

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE  
August 8, 2022

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; J. Fitzgibbon; J. Lewis; N. Rossi; B. Roth; S. Schrag; N. Simon; R. Villarosa

Absent with Notice: M. Kornbluh

Guests: B. Baltes (AVP); C. Knapp (Assist. Prof. Teaching); R. Pineau (Assoc. Prof. Teaching)

I. Factors for Teaching Faculty

AVP Boris Baltes and Assistant Professor of Teaching Christine Knapp joined the Policy Committee for a second discussion of Teaching Factors. Beale introduced the discussion by noting that the Policy Committee had held an initial discussion of the 2N committee's recommended document several weeks ago, in which members noted the problems that ensued from starting with the P&T factors policy for tenure-track faculty that has not been updated in some time. Because that policy is both disorganized and unclear, Policy had noted that adopting that same framework results in a document that will likely make the promotion process more difficult for the teaching faculty. The earlier meeting also recognized a need to make clear that the document specifically applies to faculty in the teaching faculty track (formerly lecturers and senior lecturers) and does not apply to clinical educators or research faculty. As agreed at the earlier PC meeting, this meeting with AVP Baltes and Prof. Knapp (co-chairs of the 2N committee set up to discuss teaching factors) was arranged to discuss a suggested revision that would reorganize with section headings to make it easy to find information, with a few substantive additions, including a definition of the applicable faculty, a broader statement of evaluative information (SETs, letters or other comments from individual students or former students, peer evaluations, whether or not done systematically within the department, including a statement about awareness of potential genderism, ageism, racism and other biases that may enter into such evaluations), and a requirement for at least one letter external to the university. Beale noted that the Policy document was shared early so that members could read it closely and expressed concern that nonetheless there was a separate meeting between Baltes, Knapp and Aubert followed by the highly unusual step of Aubert as Union liaison sending a new document to the Policy Committee members. Aubert responded that she had shared their updated draft in order to facilitate discussion, not to supplant the Policy document. Beale noted that factors documents have long been considered a product of shared governance, with discussions at Policy including the Union president for university-level documents, rather than negotiated documents. The Policy document distributed with the agenda used most of the same substantive points as the 2N recommended document, but it was reorganized in a way to ensure they are very clear for candidates going up for promotion.

Knapp noted that the 2N document was based on the tenure-track factors due to the timeline (the work was started in January and intended to be finalized in July). The 2N committee reviewed ten other peer and non-peer institutions, all of which had factors established similar to their tenure-track factors. The committee thought it made sense to keep it as parallel as possible to what we have for tenure-track faculty. Knapp agrees that the current tenure-track factors policy does need to be restructured—the suggestions made by Policy are all valid. But she thinks having an organization that is different from the tenure-track policy would make it harder to piece things together in the future. Lewis commented that she had read both documents and saw improvements over the original 2N document in the revised document Aubert sent, which she suggested Policy review. Beale responded that the Provost had specifically asked for Policy's evaluation of the 2N document and reminded members that the Union members and Board had been informed that the 2N committee was not established as a negotiating committee but rather a recommending committee. Since factors discussions have in the past originated through shared governance, Beale indicated she would welcome hearing any substantive concerns about the Policy document, putting aside for the most part the question of structure. Clearly, what document the administration decides to promulgate will not be Policy's decision.

Aubert noted the importance of following the tenure-track faculty factors document because there will be a 3N committee (administrative, Senate, and Union) looking at that document this academic year. Establishing a new structure would be to take initiative outside of that committee. Baltes agreed that changes to the tenure track factors policy structure can be incorporated into the factors later. Beale responded that it seems unreasonable to produce a new document using the ambiguous, poorly worded and disorganized form from the existing tenure-track document: to do so essentially reinforces that disorganized format, especially since it should be easier to make changes to accommodate the 3N final product from a well-organized document than from one that incorporates the old document's negative features.

