

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE

April 29, 2024

Present: D. Aubert; L. Beale; S. Chrisomalis; L. Clabo; D. Donahue; r. hoogland; P. Khosla; N. Rossi; B. Roth; S. Schrag

Absent with Notice: J. Lewis

Guest: Richard Pineau, Chair, ad hoc AI subcommittee

I. SENATE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON AI REPORT

The goal of the Senate ad hoc AI subcommittee is to make educational policy recommendations for the Senate to consider and urge either the provost, deans or the Board of Governors (BOG) to incorporate in formal policy. Pineau provided a background on the committee, acknowledging members Stephanie Chastain (CLAS), renée hoogland (CLAS), Bob Reynolds (ENG) and David Moss (Law) for their work this academic year. The committee's work is certainly not finished. There was a planning meeting last August. In October, Pineau completed the CourseHero "Teaching with AI" online course and issued a report on that experience that was shared at the December plenary.

Pineau and various committee members have met with groups including the Student Senate, Academic Senate committees, Department of Mathematics, Office of Teaching and Learning's (OTL) AI Teaching Circle, academic advisors, librarians, Council of Undergraduate Administrators, Teacher Education faculty and medical school clinicians. They also will conduct a training for academic advisors on practical uses for advisors, but will update them on matters of which they should be aware as they interface with students. Pineau met with AVP & Chief HR Officer Carolyn Hafner, who would also like them to meet with HR staff to discuss issues around AI use.

Linda Beale asked about the meeting with OTL. Pineau reported they had seemed less "pro AI," having realized some of the concerns that exist. He delivered the welcoming remarks at the AI luncheon hosted by OTL last week. This year they are hosting the teaching circle, which brings together a large group of tenured and teaching faculty to talk about how to use these tools in the classroom and to build policies. The problem with many of the webinars and sessions about AI is that they lack specifics. For example, they suggest using AI in the classroom to make a lesson plan, and then they move on to the next thing without demonstrating what to do. What is the iterative process? Practice entering in prompts is needed because it takes thought in order to get the output you want, and that piece is often missing.

The *first recommendation* of the committee deals with the question of whether AI is trustworthy. The committee has serious reservations because of the drawbacks to these AI tools: members are not convinced that we should take the position of being a pro-AI institution. We should be cautious about how we think about these AI tools, what the capabilities are, what the policies are, addressing privacy concerns, and similar issues. Pineau noted that CIO Rob Thompson indicated the university is considering the possibility of developing its own AI tool, similar to what other institutions have done. That work has entered the brainstorming phase, including a member of the Facility Support Services and Technology (FSST) Committee. If we have our own AI tool,

we can regulate it, train it and house it. Obviously, this will require resources and a clear understanding of its capability and limitations.

Assuming it is a large language model (LLM) or an image-producing model, Steve Chrisomalis asked whose data would be used to train the AI and what the goal of the program would be. ChatGPT claims to be a generalized LLM because it is trained on such a wide range of data that it merely scoops off the web without any licensing or other acknowledgment of sourcing. It is unlikely that Wayne State has access to data of the same scope as Google or Microsoft. Pineau indicated that the goal is to have an AI tool regulated and controlled by the university. One use might be an app that students can question to help them navigate university information (e.g., application deadlines, office locations). There might also be uses for data analysis; however, this poses problems since analysis will be biased depending on training sources.

It is Provost Clabo's understanding that the intent is to have a broader group explore the pros, cons, capacity and cost of university development. Our own plagiarism checker would provide greater control. U-M already uses their own system to give faculty a greater sense of control over their work. Thompson is merely at the point of considering exploration. It is important to have the right people at the table for that discussion about investing in our own system. Chrisomalis noted there may be researchers for whom this is an integral part of their research: is it clear that C&IT should be taking this on as an administrative research idea?

Beale noted that former interim VPR Tim Stemmler and she met with several people who had come in as "big data" faculty. They wanted to establish a CIAC-I center to consider big data and AI. That would be grant-supported, interdisciplinary research. It is not clear that C&IT creating a modular bolt-on to Banner would work. Beale suggested that Policy follow up on this at a later meeting.

The *second recommendation* in the report addresses privacy and security concerns. Faculty, academic staff and students often pay no heed to software terms of service and so are oblivious to what they are giving up when agreeing to these terms in order to access the software. We do not know fully what is being tracked, where this data is being stored or how it is being used. Education on this matter for the entire Wayne State community is important.

