

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
June 27, 2022

Present: L. Beale; P. Beavers; J. Fitzgibbon; M. Kornbluh; J. Lewis; N. Rossi; S. Schrag; N. Simon; R. Villarosa

Absent with Notice: D. Aubert; B. Roth

Guests: D. Bedi, Student Senate Dir. Student Services; T. DiMeglio, Student Senate Dir. P.R.; H. Johnson, Student Senate Parliamentarian; R. Pineau, Assoc. Prof. of Teaching; Y. Zouani, Student Senate President

I. Fall Break Discussion

The Student Senate representatives were welcomed to the Policy meeting to discuss scheduling a proposed fall break beginning in 2023. Kornbluh explained there was a possibility of making this work by starting classes on a Monday instead of a Wednesday, moving the fall convocation to Sunday, and holding FestiFall on the weekend. Linda Beale requested to hear from each of the Student Senate members in attendance regarding their sense of what students in the other schools as well as within the elected body think is viable for them. She explained that Policy had concluded starting classes a week earlier was unworkable, and so were now waiting on the Registrar to lay out the proposed academic calendar starting on a Monday. From an academic standpoint, Beale said they want to avoid losing instructional hours and to prevent odd schedules. Additionally, there were concerns about students' summer earning opportunities being impacted by an earlier start date.

As a resident advisor, Tony DiMeglio said he has spoken with many students—primarily students who live on campus—and many had concerns with starting a week earlier because of summer commitments. He believed starting two days earlier would not cause the same issues because many students will be ready to be on campus: students are already in the school mindset the weekend before classes because many of their peers are attending other institutions like Michigan and Michigan State that begin on Monday. DiMeglio shared his concern about the impact on the attendance of FestiFall, a full day event devoted to student organizations that boosts student involvement on campus, but he believed this to be a reasonable loss in exchange for a fall break. Beale questioned the impact on commuting students' attendance if FestiFall were to be held on a weekend. Naida Simon suggested offering free parking (and free food) to get commuting students to attend on the weekend. There is a cost to the university for the parking lots, however, and Kornbluh explained that every proposal has a free parking request, but parking revenue must be replaced. Villarosa noted that FestiFall is driven by students and their families, and he did not think the falloff on a Sunday would be significant. Holding the New Student Convocation on a Sunday might drive attendance down; however, there were adjustments over the last two years because of Election Day so there is some flexibility.

When researching the fall break initiative, Danishi Bedi said they frequently discussed October being the most hectic time in the fall semester. Unlike the winter semester that has a spring break, the fall semester goes nearly four months without a break. She discovered that eight of the 15 public universities in the state have a fall break and most of them are promoted as a student wellness break. Studies conducted on those campuses indicated mid-October as being the time when most students feel burn out with class exams, projects, and quizzes.

Jennifer Lewis asked the Student Senate members what motivated their requests for this break and what have they heard from other students. Hayden Johnson explained that people are not solely students: many are involved in work and student organizations, so a fall break should alleviate some of the school stress, increasing student morale and overall wellness. DeMiglio said in working with first year residential students he noticed that many would leave campus and go home on Labor Day weekend and the following weekends. He suggested a fall break is needed because many new students are adjusting to campus life and feel overwhelmed. Having a scheduled break to look forward to earlier in the academic calendar than Thanksgiving will be beneficial in helping new students fully align sooner.

Beale asked the students if they conducted any surveys or collected intentional feedback from students in other schools. Bedi responded that there have been informal conversations with peers, and they plan on conducting a formal survey. Rather than

advertising the break as two days of no classes, Johnson suggested the university promote health and wellness activities on campus. Yousra Zouani explained that there is an environment of mental and emotional exhaustion in students coming out of the pandemic, facing a tough economy, and then having to go to class—everyone is working to their max limits. When there are campus activities, she said many students cannot attend because they have class, they have to study, or they are just too exhausted. Having two days off will provide the ability to catch up on what was left behind, to take time off for well-being, and to reduce some of the load many students are experiencing. Zouani argued that many students are not able to find this time and that is the major issue.

After Policy discussions with the provost and registrar, Beale said undergraduate and graduate calendars should not be different and raised the concern about lab courses that have scheduled labs. She asked the students if there have been discussions with graduate students. Bedi said she has discussed this with graduate students in the Senate as well as her sister who is a student in the medical school and it seems like there is a divide in the services being offering to the undergraduate students versus the graduate students. Noreen Rossi explained how the medical school (not graduate school) starts in July, and second year students start in May so trying to align the medical school with any kind of undergraduate break is impractical. Beale added that the medical school has a separate calendar, and the professional schools have accreditation reasons that limit their ability to have a fall break. When asked about formal outreach to the graduate students, Bedi confirmed that only informal conversations have been held and there has been no specific outreach to schools or colleges, but the survey will target every school.