Simon asked what the composition will be of the committees that determine teaching faculty promotions. Baltes said that all departments and non-departmentalized schools/colleges that have at least three or more non-tenure track faculty will have at least one non-tenure-track faculty on the departmental or school/college P&T committee. Beale asked for clarification whether any non-tenure-track professor could serve—i.e., is the idea that a non-tenure-track clinical professor would satisfy the requirement and not require a teaching faculty representative? Baltes indicated that would be acceptable under the Letter of Agreement with the Union. He added that past promotions of non-tenure track faculty (clinical and research) have gone through in a situation for which there was no non-tenure-track representation on the P&T committee at the department, college, or university level. Now, the departmental (and non-departmentalized school/college) committee will have someone, at least, from the non-tenure-track clinical, teaching or research faculty represented. Simon noted that until a separate academic staff P&T committee was established, academic staff promotions tended to be denied under standards normally applicable to faculty rather than reasonable standards for academic

staff, so she asked whether teaching faculty would be permanently added to the university P&T committee. Baltes responded that whether there will be a change for the university P&T Committee is part of the discussions that the 3N committee will have this fall: the university committee remains now as tenured faculty. Villarosa noted these issues were discussed in the contract negotiations as well.

Having sat on the department, school (School of Medicine or SOM), and university committees and being a tenured clinical faculty member (but not always tenured), Rossi said she can appreciate this from multiple sides. If you look at the criteria being discussed for teaching faculty, those factors look almost parallel to those of clinician educators. At the school level SOM has both clinician-educators non-tenure track on the committee and research-educator tenure-track/tenured on the committee: when it comes to vote, only tenured research-educator track faculty can vote on tenure for the research educator track—and they can also vote on the non-tenure research track. But clinician-educators, who are very parallel in terms of the requirements that are being put forth for teaching faculty, can only vote at their rank or below for promotion of the non-tenured tracks. She thinks this has been working well, since by having representation on the committee with non-tenured people, there is somebody there to help people understand the factors that are different along non-tenured lines. The caveat is some of those on the non-tenured track are reluctant to speak their minds. This should be a place where people can speak their minds collegially and respectfully.

Aubert also commented on the timeline, since this is the first teaching faculty factors policy at the university level. Once the university policy is established, the schools/colleges and departments will develop specific factors for teaching faculty. That already means the earliest possibility for teaching faculty to receive promotion raises will be two years from now. There is an urgency to get the university policy in place so the departments and colleges can establish their local factors. Fitzgibbon added that some schools/colleges and departments already have files and procedures in place. Villarosa agreed but noted a likely need for reaffirmation of processes. Beale stated that a well-organized and clear policy at the university level will make it easier in many ways for schools/colleges and departments to do that.

Beale suggested the group comment on specific categories of information. She noted that the prior Policy discussion had noted the importance of making clear specifically to whom the document applied as well as stating, as noted as a problem of concern especially for SOM, categories of faculty to whom the document will not apply. Rossi agreed that without a clear statement the policy would cause confusion in terms of promotion and tenure. The clinician educators have the same requirements for external evaluators as tenured/tenure-track faculty: no internal evaluators are permitted. They are, however, permitted on this document for teaching faculty. Knapp responded that the Baltes-Aubert-Knapp meeting had agreed to add a broader definition since the teaching faculty ranks are defined in the collective bargaining agreement, but they opted not to include any specific distinction so as not to miss anyone. Rossi noted that the description for teaching faculty is almost identical to that for clinical educators in medicine, so

clarification is needed about those excluded to avoid hard feelings among SOM faculty and safeguard accreditation processes.

Beale then asked for comments about the evaluation section. She said one of the problems with using the current university tenure-track/tenured policy framework here is that people who have not gone through that process may have trouble understanding how this works. She noted that the Policy revision had moved from the application section to the evaluators section the information on how candidates suggest evaluators, suggesting there is a strong argument for having all the information about the evaluators be quite clear, especially in terms of conflicts of interest and the ability to propose and strike names. Keeping those two pieces in the ultimate version will make it easier for the teaching candidates to understand how it works. Beale also asked for Policy members' comments about the evaluator list and the wording in the 'Standing in the Field', 'Rank' and 'Objective Assessment' sections.