Noreen Rossi asked whether HIPAA privacy issues had been discussed: both students and faculty could inadvertently breach privacy in using AI. It takes very little to overstep. Pineau responded that conversations with clinicians, Teacher Education and other departments have centered on developments in AI and how those groups are using AI. They acknowledge that they must consider many issues, including HIPAA, in building policies. The units must determine what to do in terms of their curriculum, policies and admissions procedures so that these concerns are addressed. They are welcome to request the committee's guidance on that. Rossi indicated she would urge departments in Medicine to seek the committee's help. There are different venues where people advocate for use of AI in the School of Medicine: it can be a useful tool, but most do not appear cognizant of how easily privacy issues and HIPAA violations can occur. Pineau added the other challenge is staying current on what is considered private information because the HIPAA laws can change.

Beale noted this is a university-wide issue regarding how to educate students, faculty and staff about these concerns. Are there mechanisms that already exist that can be used for this purpose? Has the committee come up with a suggestion for how best to target some of those audiences that need to be targeted about these AI concerns? Hoogland explained that it behooves faculty to understand the privacy concerns and protect students against privacy violations. If faculty require

or allow students to use AI, they should make their students aware of the privacy issues involved. The question is whether faculty are willing to take the responsibility for asking their students to use an AI app and run the risk of privacy breaches.

Anecdotally, Pineau taught discrete math in the fall semester and originally intended for his students to take a proposition, pick out an AI tool in which they would enter that proposition, then bring back to class the outputs for a class conversation. When he took the CourseHero class in October, the first assignment was to pick two AI tools and try them out. Among the questions he had to answer was what the terms of use are. It was the first time he ever read the terms of service. The AI tool he chose was Google's Bard (now called Gemini), and he had to agree to it tracking his browsing history, location by IP address and responses, among other things. He realized there is no way he could subject his students to agreeing to this, and ultimately changed the assignment. He was not sure how he would have handled the situation if a student would not have agreed to sign on to the terms. Can he force them? This semester he talked about AI tools with his stats students. He asked how many were familiar with ChatGPT, and nearly every hand went up. He then asked how many had used this tool, and the same hands remained up. Finally, he asked how many had read the terms of service and understood the information that would be tracked, and only one hand went up. They had no idea what is being tracked when they use ChatGPT.

U-M offers ChatGPT through the university, so individuals do not have to purchase it to avoid discrimination and disparity among students in class. It is not clear when students access ChatGPT through the university whether each individual is still subject to the same tracking. In Pineau's conversations with Thompson, any time the university purchases software, General Counsel has to review it so U-M's general counsel would have reviewed the terms of service. But how they have educated their community about that is another question.

The *third recommendation* is the impact of AI on curriculum. This is where the committee has more work to do over the next academic year, assuming that the Policy Committee wants the ad hoc group to continue. Faculty are already using AI, but there are a number of concerns around online classes and exams. Faculty may want to reconsider doing take-home exams in an age of AI assistance. Chrisomalis noted that for the humanities and social sciences papers are also an issue. It is not realistic for the student to produce written work in person and not connected to the internet. He is dismayed with the inability to use the Student Code of Conduct when there are obvious cases of students using AI for assignments, such as happened with one of his graduate students. Absent a confession, it is hard to proceed because AI detection does not exist at the level of satisfying a standard of proof. The paper-writing courses will be unwilling to cease requiring papers, though there may be a few individual instructors who decide to move away from that kind of assignment. We need real solutions for handling a class that requires deep, sustained thought over a period of weeks or months to produce written work. Chrisomalis does have an AI statement in his class and does an exercise to show his students how bad AI is at hallucinating answers to obvious questions; nonetheless, a student still resorted to AI and as professor, he had no recourse. None of the possible responses would have affected the outcome of that case.

Pineau acknowledged that difficulty, and he does not have an easy answer. There are suggestions on additional structures that faculty can put in place that add work for faculty, which is also problematic. Eric Ash, a professor of history and chair of the department, is part of OTL's teaching circle: he has been equally frustrated teaching an online asynchronous course and trying to prevent students from using AI. It is easy to tell students not to do it and to have them sign statements, but that only goes so far. Chrisomalis could have failed his student on that

assignment, but the student has the right to appeal, and then it goes to the chair. Does the chair have enough evidence to support the faculty member or to support the student? Administrators also need education about dealing with this. Pineau spoke with Dean of Students David Strauss about the need for a body of knowledge and precedent on these issues.

Danielle Aubert tends to think everything is AI. One of her students turned something in that was not about the subject assigned, so she accused the student of using AI, but the student had a plausible reason. Rossi noted data that shows when people have actually written something themselves, putting it through the plagiarism checker says that they did not write it half the time—especially if the piece uses good grammar. The AI detection tools are simply unreliable. Pineau tested samples written by AI: detection software said half were written by the student.

