to graduate admissions.

Richard asked Sherry whether her office was seeing any issues with AI. Sherry said that no one is coming to her with any but she will ask the program admissions folks whether they are noticing any problems. She explained that her office does not review applications for admission but rather verifies minor criteria such as GPA, grades, and previously earned degrees. Everything else is reviewed by the program for which a student is applying to. Programs may elect to have specific questions or requirements as part of the application process but her office does not review those documents or answers.

At present, the application does not have a statement about AI usage. There is an acknowledgement portion where a student must agree that what they are submitting is true and accurate, to the best of their knowledge. She said that very rarely is there a challenge to that. Sherry would want to know the consequences of having used AI if an applicant discloses they have. Richard asked about perhaps providing some guidelines at the beginning of the application on appropriate uses of AI and Sherry said that may be possible, again with the proper approvals.

Richard asked whether she has thought about including a statement in the application about AI. Sherry said that she is waiting for that to come from the faculty. There is a process wherein such a recommendation would need to go through the Executive Committee of the Graduate Council, then to the Graduate Council for approval, then it is adopted.

In her professional circle, she has not heard anyone mention anything about AI. She will ask though. There has been a lot of conversation about DEI, however.

Richard asked Sherry if she thinks using AI in her own work would be helpful, such as an AI tool to help streamline processes, etc. She said that perhaps with bots, but that would require someone to monitor them and her office does not have the staff. She could see some benefit to using it to help think through processes.

Moving forward, Sherry will reach out to her community about AI and get back to us. She is open to having a statement in the application about AI usage and again, reiterated the proper approvals such a change would require along with continued conversation. She mentioned that there is nothing in the BOG statutes about authenticity and such things are more WSU policy. She will also ask the various program directors around campus if they have encountered any AI-related issues.

Observation #6 – Graduate Admissions

As part of the application for admission where students must submit an essay, either:

- Provide a statement as to the expectations for how AI should or should not be used in the application process. Discussion with the Graduate Council is needed.
- Additionally, perhaps proposing a change to the BOG statute that includes authenticity.

Future Plans

We need to invite Carolyn for another conversation on the progress of AI integration with our HR systems, any issues reported by hiring committees with applicants using AI, and the status of improving our hiring process to inquire about applicants' usage of AI and other means for applicants to apply for jobs (e.g., video questions, etc.).

For undergraduate & graduate admissions, we need to keep an eye on the trends that the Admissions Office is seeing. Developing a list of guidelines for appropriate use of AI may be needed to establish boundaries for applicants.

Computing & Information Technology (C&IT)

The subcommittee hosted Rob Thompson, Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice President for Computing and Information Technology (C&IT) on Friday, February 16, 2024. Rob took the time to overview a number of projects that his office is considering with AI. His rationale for implementing tools and systems with AI is that if we do not do it, then faculty, staff, and students will look elsewhere for the technology so we need to offer to our community. Moreover, if the university offers an AI tool or system, it will have been vetted for privacy considerations, data integrity and data security.

Specifically, he is considering:

- AI integration into MS Teams. This will allow meetings to be summarized, transcribed, and documented. This would be available to departments, units, etc. that want it.

- Co-pilot is another system that is more individualized. It can summarize how many meetings one has had with x, summarize various data, etc. This system pulls data from one's calendar, etc. and is almost like a personal assistant. No one sees the data it pulls except the user.

There are some implications and concerns:

- One concern is the accuracy of the transcription from recorded meetings.

- Recorded meetings can suppress open discussions.

- Questions about how FOIA or FERPA laws apply need to be considered. What is a transcript from a meeting is a part of a FOIA and no one properly checked that transcript for accuracy?

- Questions about privacy rules are a major factor. What if someone does not want a meeting recorded?

- How safe is the information?

Equity issues are a concern, especially for AI tools that have paid subscriptions. Everyone needs the same access to these tools to ensure equity. Rob talked about putting together a list of guidelines for users of this technology that will be shared more widespread.

In terms of an open AI for the WSU community, this is being considered to ensure data privacy, integrity, and security. The development of such a system will require input from many stakeholders, with the most obvious being the Academic Senate, Student Senate, etc.

AI detection tools also remain unreliable and are something that we should not consider using.

