WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE
August 21, 2023

Present: L. Beale; r. hoogland; P. Khosla; M. Kornbluh; N. Rossi; B. Roth; S. Schrag; N. Simon

Absent with Notice: D. Aubert; J. Lewis

Guests: Kelly Dormer, Assoc. Dir., Academic Affairs; Darin Ellis, AVP, Academic Affairs; Richard Pineau, CLAS

I.   APPROVAL OF POLICY PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of the August 7, 2023 Policy Committee meeting were approved as revised.

II.   REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Charges to standing committees: Linda Beale requested that Policy members send suggested standing committee charges for the next Policy meeting. So far, there will be a joint charge between Curriculum and Instruction (CIC) and Faculty Affairs (FAC). Chair Naida Simon has recommended a charge for Student Affairs (SAC). The Research Committee (RES) is updating the research misconduct policy; however, Chair Noreen Rossi is waiting to hear back from the Office of General Counsel. Chair renée hoogland suggested charging FAC with standardizing the university policy information on the syllabus. The Wayne State University In-Prison Educational Program was originally on Policy's agenda but had to be rescheduled: it is something that should also benefit from FAC and CIC consultation, depending on how it is developed.

Brad Roth noted he has been posting his actual syllabus in addition to posting the university policies on the Canvas site in the syllabus section. Policy members agreed the extensive material on extraneous policies prevents students from reading the syllabus information they need. Beale recommended an easily accessible webpage with a link that faculty can incorporate or something on Canvas that shows automatically in every Canvas course. This would also save faculty time in not having to determine whether there are changes.

Strategy consultant email: Beale reported receiving an email from a person describing herself as a "strategy consultant for Wayne State University" offering a learning platform for faculty to detect content generated by ChatGPT and other AI writing tools. A casual reader would easily think this was a service supported by the university, but it clearly is not. Beale forwarded it to AVP Boris Baltes who shared it with General Counsel Mike Poterala to look into it.

Presidential Search Committee meeting: President Espy has requested a meeting with the Presidential Search Committee on August 24. This may be an opportunity for the president to ask the committee for ideas they think she should focus on during her first year.

Minimum salary requirements for new postdoctoral scholars hires letter: Interim OVPR Tim Stemmler shared a draft letter with Beale asking for Policy Committee suggestions. It states there is going to be a new minimum salary requirement for postdocs of $51,000. She let Stemmler know that Policy is supportive, if it has been determined that we will not have to cut numbers to fund at that level.

American Bar Association free speech proposal: Beale informed Policy that the American Bar Association was likely to finalize a proposal in which accredited law schools must have a free speech

policy which must include not allowing speech disruptions and ensuring that controversial and even offensive topics can be discussed. It appears to suggest that the law schools must dictate that faculty cannot in any way deny a person's right to discuss any offensive topic, even if it is one that is clearly not factually supported (e.g., Holocaust denial). These are obviously difficult issues, as we have discussed before, because they require delicate line-drawing to protect free speech and academic freedom.

PhD Committee: The provost's PhD Committee created by the provost to consider what should be done to support PhD students has been meeting via subgroups. The subgroup Beale has participated in has had difficulty getting full data for use in understanding how much general fund money versus grant money is used to support students. Students want a much higher stipend (at least $46,000) for GA (GRA/GTA) positions, which would mean we would have to cut numbers unless we can find resources. We need to know how we currently allocate funds for those positions and what is the source of funds. For example, the data on the medical school lacks clarity in how it shows students who may be on T32 grants for two years and then go back on General Funds or who get supplemental funding beyond what is provided by the T32 grant.

Rossi explained that she has had to find grant funding to make up the balance for a student on a T32 grant. Where such supplementation comes from when somebody does not have a grant is a question. For example, at the School of Medicine, Rossi is only paid .5 FTE and of that, .45 is on grants. Where does the savings go? Technically she is tenured and supposed to be paid from the general fund. Where does the money saved from general fund go in the School of Medicine? For the first time, they were told what the distribution was between the Dean's Office and the departments. If the department has 50% salary savings when funding for the faculty members is on a grant, then 75% goes to department and 25% to the dean. If it has only 20% salary savings because there is less money on the grant, then it is the other way around (the dean gets most of it). This is difficult for clinical departments since most are non-tenure track and not on general fund and do not get grants, so they will never achieve 50% of their funding on grants, and most will go to the dean. On top of that, she was told by departmental accountants that they are not told about salary savings until September 1 and they have to spend it by the end of the fiscal year (September 30). As a result, there is a scramble and much gets wasted. She suggested that information should be given quarterly so that there is time to spend it judiciously.