Kornbluh discussed the logistics challenge on even years, because of Election Day, and how Monday and Tuesday off only works on odd number years. On even years, he said we need to find a Tuesday and suggested having only one day off, and on odd years having two days off. Other options include extending the calendar by a day (with the loss of a study day) or making a Wednesday a Tuesday to have an equal number of weekdays. When asked if the students have any sense of these options, DeMiglio acknowledged it may be confusing to read, but preferred changing a Wednesday to a Tuesday. Beale agreed with their preference because it allows for 14 Mondays, Tuesdays, Wednesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays and there is less disruption to the instructional calendar. Kornbluh questioned if there was a problem making a Wednesday a Tuesday because of the lost night of instruction on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving.

Rossi pointed out that there are logistics to consider for classes as well as logistics to consider for wellness and asked the students to consider if these changes will create more pressure at exam time. She recommended they run a few scenarios on the schedule to determine where the pressure points are and consider if it will enhance stress because of compression. Because there is time, a more thoughtful approach will be helpful, and she suggested having focus groups in different schools. Lewis said the university should get away from requirement for 14 instructional days for each weekday, suggesting that instructors should be more thoughtful about use of instructional minutes. Beale thought it would be worthwhile to review the scenarios from Kurt Krushinska (Registrar) and then do separate surveys for students (undergraduate and graduate, not medical school) and faculty in the fall to confirm that the projected schedules can work. She stressed that the faculty do have concerns about the elimination of instructional time, especially in bench sciences with labs, and it would be good to have a survey to provide a chance to express concerns and hear arguments. The group generally agreed that the idea of a calendar with classes beginning on a Monday and a fall break of Monday-Tuesday in October, with classes going through a final Monday (or Tuesday in years that elections result in an additional Tuesday off) would be the most reasonable. Kornbluh said he will find out the date to finalize the calendar.

Beale asked the students if they had any other questions beyond fall break. Villarosa proposed scheduling a meeting with the Student Senate's executive board and Policy Committee to discuss topics determined by the students. Beale agreed to work with Zouani to set up further meetings and thanked the Student Senate members for their time.

II. Academic Integrity

Richard Pineau returned to Policy to provide an update on academic integrity. He provided a background on the Senate discussion of academic integrity over the last five years. The conversation began in the Curriculum and Instruction Committee (CIC) when there were concerns raised by faculty in the College of Engineering about a sanction issued by an instructor that was overturned by the Dean with unclear reasoning. A subcommittee that consisted of members from the CIC, Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC), and Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was created to look at the student code of conduct and to find ways to ensure faculty involvement—especially with appeals and the formal hearing process. Brad Roth took the lead in the subcommittee development of Code of Conduct changes. Out of those conversations, the subcommittee also determined it was important to talk to students about academic integrity.

Pineau took the lead on this, in a process that involved considerable consultation. Two things emerged: i) the creation of a lesson that addresses academic integrity and the consequences of academic misconduct (the document shared with Policy) and ii) the importance of adding that lesson to the Wayne Experience general education courses. Pineau said he taught FYS 1010 the last two fall terms and it seemed like a great opportunity to deliver the discussion as students enter the university as freshmen. During the winter semester, Brad Roth had reached out to the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) whose Co-Chair, Jennifer Hart, indicated they were “not ready” to have that conversation (Pineau was not privy to the full details of that conversation). A few months later, Pineau posted the academic integrity lesson to Canvas and created a module for any instructor to copy and use. Quite a few people reviewed the lesson, including members of Policy, CIC, SAC, FAC, Academy of Teachers, OTL and Veronica Bielat (Student Success Librarian). Bielat indicated to Pineau that Libraries was putting together a research guide about academic integrity and the modules he created could live there. Pineau noted that the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) is currently reviewing the module, so he is awaiting their feedback.