Beale noted in particular the disagreement with the 2N result regarding the issue of external letters. In the last discussion there was a strong view that there should be at least one external letter (external from WSU) and that it would not be hard to obtain because there are other places that could be asked that have teaching faculty, and of course tenured faculty could also be asked to evaluate teaching. Beale noted that having at least one external letter will increase credibility with the tenured faculty. Knapp said this was discussed at length in the 2N committee and there was concern about a requirement for an external letter for teaching faculty: most are not attending conferences and presenting research or don't have publications so their name doesn't get out there. Many don't know who they would suggest as a name of someone external. She suggested that people at Wayne State will know better what a portfolio looks like in terms of service or if someone is on Academic Senate that is a considerable amount of work—they will know things that other people and other institutions might not necessarily know. The 2N committee decided to keep it internal, though the Baltes-Aubert-Knapp meeting changed it to having external letters be "strongly recommended". Lewis expressed a similar concern that much of what teaching faculty do is internally facing, making it harder for an external person to judge teaching. Rossi shared that she has read poor letters from external reviewers who have received no information on which to evaluate teaching—not even the teaching grid, so it will be important to *provide information* to evaluators so they can judge the teaching, including syllabi, PowerPoints or other materials developed for a class, evaluations, and information on the volume of teaching—i.e., any of the information that goes into the file to support the person for promotion based on excellence in teaching. Fitzgibbon added that it will be easy in some fields to get evidence of service and teaching, whereas perhaps others will struggle. Roth stated that it is valuable to have some sense of external participation so that people are thought of as significant in their field, but imposing these requirements across the board when there are circumstances where it will be difficult to get an external letter suggests keeping it at "strongly recommended." Aubert added that she considers Wayne State to be leading in defining teaching faculty and the process of promotion: there are non-tenure track faculty everywhere, but the processes are just being developed. She prefers that external letters be strongly recommended rather than required. Beale suggested evidence for external

evaluators is not hard to provide: handouts/PowerPoints used in classes, syllabi, student commentary, peer review, presentations, even video recordings of classes (more likely with Zoom now)—all the evidence that a candidate would provide under the factors to be promoted can be provided to external evaluators. Not requiring an external letter seems especially problematic for two reasons: 1) it suggests that the evidence being presented on behalf of the candidate will not be good enough that an external person could recognize it as satisfying the standards and 2) it may lead to/reinforce a tendency of tenured faculty to treat teaching faculty as second-class citizens, something that lecturers have sometimes experienced in the past. For tenure-line faculty, Lewis noted the teaching portfolio is reviewed by internal committees and the other parts are reviewed by external reviewers, which points to the deeply contextual nature of teaching, and she suggested valuing internal reviewers for teaching might elevate the important work of teaching and responsiveness to the local community. She supported the letters being internal, noting that some teachers don't write their own syllabi. Knapp said a comparison table of some peer institutions was presented to the administration and none of them had a requirement for external evaluation letters, only external to the department.

Knapp noted that comments about SET were not addressed because it is currently being revamped, and public scholarship was added to the revisions because they did not feel that it moved too far away from the tenure-track guidelines. Beale pointed out that long-term Policy discussions with the provost's office had led to an agreement to have anti-bias caveats about SETs included in as many policy documents as possible. Including SETS but not acknowledging the potential biases or that faculty often get positive letters from students commenting after the fact that they are not encouraged to include as evidence of their teaching seems problematic. Peer reviews that colleges do when they are looking at promoting people could be termed 'not done systematically' because they are not done for everybody, and yet they are usually very thoughtful peer reviews of teaching. This is one of the places where teaching faculty can make a push for inclusion of the kinds of evidence of teaching that counts because if the policy does not mention it, people will be reluctant to include it. A letter from a student would be discounted when in fact those post-graduate (and often post-graduation) letters are sincere and thoughtful evaluations upon reflecting back on the experience. Lewis suggested peer review and student letters are not "systematic" so do not provide a reliable picture of quality of teaching, but perhaps the document could include language about these items that supplement systematic reviews of teaching. Beale commented on the long history of research and Policy discussions regarding the fact that SETs seem to be more popularity contests than factual evaluations, are statistically poor (negative views more readily presented; many students do not respond for various reasons; averages across disciplines meaningless, etc.) and are inappropriate to use without some understanding of the potential gender, age, attractiveness, easiness of course, and other biases. It is important, from a fairness perspective, that the factors include other means of evaluation for teaching faculty that may in fact be *more* reliable. Roth explained the big problem with teaching faculty is that they seem to be much more likely to be assigned the kinds of courses that students take under duress where students are likely to rate the teacher poorly in SETs. Lewis suggested an insertion about bias could be added as an overall statement of various modes of evaluation—SET is not the only instrument or form of evaluation