Jackie Wilson on the HIGH Program: Beale reported that former president Wilson's wife was given an ongoing .5 FTE appointment as director of the HIGH program. The program will be moved under the financial aid office from development.

III.   SEPTEMBER 6 PLENARY AGENDA

The election for the Policy Committee will take place at the September 6th plenary session. Simon will be retiring mid-year, and Policy members agreed to run a special election for her replacement at the December plenary to take office in January rather than combining that with the September 6 session.

IV.   REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Fall opening: President Espy will welcome faculty at the Sunday brunch followed by the New Student Convocation which is being reorganized as a fun activity for the students. They anticipate a good turnout. Provost Kornbluh reported there has been a good response from the academic departments. Over 500 tables are signed up between student groups and academic departments for Festifall, which follows convocation. At this point, the weather forecast is good. There is no backup venue in case of inclement weather.

Enrollment: Undergraduate enrollment still looks good with the freshman class and transfers up substantially from last year. We may have a 20% African American incoming class and higher percentage of Hispanic students than recent classes as well. Master's enrollment does not look as good.

Engineering is only showing a slight increase. The business dean knows that their programs need to be refreshed, and that is taking place now with the expectation of more recruits in the future. It has been challenging to get the medical school to focus on master's enrollments.

Rossi noted the poor handling of a recent recruitment event for minorities in master's programs for the medical sciences. Wayne State bought multiple $2000 tables: there were materials on the tables but in most cases, there was no one there to talk to people. Joe Dunbar and Ginianne Gilchrist were the only representatives present (they staffed tables for research and master's in the School of Medicine), so they found themselves trying to answer questions about other colleges.

V.   RENEWAL OF AD HOC AI COMMITTEE

Policy invited Richard Pineau (Chair, ad hoc AI Committee) to discuss extending the existing subcommittee and requested his suggestions around enlarging the membership and determining the focus going forward.

Pineau explained there is a need to continue this work. There remains uncertainty whether artificial intelligence is good or bad and there is hesitation among committee members how to proceed. Although some syllabus language has been provided for whether or not to allow AI usage in the classroom, there is a lack of clarity and institutional guidelines are needed for instructors looking to use AI. There are significant privacy concerns around inputting data. How is the data going to be used and how secure is it? What do we need to tell our faculty and students about using AI? It is important to watch how this continues to evolve. One of the things mentioned in a recent OTL panel discussion Pineau attended was how AI will affect workplaces: students likely must know how to use it, with use varying by discipline.

If the subcommittee were to continue, charges should include input from the privacy officer of the university as well as Academic Affairs, particularly DOSO to see if they have noticed academic misconduct issues. After the fall semester, a brief faculty survey could gauge whether faculty have put something in their syllabus around AI usage, whether they have noticed any patterns, if they have used it and in what capacity, and what guidance is needed. At the last Senate meeting, a concern was raised about the preliminary report lacking detail on online classes and guidance, an issue that needs further exploration. Another issue is the need to educate ourselves on the biases of the systems. The outputs take into consideration demographic information and can frame the output, for example, to make it sound 'lower income'. The Student Senate also has a strong interest in having this conversation because there is much uncertainty among the students around AI cheating and accusations of academic misconduct.

Beale asked if the subcommittee has considered setting up a time to meet with the Student Senate. Pineau explained he was waiting for guidance from Policy to proceed.