Observation #7 – C&IT

The development of any AI tool or system for WSU must have input from various stakeholders, including the Academic Senate, Student Senate, etc. We support continued discussion about innovative AI tools with the understanding that data privacy, integrity, and security precautions need to be disclosed at the front end. Moreover, providing the WSU community with a list of guidelines for navigating the various AI tools and systems is beneficial.

We recommend that the Senate's Facilities, Support Services & Technology Committee take up the discussion of developing, integrating, maintaining, and using these AI tools and systems.

Future Plans

We need to invite Rob for another conversation on the progress of AI integration with our systems, and any subsequent plans.

Privacy

The subcommittee hosted John Rothchild, Chief Privacy Officer and Professor of Law for a meeting on Monday, February 26th. Part of the subcommittee's work was understanding what a chief privacy officer does. It is an informal role. John has no authority over anyone but is more so an advisor and under the purview of C&IT. He helps develop policy for the university with policy. He also looks at contracts for software that may have an impact on privacy-related stuff. He has been doing this for 3-4 years and serves year-to-year.

John is keeping an eye on the data training of the AI tools. ChatGPT for example, will take the prompts and add it to the training data. This feature is defaulted to be "on". Confidential data can thus be compromised. ChatGPT has a setting to turn this off. Currently, there is no central website with privacy information and tips for the WSU community. The subcommittee believes that such a site would be useful. This could include information on privacy agreements, current technology that WSU uses or subscribes to and known risks of privacy, general cautions, etc. Education of the WSU community will be paramount to these efforts for awareness and the Academic Senate can be a leader in this. Faculty can also help their students see the value of it. Terms of use, for example, can be tricky to read through since there is no standard way of presenting them. John, for example, looks for the types of information that the entity tracks, and what they do with that information. The difficulty is finding an entity that does not make inappropriate use of our personal information for maximizing profits.

The need for users to avoid entering personal information, their own or someone else's, is perhaps one of the top cautions we can offer. For clinical settings, this remains difficult with FOIA and HIPAA laws in place. Further guidance will be needed.

The subcommittee also discussed recordings of meetings, especially with students, and the safety of the data that is saved by the 3rd party vendor (Zoom and MS Teams in our case). Whether a meeting recording is subject to a FOIA or FERPA violation depends on the language of those Acts. It may be necessary that the meeting facilitator needs to read a script to attendees so they know what they are agreeing to if recorded. The same holds true for researchers who may use Zoom for transcribed interviews.

Another concern are emails to faculty advertising curriculum, technology, and other products with AI integration. Faculty should and need to consult with C&IT prior to agreeing to purchase or use the software. This is so that terms of service can be reviewed for privacy terms and data integrity.

Observation #8 – Privacy

The development of a website with privacy tips, cautions, and information would be a worthy investment of time. This website will need to be maintained by the Chief Privacy Officer, C&IT, and other relevant entities. Regular reminders about its existence and updates must go out to the WSU community. The Policy Committee should follow through on this item.

The education of our WSU community about the risks and benefits of AI tools must be at the forefront of our work. This is especially important for our students, who may be exploited by technology companies with the guise of saving time, but in fact who are mining private information from our students.

Meeting recordings remain a concern for privacy issues, especially meetings where confidential information is shared. Zoom, for example, may keep recordings saved in their cloud, but what happens with this data? Meeting recordings may contain extraneous conversations that have no bearing or weight on the topics discussed, are these transcripts subject to scrutiny should a FOIA request be made? These concerns are more technical in nature and must be taken up by the Senate's FSST committee for regular discussion.

Future Plans

We will keep an eye on changes to privacy concerns surrounding AI and will look at ways to educate our WSU community about privacy risks and concerns especially those involving AI.

Libraries

The subcommittee met with Veronica Bielat, Student Success Librarian & Librarian IV, about the work the WSU libraries are doing with AI. Currently, the libraries are still grappling with AI tools, their implications on the academia, research, privacy, etc. and ways in which AI could be used in their own work. There is a research guide published by the libraries on AI: https://guides.lib.wayne.edu/c.php?g=1368920&p=10114741 that will be made available to the WSU community. Veronica's concerns about AI lie with privacy violations, the corpus in which the AI tools are trained, academic uses of AI, and keeping up with the general trends.