that suffers. Beale agreed that all these forms of evaluation should be considered in the context of the fact that they may reflect these biases (though SETs are the most likely to do so). Knapp explained that the guidelines include examples. Beale strongly recommended having a paragraph that lists the kinds of evidence a candidate could present regarding evaluation and includes a clear caveat that will caution as to the demonstrated biases of SETs and possibly other forms of evaluation.

## II. Academic Integrity

Associate Professor of Teaching Richard Pineau joined the meeting to review the academic integrity module in detail and encouraged Policy members to provide feedback. Pineau provided a document that includes the different types of misconduct as amended to include additional definitions (collusion, contract cheating, other category, and changes to the definition of the unauthorized reuse of coursework). He wanted to include this information in the syllabus template that is available for all instructors and has discussed this with AVP Darin Ellis who agreed that the template needs a full revision. Beale questioned if the idea was to provide a link to the definitions or include them in syllabus. Pineau said it is in his syllabus because he was instructed to include them. Students really need this information, but Beale's concern was that students will not read it on an already full syllabus. Rossi asked if students are told about this at orientation. Simon responded that it depends on schools, colleges, and departments. This was one of the reasons that Policy had originally suggested it be included in the Wayne Experience courses.

Pineau discussed moving the academic integrity lesson into a Canvas module. Many different groups have reviewed the module and provided feedback—most of which was positive. For the module to be posted to the resource page for instructors, the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) first had to review it and offer their feedback. Pineau reached out to Tonya Whitehead, Associate Director of OTL, who provided two stages of OTL feedback. The four takeaways from OTL were: 1) the language in the module seemed adversarial and appeared to have been put together by a “disgruntled faculty member”; 2) they wanted direction to be provided on how faculty could facilitate use of the module (Pineau, however, stated he is unwilling to invest time into putting together instructions until there is consensus about the resource); 3) the module should be more “open minded and student centered” in the presentation; 4) OTL seemed to be blaming faculty rather than students for any student academic misconduct. Pineau noted that OTL did a video series on academic misconduct earlier this year that was focused on faculty creating better assessments and better assignments—rather than helping faculty help students to understand why academic integrity is important. He explained that he reached out to three former students for feedback on the Canvas module and none of them mentioned the tone of the module as being a problem (student #3, for example, suggested a few procedural tweaks but gave very positive feedback).

Pineau shared the Canvas module on the screen to review with Policy members. He pointed out the outline was a lesson proposal for Wayne Experience courses but he wanted to have a conversation with the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC)

to be more inclusive of all general education courses: the module is for all instructors, regardless of discipline. When asked if the module is done in class or online, Pineau explained the instructor can use it however they want (in class, printed out, or as an online module). He pointed out that he is doing an in-person pilot lesson for Warriors 360 this week. Fitzgibbon commented that we also need something for the transfer students because academic integrity isn't discussed during the transfer student orientation. Regarding the definitions of types of misconduct, Aubert suggested there may be some generic language at CFPCA specific to creative production that could also be included, because often times plagiarism is thought of as just being words.