Roth noted his first encounter with AI cheating took place in the winter semester when he was convinced a student's term paper was AI-generated. He ran it through three different checkers and received three different findings, from almost all AI-generated to hardly at all AI-generated and one in the middle. Even if all three of them had indicated the term paper was AI-generated, he would have felt that insufficient to justify downgrading the assignment because of concerns about due process. What sort of due process applies to accusations of violation of a ban on the use of AI is a conundrum? It would be helpful to know what other universities are doing about this, because this must be a problem for all. Pineau agreed that is a hard question. Nathan Chavez' (Assoc. Dir., Academic Application) discussed the problem with detection software at the last meeting of the subcommittee. Every AI developer creates their own software and says their detection tools must be used to detect their AI outputs. There was one developer that claimed to be 95% effective and even that was questionable.

Rossi raised another issue about plagiarism checkers. Is the data in the material being tested now able to be usurped by generative AI? Beale pointed out the similar privacy concern around proprietary material

that has not yet been published that is used by generative AI. Kornbluh noted the New York Times lawsuit against ChatGPT because of copyright. There have been calls for the government to somehow regulate AI usage, and some institutions have completely banned it.

Even if the syllabus says that you cannot use AI and that it might be punishable under academic misconduct rules for a student to do so, Beale questioned how that process takes place. If students are told they cannot use AI, but the ban cannot be enforced or any penalty applied, it may be a rather weak ban. hoogland suggested faculty lay claim to some kind of expertise. If it is the student's word against faculty's word, then the faculty's word should weigh more heavily than the student's. Beale suggested that penalizing a student under a student misconduct provision will be dependent on witness credibility over everything else, which is where faculty expertise should matter. hoogland agreed: because it cannot be proven in the same way as copying and pasting, something must be in place that makes some kind of punitive action or corrective action enforceable.

Pineau explained he initially confronts a student he suspects of using AI and tries to get an open confession: that worked in an instance last semester. However, he questioned whether it would work when there is no access to the source that wrote the paper for the student. It is assumed the student could be downgraded and must appeal to the chair. Roth said that if he cannot demonstrate that it is plagiarism, he does not treat it as plagiarism, even though he knows in his heart that it is. His students often do not confess, even with proof. hoogland would talk to the student but it is dependent on how hardcore they are in their cheating practices. If they are hardcore, they could likely get away with it.

Policy agreed to recharge the ad hoc committee consisting of Stephanie Chastain (CLAS), hoogland, David Moss (Law), Pineau as chair and Robert Reynolds (ENGG). They can recommend additional members if they think it appropriate. Simon suggested including a student from the Student Senate on the committee. Beale noted we have generally not included students as members of ad hoc committees, but the committee can bring in students for discussions. There may be multiple people that they would like to include such as graduate students who may have different issues than undergraduates. Pineau agreed to meet with the existing committee to determine their willingness to serve and discuss the issues they want to pursue within the next two weeks. After this organizational meeting, he will approach the Student Senate.

Pineau also announced that updates were made to the academic integrity module to include the good ethics activity that Jenny Lewis has suggested, as well as some language on AI. Additionally, there had been a proposed statement on AI for the Senate to vote on, so he asked whether that would come before the plenary soon. Regarding the revisions to the student code of conduct to add the additional definitions, he questioned if there are any other revisions that should be considered or revisited.

As far as the proposed statement on AI, Beale does not believe it is ready to be put forward. The AI subcommittee should send specific recommendations for the student code of conduct to Policy that can be shared with CIC, SAC and FAC to ask for their consideration, as done for that last resolution on the student code of conduct. We can then take it to a plenary session later in the fall.

VI.   UROP PLANNING

Ellis and Dormer were invited to Policy to discuss UROP planning. There had been a subcommittee formed in the Senate that was working with the UROP program to ensure that there was more faculty involvement and a process for faculty review. The program suffered under COVID and became moribund. Roth noted there were not more applications than there was money to fund them, so there was not an imperative to get people involved in the review of the applications.

The program now resides with Dormer in Academic Affairs: it fits well with other undergraduate affairs programs (Learning Communities, First Year Seminar and First-year Interest Groups). There is now a

team covering a series of academic programs that are tied closely to students in their majors and in the coursework that they are taking. The team supports each other, learning best practices and how the central administration can support the faculty with these undergraduate programs.