Observation #9 – Libraries

Veronica mentioned the need to educate the WSU community about privacy concerns, perhaps through a colloquium talk and/or panel discussion. The subcommittee supports this recommendation. This could be organized by a standing committee of the Senate or sponsored through C&IT among other stakeholders on campus.

The development of the research guide for AI is important as a means to educate our WSU community. We feel strongly that this resource, among others, needs to be disseminated to the WSU community much better, perhaps through a start of term email from the Provost's Office, department/unit meetings, etc. We also need to keep the libraries informed of the Senate's work on AI, especially policy matters.

Future Plans

We will need to meet with Rhonda McGinnis, who is overseeing the development of the AI research guide to discuss the content, future plans, resources, etc.

We feel there is a need for a centrally located website with information on AI is important to consider. The current siloing of information makes it hard for one to navigate policies, let along consistency across schools, colleges, and units. More will be needed to make this possible.

Academic Advising

Stephanie collaborated with the Advising Training Academy to lead an informal discussion among academic advisors titled, "Academic Advising Discussion Regarding AI & Data Access". Richard was able to attend and took notes regarding feedback. Attendees were comprised of 27 advisors from schools and colleges across campus. There was a mix of AI use among advisors that ranged from using generative AI to help compose difficult emails to no use at all due to either lack of training, awareness or concern for security and privacy. Advisors agreed that the syllabus should be where instructors provide students their guidelines on using AI for coursework. There were mixed reactions about the use and reliability of AI detection software and students using AI to help them write essays for scholarships, admissions, etc. One of the advisors mentioned that context was important for determining whether an AI can be used for these types of essays. There was a consensus that AI should not replace the human element needed for critical reflective conversations with students and that it could assist with mundane questions such as finding information on WSU's websites.

Academic advisors seemed to agree that an AI chat bot could be beneficial in answering ordinary closed ended questions. With that said, if an AI is created for WSU that will answer questions related to advising then academic advisors would like to be included in the design and testing phases to provide feedback on what types of questions and answers would be most appropriate for the tool. One of the expressed concerns with relying on an AI tool is that many advising conversations are not linear. For example, if a student is asking for math tutoring resources, there could be an underlying issue that could surface in a conversation with an advisor that will be missed if they only inquired with the AI tool. Another concern was ensuring the accuracy of the information provided to students by the AI tool and whether there would be budget for an assigned staff person to monitor it.

Observation #10 – Academic Advising

Collaborate with the Advisor Training Academy (ATA) to develop and facilitate a training workshop for academic advisors with practical examples and training related to artificial intelligence.

Designate a specific entity on campus where academic advisors can refer students who want help with using artificial intelligence. Some of the offices that came up in the conversation were the Student Service Center, Dean of Students Office, WSU Libraries, and C&IT.

Incorporate AI education for students, including code of conduct policies, at multiple points throughout their program curriculum.

Future Plans

We will continue to monitor how advisors may use, want to use, and concerns related to AI. The subcommittee is thinking of providing an informational seminar for advisors regarding AI. This will allow the subcommittee to learn more about what advisors have been seeing with their students about AI.

<u>Appendix</u>

Survey Questions

The committee would like to poll faculty on their use of and concerns with AI in AY 2024-2025. Possible survey questions for faculty:

1. What department do you teach classes for?

2. What is your affiliation (tenured faculty, teaching faculty, GTA, Part-time faculty, other)?

3. Do you have an AI policy statement in your syllabus (yes/no)?

4. Which best describes your policy on AI?

    a) Students are allowed to use AI within certain parameters (Describe those parameters)

    b) Students are not permitted to use AI (why?)

    c) I am unsure about an AI policy in my class (why?)

5. Please share any positive and/or negative uses of AI?

6. Have you had any suspected AI misuse (i.e., using AI to cheat) in your classes? Please describe.

7. Is there anything you'd like to convey to the ad hoc Subcommittee on AI?

AI user guides for the WSU community

(follows on next 2 pages)

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)
A QUICK GUIDE FOR FACULTY

WHAT IS AI?

Artificial intelligence (AI), is a branch of computer science that builds, examines, and perfects machines that mimic human behavior.