Pineau reached out to Hart about the lesson and requested the opportunity to discuss with the GEOC the possibility of either amending a learning outcome that exists for the Wayne Experience course or including a new one that focuses on academic integrity. Hart rejected the idea outright without discussion with the GEOC, nor did she request to review the lesson outline, the module, or the Canvas course. She indicated that the learning outcomes for the Wayne Experience courses had undergone a revision several years ago, as though that was the definitive response. Pineau pointed out that the new general education requirements had come out only a few years ago, so that did not make sense. In his capacity as chair of the Academy of Teachers (AOT), Pineau had mentioned the apprehension from Hart on behalf of GEOC to examining—or at least considering—the academic integrity discussion, and one of members of the AOT noted the difficulty in changing a learning outcome and related assessments. Pineau pointed out that no one on GEOC has even reviewed the module to see that there are items that assess students understanding of academic integrity and academic misconduct. Hart had also indicated that there were resources listed on the general education website for faculty and suggested that he include the Canvas module there. Hart had indicated that the basic competencies (oral communication, intermediate composition, and basic competence composition) have a learning outcome that is explicit to academic integrity—these were on the handout Pineau provided, showing the basic composition rubric learning outcome two “integrates credible relevant sources in ethical ways”, and from the intermediate composition rubric learning outcome two “uses sources in ethical ways when writing texts”, and oral communication “integrates credible relevant sources in ethical ways”. Pineau indicated these were very narrow and limited to those respective competencies and does not show in any way why academic integrity is important to the university or the discipline. It simply talks about ethics, which is open to interpretation: academic integrity is not listed in learning outcomes, but the idea of good ethics is. He argued that the university needs to get ahead of this problem: the more we talk about academic integrity with students, the less likely they will engage in behavior that leads to violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Pineau intends to reach out to GEOC to try to get on the fall agenda.

Pineau shared an updated list on types of academic misconduct: plagiarism, cheating, fabrication, collusion, contract cheating, and unauthorized reuse of work products. Brad Roth will contact David Strauss (Dean of Students) to update DOSO’s website. Pineau believed these are also listed in article II of the Student Code of Conduct and he was not sure if a BOG vote is needed to add the updated types of academic misconduct. He did believe they are important enough to consider doing so. Beale said she believes examples of academic misconduct are listed in the Student Code of Conduct, but that did not mean more examples can’t be listed. Darin Ellis (Assoc. VP, Academic Affairs) had asked Pineau to update the template syllabus language for the university to include the types of academic misconduct.

Beale agreed with Pineau that this issue was urgent enough to get in front of the problem and believed students don’t fully understand plagiarism. Rossi said she can’t imagine not having it as part of the curriculum—it is not only about academic integrity but also a life lesson for students entering the workforce, regardless of the field. Regarding Brad Roth’s piece on unauthorized reuse of work product, Villarosa asked if this was formally incorporated and an identified form of academic misconduct. The provision is already in the code, and Pineau responded they were playing with the standard syllabus language because they were not happy with the way it was explained. Villarosa explained that if Policy is listing or contemplating listing things that then become something that would cause action of the Student Code of Conduct, he wanted to be sure he had a sense of where unauthorized use of course work was listed and the impact that might have on actual conduct cases. Kornbluh questioned why a student can’t reuse any work done in one class and do what every academic does: rework their own work. He suggested it is a complicated debate and that adding in a very complicated intellectual question about how much revision can be done to one’s own work may go too far. Beale agreed that there are appropriate reuses, but suggested that there are lines that need to be drawn: taking a paper and changing the title to submit it somewhere else and calling it a second publication is unethical, and students should learn that. This issue came up as a result of the number of

instances of students taking a paper they wrote for something else and submitting the same paper. Pineau pointed out that students should have a conversation with their instructor to let the instructor make the judgement call on how much of the paper can be used. Jane Fitzgibbon noted that she handles this by having her students cite to their original work and then provide an update on what additional work has occurred. When students in the past submitted work they had already submitted in other classes, Fitzgibbon required them to redo and add substantially to the paper. She agreed with stressing prior permission from the instructor. Kornbluh understood these issues and believed they are very complicated, arguing if students want to reuse thoughts, they don't need permission. He said it has to do with learning and what type of assignments they have and the materials available and if it is a student's work then they own it—there are lots of learning theory arguments around this and there's no argument around any of the other pieces. Beale disagreed, noting that students own their work, but that doesn't mean that a single work can be submitted for two separate courses to claim double credit for the same work. Kornbluh suggested it was the instructor's responsibility to shape assignments to require new work. Lewis thought the exercise should focus on how to help our students be successful. She noted the importance of including information on academic dishonesty in the syllabus and suggested the issue is endemic to school life. It has to do with some of the contingencies that each professor and instructor needs to deal with: talking openly with students, establishing relationships, setting norms, and showing what good work looks like while supporting students along the way as they do good work. Beavers argued that while faculty are clear about academic integrity, students likely can read statements and still not be certain where lines fall. He questioned whether the Wayne Experience classes have a set written research product or whether that comes later in the curriculum. Pineau responded that FYS 1010 provides study skills as well as the importance of sleep, diet, exercise; there are a number of assignments and discussion boards, but the final product is essentially a toolkit they put together with everything they need to be successful in their first year at WSU. Ironically, there was an issue with one student handing a toolkit to another student taking the class who submitted it as their own. It was caught by an instructor who thought it looked familiar.