The committee has a lot more work to do with regard to the impact of AI on curriculum, especially with take-home exams and qualifying exams in take-home format. Pineau suggested that the Teacher Education faculty rethink these issues or at least provide guidelines for what is construed as appropriate use of AI and what is not, so it is made clear in the syllabus language. hoogland had an issue this semester where the syllabus says AI tools are prohibited, but students think that means generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT, Gemini). They do not consider grammar checking tools (e.g., Grammarly, Quillbot, which are a form of AI), so faculty will have to be more specific in their syllabus language.

The *fourth recommendation* is educating our campus community about AI and especially about the privacy and data sharing concerns. Veronica Bielat (University Libraries) had suggested a colloquium talk on AI and privacy for students and for faculty and staff. We are all generally ignorant about what we give up when agreeing to the terms of service. There are no standard terms, so it is important to ensure that people become aware of this problem. Faculty also need to communicate their specific expectations about AI use to students. Detection tools remain an issue and we need some kind of precedent for these. Are there examples of circumstances or past misconduct issues that faculty could use for reference to understand what is going on to help make an informed decision on whether to file charges?

Pineau pointed out academic integrity has been missing from most of the conversations. It is one of the institution's values, yet it is not as prominent as it should be. Clabo noted there are schools and colleges where the university's mission, vision and values, including academic integrity, are posted in at least two locations on every floor of the building, but it depends on the department. She acknowledged that the websites should be better in addressing this. Perhaps we should also put the mission, vision and values in the elevators. Beale agreed: you see College-to-Career everywhere, but you do not see academic integrity everywhere. Rossi noted we tend to focus on students, but integrity also applies to faculty jobs in terms of reviewing manuscripts and new grants and contracts for plagiarism. There is a problem because once you put something on a plagiarism checker, it goes into the cloud and may no longer be confidential. When she brought this up at the NIH study section, it had a chilling effect. They had not thought about that.

Pineau noted the need for academic integrity to play a larger role in new student orientation. There is also potential to tie it in with the Wayne Experience course that is currently suspended. The Faculty Affairs Committee had suggested using orientation to put a greater focus on academic integrity rather than waiting for a new Wayne Experience course to reemerge. Beale noted discussion about having some orientation-related topics extending beyond the first week in the fall semester, with a particular focus on AI and academic integrity. hoogland agreed a longer orientation period would be beneficial, adding several of the elements from the Wayne Experience course into that time period.

So far, human resources and admissions have not reported applicants using AI; however, Teacher Education reported some AI use on writing samples. At the forefront of this, we need to provide guidelines for applicants (i.e., what is appropriate use and what is not appropriate use of AI). Pineau referred to an instance where at the end of an online job application there was a question about using AI in any way to fill out or help you fill out any aspect of this application. When he suggested adding this to our applications, academic advisors were reluctant because it might turn students off from applying. There was also concern that if a student indicated they did use AI, they may be disqualified from the program. This is something around which a full discussion must be had to determine university policy.

For graduate admissions, Chrisomalis pointed out that the personal statement is an issue. He also noted an issue in foreign language testing because most TOEFL testing is internet based, and Duolingo is solely internet based. Use of AI to “take” the test is difficult to catch, but it is indeed happening. The TOEFL spoken component is least amenable to that AI scam, because the person must speak into a system. It is a red flag when students have three high scores but a low speaking score.

AI support must be considered if an AI tool is integrated into Canvas. There needs to be faculty and academic staff buy-in, support and discussions. We need clear guidance on the vetting process, implementation and support of these tools. Pineau shared how a Pearson rep slipped a flyer under his door offering an AI-powered study tool. He sent a long list of questions to the publisher. Based on the response, he is not convinced this is something that we want. We have to be careful because these integrated tools and courseware are being marketed as a convenience to faculty. AI tutoring is a concern: if a student is having difficulty in the class, they should talk to their instructor rather than resorting to an AI tool.

The *final recommendation* is around future work. The committee would like to further explore the impact of AI on DEI as well as on research. The committee is not aware of what the president’s AI committee for research has been doing, and would like more information on that work being done. On the curriculum side, the committee wants to know what faculty and staff are doing or not doing, and what their concerns are regarding AI. Do we need to do anything differently regarding availability of AI (e.g., assessments, teaching)? There was a question about assistive technology that might include AI, especially for students with disabilities, and what the implications would be for instructors.