Beale asked Policy members if they saw anything in the module that could be described as disgruntled and negative. Lewis commented that the module was “fabulous” and a good resource for anybody. She did not think the tone was scolding, but she suggested finding places to address OTL concerns while maintaining the integrity of the module. Roth recommended putting front and center the idea that consulting with faculty is key. If a student is behind and in trouble, the absolute worst thing to do is to take this kind of short cut. Roth related his experience in teaching courses that he does not regard as performing a “gatekeeping” function, and where he is accordingly lenient in providing extensions and other forms of flexibility. He takes it personally when students try to deceive, since they had the opportunity to be up-front. He pointed out, however, that some instructors have justifiable reasons to be far less lenient, and their inflexibility in no way renders them blameworthy for their students' dishonesty. Beale commented that all the material here is well stated and certainly does not come across as produced by a “disgruntled faculty member”. She agreed with Roth that it might be helpful to add something at the beginning that emphasizes the importance of working with faculty and understanding the assignments and how faculty want you to succeed, as well as the value of adhering to academic integrity concepts—a value that will apply to professional roles after graduation as well. Roth added that no question is a stupid question, but often people don't want to ask because it may seem like they have in mind to cheat, or they simply feel stupid asking. He recommended it be made clear that they should ask if they have any doubt.

Pineau explained that if there remains a difference of opinion between what OTL feels a module on academic integrity should have and Pineau's view (presented to Policy with their feedback in mind), perhaps OTL should provide several different options for instructors, who can decide which approach they wish to use. Lewis emphasized that she is not advocating for being softer on misconduct but on building relationships, faculty being approachable, and the student experience—these are higher values to serve students in the end. Pineau's impression of the OTL feedback is they want a softer approach. Lewis suggested instead that their concern was student growth and empowerment; perhaps there is a better way to present the information to students with user-based design. Roth pointed out the sentence in the OTL response that suggests an OTL inclination to blame instructors for their students' misconduct: “No amount of explaining academic integrity will eliminate the problem if faculty continue to create very high stakes assignments and don't provide opportunities to resubmit or scaffold to begin with.” Roth noted that this displaces responsibility in an inappropriate way and is

reflective of a mentality that should be pushed back against—that it is the faculty members who are letting themselves in for students lying and cheating when they establish high standards. Lewis stated that she no longer gives assessments that students can possibly cheat on: cheating is endemic to the work of teaching, so if there are high stakes, people will cheat, and that is a problem. Roth countered that an open topic research paper is a sine qua non in many courses, because it demonstrates a student’s capacity to deal with subject matter beyond the scope of the assigned materials. Nonetheless students can cheat on that sort of assignment. Simon commented that going to school is to learn, including things you don’t like: students must learn there are rules whether they like them or not. Beale added that OTL does come across as wanting to make it easier for students in their feedback to Pineau: she was concerned about the way OTL seems to be saying that student supporting means not being demanding or having high standards.

Beale suggested that Policy send a memo to Pineau expressing appreciation for his two presentations to Policy, support for the module he has worked to develop and the extensive consultation he has undertaken. The memo should also add two comments regarding points to make at the beginning of the module: 1) a positive statement of why understanding academic integrity is important as an ethical exploration for students that will serve them in their coursework and also in their future professions and 2) emphasis on talking with faculty first if students are ever uncomfortable with knowing whether something would or would not be a problem. Policy members agreed, so Beale will draft a memo and circulate to the committee for comments/edits before finalizing.

### III. Approval of the Policy Committee Proceedings of July 18

The proceedings of the July 18, 2022 Policy Committee meeting were approved via email.

### IV. Report from the Senate President

Resignation: Paul Beavers has taken an interim associate dean position and submitted his Academic Senate resignation letter.

### V. Communications and Required Actions

#### A. Academic Senate Plenary Agenda for September Meeting

The committee discussed the draft agenda for the September plenary. It will include the Policy election, a poll on in person or Zoom plenary sessions, the president’s state of the university address, Chief Health Officer Clabo’s update on campus health plans, and possibly a BOG member introduction (Terry Lynn Land has been contacted but has not confirmed). Lewis suggested making time for new business even with this busy agenda, so Beale will ask the president to speak for 20 minutes instead of 30 minutes.