Ellis was responsible for standing up the UROP program in the College of Engineering with an internally funded program that started with 20 students and eventually funded up to 2000 students annually. He worked on the first university UROP committee under Monica Brockmeyer when it came out of Honors with former VPR Steve Lanier. There are various ideas from the Office of the Provost, the Student Senate and Academic Affairs, and he wants to maintain the commitment to funding the individual projects, which was a point of contention with the Senate a few years ago. The core of the program will continue to run as individual projects that are presented by students with the support of a faculty mentor. There is a desire to expand the program beyond writing a check for the project, per the subcommittee's first round of recommendations, and he welcomes Policy's input and consultation.

Dormer reported plans to meet with financial aid to look at offering research projects as a work study placement instead of the traditional monetary award. For this option, they must consider managing hours, payroll, etcetera. Career Services may be able to help market through their office because they do a lot of work study job placement. They have also been meeting with Claudio Verani in CLAS, working to offer a four-credit course for students to earn credit for research as a different way to have students engage without just giving them a check for $2300, which is an issue with some students who turn down the award to avoid impacting their financial aid. The goal is to broaden how students can opt in.

Beale questioned the type of four-credit course being considered. Dormer explained some of the faculty in CLAS had mapped out a curriculum prior to COVID and provided much of the blueprint with the vision that faculty would sign up to teach one week of the course (not a whole semester), teaching different topics just one week at a time. The idea is for a 50-minute class that meets once a week for a period of weeks, with the other hours spent working on research with a faculty mentor. Ellis clarified that Verani envisions the course as a coordinated interdisciplinary course across CLAS. It is currently focused on STEM majors, but it would include an arts and humanities scholarly inquiry path as well. There are probably dozens of directed research courses across campus that are largely underutilized, but where they are utilized, they provide good examples.

hoogland commented that encouraging more things that go outside of the faculty teaching load is problematic overall. She noted the College of Education offers some programs where faculty earn a course release for supervising or mentoring a certain number of graduate students through the year. It makes better sense to balance things out and not just expect people to take on more work. Ellis emphasized he wants to support faculty who want to do this and can fit it into their workload. It is important to ensure we have a conduit to share best practices and to support the faculty.

More broadly, Beale questioned whether other institutions have developed innovations around these kinds of directed studies: they are important for faculty to do, but faculty do not get much credit for doing them. Could there be a minimal stipend? Are such courses handled differently at other institutions? Ellis admitted they had not paid much attention and as part of this process of bringing these various academic programs together, he is interested in gathering best practices across the country for directed study.

Simon pointed out an example from last year: Dave Merolla (CLAS, Sociology) sent his undergraduate student to SAC to present their research on alcohol and consent. In CLAS, they do a research symposium for their students and historically, it is the week after the UROP symposium. Dormer reported CLAS has agreed to move theirs to the fall so that students will have an opportunity each term to try to encourage more participation in those. There appears to be willingness to elevate exposure.

There is a difficulty in that a faculty member will do these things sporadically. Roth has offered a study abroad opportunity, but he agreed with hoogland's point: everything done in this regard is an overload. It

is one thing if a faculty member takes the initiative to do things with a particular group of students, but if it is further institutionalized to impose obligations on faculty members to take on these extra obligations (which they otherwise do spontaneously as a matter of voluntary work), there needs to be some thought for a structure that makes that possible.

Ellis does not intend to impose anything on faculty, rather gather best practices from faculty who are doing this and provide them with support to share this among one another. Kornbluh added many of our colleagues that have their own research benefit tremendously by having smart undergraduates work in their labs and work with them. Disciplines vary here, but if you look at what our students major in and you think about the breadth of our colleagues' work, having undergraduates in your lab is free labor for the faculty member in many cases. Ellis also pointed out our single biggest feeder for our research graduate programs is our own undergraduate student body. Many of our faculty do this as a pipeline because they want the undergrads in their labs that they know are the cream of the crop, and they are going to be the ones that they invite to apply for graduate studies.