The report has a number of other areas that the committee would like to work on as well. Pineau concluded with the need to continue the work. He recommended this report be shared with faculty and academic staff, and the user guides go out to students as well.

Beale noted on a related matter that Policy will discuss the Curriculum and Instruction Committee’s suggested changes to the Student Code of Conduct at an upcoming meeting, and then determine who it should be shared with before it comes before the full plenary, or act in the summer as the executive committee to then send it to the provost and BOG if it needs to be in place before the start of the semester.

II. APPROVAL OF POLICY PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of the April 22, 2024 Policy Committee were approved as revised.

III. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Student protest at BOG meeting: Clabo discussed the protest at the April BOG meeting and provided some context. Many people saw disturbing videos, and the action of the WSU Police Chief Holt and other officers moving students out of the meeting. The student with the microphone said, "we are taking over this meeting." There were two egress doors, one at the front and one at the back. Students blocked egress with their bodies, arms linked. It took two police officers to force the door open to allow egress. The same thing happened at the back of the room. There was at that point, in the judgment of Wayne State Police, a threat to safety for those in room.

Another important part of context is that the person who was arrested, ticketed and then released was not a Wayne State student, but an OCC student. He was detained for actions that he took as he was being moved out. The police must do an after-action report after an incident that involves contact with civilians, and that is ongoing. That was a disturbing day for anyone who was in the room or outside the room. What started as a vocal and peaceful protest became something different at one point in the professional opinions of officers there.

Clabo noted that one WSU student, who is a leader of Students for Justice in Palestine, spoke passionately during the public comment. She is also a member of the Student Senate and sat at Clabo's table at the Student Senate annual banquet on Saturday night. She is passionate about the issue, and Clabo is proud of Khan and supports her right to protest. When it comes to people from the outside inciting bad behavior, or an interaction that has the potential to threaten the safety of the people in the room, it is a different story.

Beale witnessed the incident when one of the large officers removed four female Muslim students, noting that it could have been handled better. There should have been a clear, loudspeaker announcement that the protesters must quit blocking the exits and a time period given for that to happen, else police would have to move the protesters out. After the time period, there should have been a clear loudspeaker announcement that the police would now move protesters out of the room, which also did not happen. Beale also noted her view that it was a mistake for the Board to decide in executive session not to consider divestment. It would have been easy enough for them to agree to put it on the agenda (for the June meeting, for example) and hold a public discussion of the pros, cons and difficulties of determining how to invest with a social conscience. Even if the ultimate conclusion were not to divest, it would have demonstrated a responsible approach to consideration of the moral underpinnings of the university's investments. Clabo noted that the Board had responded to the Student Senate's fall BDS resolution in a letter that was posted shortly after the BDS resolution was promulgated: the letter simply says that they discussed the idea but will not divest.

Preparing for interruptions at commencement: Clabo will send a message to families to expect minor disruptions at commencement. The following items are not allowed in the fieldhouse: signs on sticks or poles, banners and sound amplifying devices (i.e., megaphones). If such disruptions occur, the people using those items will be asked to leave.

Policy members discussed that the point of protest is to be disruptive in some sense, and that we have to rely on the police to make the best judgments about what that is. At last year's commencement, there was an unfurling of a flag which was disruptive for about 10 to 15 seconds and that was it. Pramod Khosla is concerned that something as simple as that at this year's commencement will be interpreted negatively and lead to different response.

Chrisomalis questioned Clabo's confidence that WSU Police Chief Anthony Holt and his officers understand the line for reasonable protest and "disruption". Clabo stated her confidence that Chief Holt and his officers understand. Should there be a disruption at commencement, a prepared statement will be read that says something like "you have the right to protest, but you do not have the right to disrupt the ceremony. Thank you for your perspective, and it is time to move on." That prepared statement will be read every time there is a disruption that prevents the flow of the ceremony. Threatening language that makes others feel threatened such as "from the river to the sea" or behavior that impedes the ceremony will cause the speaker/actor to be removed.

Brad Roth pointed out that the phrase "from the river to the sea" does not count as a true threat. That is a matter of law. It is a slogan that people interpret variously, and some people interpret it as having genocidal overtones. Beale agreed it is difficult because there are words that are perceived as hurtful by some individuals, but they do not justify action against individuals using those words. It is problematic if the utterance of "from the river to the sea" is enough to bring out a police response at commencement. Anything that is said will interrupt in some sense, so even the term "interrupt" is probably too mild an incident on which to take an action. It has to actually impede the furtherance of ceremony, and the police need to understand these distinctions. hoogland emphasized that what the police call de-escalation is not necessarily experienced by the public as de-escalation. She feels threatened when she sees five police cars on campus, but the police justify that by claiming it is less likely that incidents will occur when there is a significant police presence. The police need to bear in mind how that show of power is experienced by the public. Roth agreed it serves as a provocation. It is not just that it feels oppressive to people: rather than de-escalating, it can trigger further action. Commencement by its very nature has a greater diversity of people, and emotions run high because of the celebratory nature of the occasion. Rossi noted that could be easily misconstrued, as well. We have to be careful that the excitement is not misinterpreted and shut down.