Beavers noted that in years gone by, library instructions were sometimes given long before students actually need to use the library for research so the instruction was essentially wasted. Maybe the emphasis on academic integrity should come later in general education classes when students are engaged in those kinds of assignments—not a “one and done” conversation. In the substantial research he has done, Pineau said there are two components to remember: i) how we talk to students about this is important: framing academic integrity from the positive will hopefully foster positive thoughts and lead to better judgement and ii) this cannot be a “one and done” conversation. Without knowing the background all freshmen have had in high school on this topic, it is likely best to plant the seed early. Ideally, every instructor should have the conversation with their students, but clearly we have to do better as a university in our classes to ensure students understand this beyond the first day. Although 14 hours of Wayne Experience class time is not a lot of time, Simon agreed that instructors need to talk about academic integrity because it is important students hear it and keep hearing it.

Pineau added that it is important for instructors to understand the reasons why students engage in academic misconduct and the support they need. Kornbluh added that with technology, students know they are cheating in math but may not know they are cheating in history. Our culture is about repackaging content and they may not know the difference between collusion and assigned work, so this should be done throughout the curriculum. Part is practice but part of it is a very different culture that has moved away from solo work, and he agreed it should be in the basic writing courses. Pineau wanted to be clear that he was not there to mandate a curriculum, but to have this conversation with students about academic integrity in the Wayne Experience courses and throughout their time at the university and the lesson he put together is available as a resource with the ability to tailor the module.

Beale believed Policy needed to review the makeup of the GEOC: it likely is a time for refreshing membership to bring in some new perspectives. While she does not believe in dictating what any professor says, it seems that excluding academic integrity as a covered subject in a course billed to introduce students to what college is all about is a true lost opportunity. Lewis noted that people tend to want everything to go into Gen Ed classes, so it is important to respect the committee's work: perhaps Policy could ask for the typical syllabus for those Wayne Experience classes. Beale noted that the response given to Pineau was not a committee response, but a personal view of one of the co-chairs. Villarosa agreed with the importance of academic integrity's inclusion in the Wayne Experience course, but worried about adding more materials to a full course. Perhaps making the resource available for faculty across campus and a concerted effort to elevate this issue from the faculty side and student side may be a better way to pursue it. Pineau responded that he will pilot this lesson in person in August with the Warrior 360 summer program and will let Policy know how it works with a captive audience of 30 students. Beavers noted the virtues of having these classes to welcome students to campus, so it is important not to lose track of this when talking about first year experience. Beale thanked Pineau for coming and appreciated all the effort he put into this research.

III. Approval of PC Proceedings

The proceedings of June 20 were approved as revised.

IV. Report from the Chair

BOG Meeting: Kornbluh reported that student enrollment numbers for the fall are in the range projected in the budget. Kornbluh also referenced the five-year budget slide created by Dave Massaron (CFO/VP Finance and Business Affairs) that acknowledge the importance of a more significant investment in deferred maintenance. A significant amount will be added into the base budget for deferred maintenance over the next 5 years, which illustrates the depth of challenge the university is facing in recruiting and enrolling students. That is, Massaron has challenged Kornbluh to bring in more revenue because the longer-term outlook is challenged by the needed deferred maintenance. The budget was approved by the BOG with surprisingly little difficulty. Kornbluh reported that the entire BOG is deeply interested in DEI questions. Finally, the BOG has decided to bring two finalist candidates back for consideration for the General Counsel position.

Beale noted the number of unnamed university buildings and suggested attracting donors who will cover some of the renovation for the honor of naming. FP&M has been asked to do the first stage of researching the costs of a new teaching and library building for the law school, which Kornbluh said would rely on substantial philanthropy. The final language has also been worked out for parts of the state budget which includes \$100 million to Wayne State (a public university in a metropolitan area with a population over 500,000) for a building with a non-profit cancer research organization (Karmanos). The CFO believes we can borrow up to \$100M for a total of \$200M towards the \$400-450M project, but there is a major challenge to raise philanthropy for medical school. For example, McLaren opened a hospital in partnership with Karmanos and Michigan State in Lansing. Beale acknowledged the bad news in medicine is worrisome to the university's R1 status. Rossi pointed out that the bad news in medicine is also being heard by the alumni of medicine, and philanthropy coming from them is drying up. Until things start looking up under new leadership, any kind of investment from alumni will be very difficult to engage. Rossi said we need to move fast and make positive steps to be more stabilized in the next few months to take a big step in the right direction.

V. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Technology Upgrade: Beale announced a technology upgrade in the Academic Senate conference room. The upgrade will support Hybrid/Zoom meetings for the committees that wish to use it.

Leadership Departures: Beale acknowledged the retirement of the director of Karmanos and departure of others in medicine, as well as Alexey Petrov (Physics, CLAS) who has accepted a position at the University of South Carolina as a USC Endowed Chair in Physics (though a retention offer is pending). The departures of high-level research faculty is worrisome.

Article XXIV Recommendations: Beale received queries from members of the Executive Committee in medicine about the Article XXIV recommendations. They thought that any establishment of peer mentoring was a punitive move, to which Beale responded that it could be positive since it is peer-initiated and peer-handled as a means of mentoring people that may have been unproductive for a while. She said she was concerned that what could be seen as positive is being cast as negative. Villarosa explained that there is a new structure in the regime of reviews. Simon added that she took part in the first academic staff mentoring process as a provost's office appointee and it worked well; the person was receptive and changed behavior—it was positive. Beale agreed that was the goal of the recommendations but she was concerned about the negative reception by the Executive Committee. Simon suggested it was seen as post-tenure review. Rossi argued that it was very difficult to view it as post-tenure review when her department suggested five of seven for mentoring—none of them are tenured or tenure track. Villarosa added that it is not even Article XXIV at that point. When asked by the Office of Faculty Affairs to recommend individuals for mentoring, Rossi said she did not view it as punitive at all. What she sees are people getting 3s, 3.5s, and 4s in scholarship and other metrics for more than one year who need help. The junior faculty in one particular division are floundering, and they do not have the appropriate people to mentor them in that division or department so they were forwarded with the idea that the school would be able to find mentors to help. Mentoring is not remediation: it's mentoring. When Article XXIV mentoring is not used, it has ended up with administrative attempts at de-tenuring. These clinician educators can be fired with only 60-day notice. The suggestion for mentoring is because those in the department want them to succeed.

Beale wanted Policy to be aware of these questions: if anybody asks about it, we should let them know the positive aspects of mentoring are much preferable to administrative action (a hearing or firing). Mentoring provides a time period for a chance to show improvement.

HR Procedures: Beale noted continuing problems with HR procedures so it may be worthwhile to consider having a discussion at Policy at some point. A required 90-day employee review form issued by HR that was not working properly took up about six hours, since it continually auto-checked other boxes than what were selected. She informed HR of the problem but received a rather snarky response.

New Student Convocation: The New Student Convocation will be held on August 29 at 11:00 in front of McGregor.

CMMC Report: Beale announced that Rob Thompson (AVP/CIO) shared the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) report with her regarding security issues. She will share the report with Policy members and stressed that it is confidential.

VI. Communications and Required Actions

A. Academic Senate New Faculty Orientation Session

The dates for the New Faculty Orientation are Thursday and Friday, August 18 and 19. Policy has been invited to attend on Friday, August 19 from 11:00 to 11:45 am. This will be an in-person event held at McGregor. Beale said she will provide an overview of the Senate, the chairs of each of the committees will talk about their committees, and then they will take questions

B. University Statements on the Supreme Court's *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.* Abortion Decision Overturning *Roe v. Wade*

Although the meeting had run out of time, Beale wanted Policy to be aware of the decisions coming out of the Supreme Court over the last week. She said there had been some question about whether the university should make a statement on the overturning of *Roe v. Wade* since Michigan and Michigan State have made statements. Beale said she liked what Michigan State did in terms of a faculty forum on the issue that was ready to go the minute the case came down. Lewis agreed it was important to figure out what kind of policies the university can put in place, such as protecting people's medical records regarding reproductive health and continuing to provide reproductive health care. It is important to be clear what our commitments are. Rossi pointed out that information is confidential to the extreme and any breach should cause the individual to be fired, removed from school, and lose their license. Beale responded that there may be criminal exceptions to that in states that make abortion illegal. Rossi added that the case is impacting the search for the chair of OBGYN.

The provost had asked Beale and Brad Roth if university leadership should make a statement. They suggested talking about protecting our students' and employees' access to reproductive healthcare. Beale recommended a faculty response rather than a leadership response. If Policy members have any other suggestions, they should let Beale know.

Approved as revised at the Policy Committee meeting of July 18, 2022