Rossi agreed it is important that faculty get some sort of recognition for the effort that they put in, whatever form that takes: it may need to vary depending on the disciplines, school and level of involvement. It will be more engaging for faculty. For students whose financial aid is impacted, taking a course credit as opposed to getting money is a good idea because course credit is like money. She suggested Dormer and Ellis come to a Research Committee meeting. There are committee members from social sciences, humanities and STEM who would welcome knowing what the programs are and could share ideas and thoughts.

The Student Senate wants UROP to act as a clearinghouse for research opportunities for undergraduates. Kornbluh suggested building a website where faculty members can request undergraduates to work in their lab and students can apply. Dormer reported last week they purchased a brand-new platform to replace the existing (outdated) UROP Connect with Forager One that was built out of Johns Hopkins. It will be a one-stop shop that allows faculty to collaborate with one another. Faculty profiles can indicate if they are looking for faculty collaborators, student researchers or are open to conversations. There is a lot of undergraduate research happening that is not funded out of UROP, but if we can drive people to the platform, it has data analytics that would allow us to report out institutionally what is happening. It is student-friendly; they create a profile and then can sort by major, college, interest, and open opportunities. Currently, UROP Connect does not indicate if you are taking new people and nobody is checking it very often, so many students complain. The Student Senate reported that messages sent to a faculty member received no response—but that faculty member left three years ago and UROP Connect had no way to incorporate that. Forager One syncs with Banner, so if someone leaves the institution, the profile goes down. It also pulls general academic contact information from the CMS and allows a person to claim the profile; if a faculty member does not want to be on it, they simply would not claim it and it would not show up. It can also support medical students, postdocs and graduate students.

Beale questioned how the UROP funding interacts with Forager One. Dormer explained it is designed to match faculty and students, so that if a student wanted to apply for UROP funding, an application would be filled out. They are still working on the implementation process. Ellis agreed having that process flow better and be trackable is important: they need to find a way to make the surrounding processes more robust.

Dormer suggested the data gathered from Forager One is also something the new faculty advisory group can assist with, perhaps considering if there are areas where people are not using it or there is low research activity and suggesting ways to encourage or support usage.

Beale asked for further discussion of the role for an ongoing faculty advisory committee for UROP. What kind of things would it be doing? What would be the charge to that committee? The criteria Ellis recommends would be for the structure of the committee to have the option of multi-year terms, rotating

fresh people through. They can expect to move on, but could get reappointed because institutional memory is necessary. Members should be active researchers who have or may have undergraduates involved in their scholarship and should come from the five different areas of the of the program, and those five faculty would be involved in steering the overall direction and helping recruit reviewers. Alternates should be named to ensure a full committee. It is important to be able to find a time when everyone can meet. Dormer would be the chair and Matt Orr (Program Coordinator—UG Research, Academic Affairs) needs to be involved. As he previously discussed with Beale, for the benefit of the group, there were different units that would make sense to partner with on campus (financial aid, development, OVPR, various associate deans of research and/or academic and student affairs, schools and colleges, McNair Scholars Program, institutional research, the MARK program in chemistry and biological sciences). There was valid concern about the growth of administrative committees on campus, but if we are going to have a standing advisory committee, it should be five faculty from the five areas in the program.

Similar to an Article XXX committee, Beale recommended the need to request nominations and self-nominations from each of those five areas. If we get multiple nominations, we can put together a committee that makes sense. A draft call for nominations and self-nominations is needed as well as a draft charge and make-up of the committee. Ellis will reach out to Baltes' office for a template. When the drafts are ready, Ellis and Beale will send out a joint call for nominations and self-nominations.

VII.   TUITION AND FEES APPEAL BOARD SENATE APPOINTMENT

Policy members discussed the demand of the appointment. Beale agreed to send an email to Dean Cummings (EACPHS), Dean Kubiak and Patricia Wren (Dept. of Public Health) requesting nominees, and will then reach out to those nominees to gage their willingness.

VIII.   AGE-FRIENDLY UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Beale was unfamiliar with the committee and will reach out to Peter Lichtenberg (Director, IOG) for more information.

IX.   NEW BUSINESS

Roth updated the Policy Committee on recent discussions at the DEI Executive Committee.

Approved as submitted at the Policy Committee meeting of August 28, 2023.