The police are aware that we are doing things to make this commencement ceremony more celebratory. When the disruption at U-M's convocation ceremony occurred, some people felt frightened and started running and pushing. That is a dangerous cycle. We have sped up the ceremony with taped remarks from the student speaker and the alumni association in order to move them along. The May ceremonies at which honorary degrees are awarded will have an additional speaker. The president shortened her speech, and Clabo trimmed her script. At the end of this ceremony, we will have a less formal recessional: as the platform party comes off the stage, the screen will show visual fireworks, play happy music and the platform party will launch beach balls into the crowd (a graduation tradition at many universities).

Enrollment: Clabo noted we are up in both domestic and international master's registrations for fall though it is too early to be sure of numbers.

IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Title IX regulations: The Title IX regulations are out from the federal government. Beale spoke with General Counsel Mike Poterala briefly at the BOG meeting and agreed to talk over the summer about what changes to policy are required. He must first figure out the process within chief counsel's office.

NFL Draft Parking: Beale commented on the use of the parking structure for the NFL draft. The notice came out late, and it was hard on people who had not seen the notice. On the day of the

Academic Recognition Ceremony, there were many people not associated with Wayne State who tried to park in the staff parking, which they could not access. There was nobody from parking present, and the person on the intercom line was extraordinarily rude, not understanding the difference between the staff parking and the NFL parking. Beale ultimately had to direct several cars to the correct entrance and help an emerita faculty member back up (with the buses almost blocking the way) and go to an entrance that allowed credit card use. The parking staff should have been prepared and had staff at the entrances.

U.S. dollar versus foreign currency interchange values: The U.S. dollar interchange values for 17 countries (including Kenya at the top and Russia) is in a slightly better position in terms of foreign currency translating to U.S. dollars. But for students from Saudi Arabia, Japan, Brazil, Ethiopia, Chile, Turkey, Argentina and Nigeria (23.85%) at the bottom, it will cost even more to translate their currencies into U.S. dollars. Obviously, that will also affect the likely graduate student enrollments from Nigeria. India is barely in a better position (0.1% better).

Lewis-Burke and Associates follow-up documents: Lewis-Burke and Associates met with members of the Academic Senate a few weeks ago, and follow-up documents were emailed to the Senate last week.

Academic Recognition Ceremony: The Academic Recognition Ceremony was heartwarming, and the people who were awarded often had people in their department or area and loved ones who were there cheering for them. Beale was the only person from law in attendance: she did not recall any announcement in the Law School that one of its members would be recognized. The general announcement that went out did not list everybody that was going to be recognized. In the future, deans and chairs should be encouraged to attend, and the announcement that goes out about the ceremony should include the names of people being recognized as an attachment so that people will be more likely to attend to celebrate their colleagues.

V. POLICY COMMITTEE SUMMER MEETING SCHEDULE AND 2024-25 PLENARY DATES

Policy members determined the summer meeting schedule as well as the 2024-25 Academic Senary plenary dates (September 4; October 2; November 6; December 4; February 5; March 5; April 2; May 7).

VI. OTL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO ED TECH

OTL offers subscriptions to several software that they encourage faculty to use and have listed as a university-wide resource. It was brought to Beale's attention that departments and schools will have to pick up the cost of these subscriptions instead of OTL. Clabo agreed to find out what has happened.

VII. DISCUSSION OF NATIONAL RESPONSES TO STUDENT PROTEST MOVEMENTS

Beale discussed the national responses to student protest movements. Obviously, we do not want to be in that national media if we can avoid it. The Columbia president did a poor job at the hearing, and her response to the protests is worrisome. Generally speaking, there seems to be much less willingness to allow student protests than there was in response to the South Africa divestment movement. The Senate should continue thinking about that issue as we move forward. Beale believes it is time for an institution like the Senate to issue a statement about academic freedom. Chrisomalis agreed this is a broader issue about academic freedom, and he

supports a careful, strong, well-written statement in favor of a broad notion of academic freedom that Policy could develop over the summer.

Approved as revised via email on June 25, 2024.