Large language models or LLMs are a form of AI capable of thinking since its trained on large data sets.

Generative AI is a type of LLM that can produce text, images, etc. when prompted.

Prompts are what a user enters into an AI tool. Prompts can be a set of directions for what the AI should produce.

CAUTIONS OF USING AI

- Read the terms of use carefully as private information can be tracked (e.g., browsing history, etc.)
- Do not enter personal information.
- Do not enter someone else's personal information.
- AI can hallucinate so you must check the accuracy of what the AI produces.
- The AI's output can be biased. Analyze the output carefully.
- Be aware of entering someone else's content as that may violate copyright or intellectual property rights.

POSITIVE USES OF AI FOR INSTRUCTORS & STUDENTS

For instructors:
- Create lesson plans, syllabi, exam questions, case studies, examples, and learning outcomes.
- Create icebreakers, group activities, summarizing feedback, and transcription.

For students:
- Creating outlines, grammar checks, & brainstorming
- Breaking down complex topics, generating practice questions, etc. for studying.

Useful links:
- 101 Ideas for AI in Education
- Practical AI for Instructors
- A Guide to Prompting AI

HOW TO TALK TO MY STUDENTS ABOUT AI

- Decide on your policy for AI in your class. Put syllabus language together and/or draft language as a class.
  - If you prohibit it, be sure to explain why.
  - If you permit it, provide guidelines for its use.
- Remind students about drawbacks of AI (i.e., privacy issues, bias, accuracy of output, copyright, etc.)
- Ask the AI to generate talking points...
- Requiring AI as part of the class will require students' agreement of terms of use; discuss with students.
- Be transparent with how you use AI to students.

OTHER IMPORTANT INFORMATION

Detecting misconduct with AI is tough as AI detection tools are unreliable. As a best practice, compare student writing samples and consult with the Dean of Students Office.

Helpful links:
- WSU AI Research Guide
- Artificial Intelligence and Teaching (WSU OTL Canvas)
- How to cite AI
- Thwarting AI
- Teaching AI Literacy
- Academic Integrity & AI
- Testing the legitimacy of AI
- Students using AI to cheat
- AI in Higher Ed - State of the Field
- AI & Online Classes

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI)
A QUICK GUIDE FOR STUDENTS

WHAT IS AI?

According to IBM, AI is technology that enables computers and machines to simulate human intelligence and problem-solving capabilities. Examples of AI include things like GPS guidance apps, self-driving vehicles, smart home devices like Alexa, and recommendations from streaming services.

Generative AI is a type of large language model (LLM) that uses large data sets to create text, images, etc. based on the user entering a prompt.

Prompts are what a user enters into an AI tool. Prompts can be a set of directions for what the AI should produce.

CAUTIONS OF USING AI

- Read the terms of use carefully as they can vary depending on the AI tool. If accepted, some may allow your personal and private information to be tracked.
- It is recommended that you do not enter your personal information or someone else's personal information.
- AI can hallucinate which means it may create false information such as nonexistent references, so you must check the accuracy of what the AI produces.
- The AI's output can be biased. Analyze the output carefully.
- Submitting someone else's content into AI tools may violate copyright or intellectual property rights.

PRACTICAL USES OF AI

AI tools are great for:
- Creating outlines
- Grammar checks
- Brainstorming
- Breaking down complex topics (remember to verify accuracy)
- Generating practice problems, writing prompts, etc. for study purposes
- Providing a structure for cover letters, resumes, and interview responses (do not enter personal info)

AI & COURSEWORK

- Always check with your instructor and/or the course syllabus before using AI.
- If allowed, consider the following:
  - Speak with your instructor about how you intend to use AI.
  - Track how you use the AI including the prompts and the output.
  - Describe how you verified the accuracy of the output.
  - Use accurate citations for AI generated information.
  - Communicate how you will address any possible bias and/or copyright issues.

SUGGESTED RESOURCES

If you're having difficulty in your class with an assignment, consult with your instructor. They are there to support you!

Helpful links:
- What is AI?
- WSU Student Code of Conduct
- How to cite AI
- AI Literacy, or Why Understanding AI Will Help You Everyday

AI continues to evolve and stay tuned for future announcements, policies, etc. about AI.