

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY  
ACADEMIC SENATE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICY COMMITTEE  
November 13, 2023

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

Guest: Richard Pineau (CLAS)

I. REPORT ON COURSE HERO AI ACADEMY

Pineau was invited to Policy to discuss his report that captured information from his participation in the month-long course with Course Hero which offered an online academy to discuss the role of artificial intelligence (AI) in education with participants from pre-K through 12, higher education and administrators. Each week of the academy was organized around a particular theme with assignments that went along with each of the themes: week one focused on getting to know the AI tools; week two focused on the instructional uses for AI; week three had to do with the ethics of AI usage and academic integrity; week four focused on talking with students about AI more generally. Open dialogue throughout the weeks was welcome among all participants. Wednesdays featured guest lectures. Fridays included a community hour, where everyone could share ideas, raise questions and discuss the material. There were three or four sections, each with about 60 people. The LMS online platform was called YellowDig, best described as a cross between our Academica, Twitter and Facebook. There were a good set of learning outcomes and essential questions, and much of the learning was self-paced, like an online asynchronous course.

Pineau shared some of the highlights from each of the weeks. The first week covered AI tools. It was about not creating a culture of fear around AI but having an open mind because of the growing role of AI in the workforce. We need to teach students how to responsibly use AI, yet requiring students to use AI sites forces them to accept privacy agreements. Pineau decided to use QuillBot and Bard (run by Google). Before you are able to use Bard, there is a long list of privacy terms that you have to agree to, and one of them is that Google will track browsing history, cookies, locations and other aspects of what the user does. Pineau had every intention of having his students use the one of the AI systems for his discrete math class, but this gave him pause. Is it fair to require my students to agree to all of this? What is going to happen if a student says they do not want to do this particular assignment? If we are going to ask students to use this as part of the course, are we aware of all the privacy terms they must agree to? What are the ways in which we need to educate them about this?

Linda Beale pointed out Google does it because it gives them more data to scrape. One of the worries is that the systems scrape every piece of data and then will use it to spew out later. There are many related issues including building in biases, mediocre writing and invasion of privacy.

Jennifer Lewis asked whether the AI sites that require privacy agreements are different than other online services that we require our students to use. Pineau responded that the courseware for elementary statistics requires agreement, but it is unclear what information they track.

Steve Chrisomalis noted Safe Assign and Turnitin, which are the two plagiarism checkers that every Ph.D. student is required to use, do collect and use that data as part of their data set going forward. A student's dissertation will be aggregated with everyone else's dissertation as part of

the data it checks against. It is not a generative AI, but it is a form of AI; a large language model, basically.

Beale noted at the Budget Committee meeting she had asked a similar question of Development VP David Ripple about the development software that we use: we input data on donors and fields of interest, and some of these national databases can tell us what our peers are doing? The data you feed in is used to form benchmarks so ultimately it is worrisome what kind of information all these systems are accumulating.

Pineau pointed out that many of the participants were concerned about incorporating these generative AI systems into a course because of these agreements. Beale noted that if we have our students use ChatGPT to answer a question, ChatGPT will have that question in its database in the future and know that question may be asked. Is there a way to use ChatGPT to discover what questions have been asked about a particular topic? That is another way integrity is attacked.

The bottom line is that we must know the implications of having students use these tools. Had Pineau not explored Bard, he would not have thought about the agreements. Additionally, with Quillbot, you can enter or copy and paste portions of your paper and ask Quillbot to paraphrase it for you. renèe hoogland noted that students who use AI to write are at this point obvious since it is a data-driven phenomenon. Lewis commented on her own need to develop better rubrics for her writing assignments. Pineau noted an academic misconduct administrator who explained that his office runs a suspected AI cheat through four or five checkers but they are all unreliable. Pineau investigated GPTZero after the maker of that program attended a session claiming that the checker was good. When Pineau entered text that he knew was generated by AI, however, it told him there was only a 52% chance of being AI produced.

Week two was about the instructional implications for AI. Key skills of teachers are the ability to teach critical thinking, build relationships, motivate students, create positive learning environments, provide feedback on student performance, and attend to students' basic needs. A participant commented that few faculty create materials from scratch. They rely on publishers and other teachers for test banks: using AI is just another resource. Others noted the fact that paid subscriptions create disparities among students in terms of access to AI tools. There was also discussion of defining AI literacy. Are there things related to AI that we need to include in our curricula, and if so, how do we define this idea of AI literacy? Beale noted that was part of the discussion that came out in the recent Big Data/AI Research meeting organized by Interim VPR Tim Stemmler. Researchers will want digitally literate students who understand how to use AI. Should we now have a Gen Ed digital literacy requirement? This is something we need to consider.

Week three focused on academic integrity. One discussion was around appropriate syllabus language. The two points most useful were (i) if students are allowed to use AI, there should be a statement about the biases of these tools and (ii) students need to understand the source issues that come into play in AI outputs, since sources may include intellectual property without being so designated. The Senate should revisit the syllabus language suggested earlier to include these two themes. Brad Roth noted credit to creators and intellectual property rights/copyright are not the same thing, so that must be kept in mind.

Another discussion concerned citing AI as a source. Students developing a thesis statement for a paper might share it with the instructor or a friend for feedback but they are not expected to cite the instructor or friend as the source for ideas. Should it be any different if the thesis statement is entered into ChatGPT, which provides another idea? Chrisomalis suggested the answer has to be

“no” across the board. Beale suggested that if a major idea were provided by another person or Chat GPT, it would be appropriate to cite the source: it is an integrity issue. Chrisomalis noted we do not currently ask our students—if we put them in small groups and workshop their ideas—to cite personal communication with their peer in that situation. hoogland noted that ChatGPT might be the only source used for the thesis, and Chrisomalis suggested that leads to a different conclusion since it is specific language rather than merely an idea.

This discussion highlights the expectation of academic work as a solitary operator. Lewis suggested this is a difficult concept perhaps because we do not necessarily want to preserve that solitary operator model (and AI is just part of this). hoogland suggested it depends on the field of work: she does expect students to write their own papers.

Pramod Khosla suggested AI is a new tool, and our job is to educate people about the tool’s effectiveness and use so that they can decide how to use it. Slides rule were replaced by calculator, but some who were reluctant to use them. It is hard to know where ideas come from—especially as people accumulate knowledge on which they draw for new activities. Chrisomalis suggested there are different expectations for student theses, dissertations and research publications where it is important to include professors in the acknowledgements page. hoogland argued that personal communications or conferences that provide feedback on a paper are fundamentally different than using a machine that generates data. Scholarship is interpersonal and involves interlocutors: it never starts from scratch. To have a machine do it is something completely different. Writing is a tissue of many ideas: it is like many threads that come together. That is not a question of plagiarism, and it is confusing the issue to assume that interpersonal communications and use of AI are the same. hoogland noted various research requirements that require citation to any source for particular ideas: faculty have said that if they did not cite AI sources used in applications for grants, it would be a violation of expectations.

Some of the other conversations that came up included reluctance to embrace the idea of using AI in the classroom, and part of this was based on where the AI was getting its data from. If they are going to allow students to use it, they felt they were engaging in this illegal practice and were a bit cautious. Beale agreed that is another reason to cite AI when you would not say certain other things, because we know that there is that issue with AI. Pineau said that gets to this idea of using AI responsibly. If a student is going to cite AI as a source, they would have to fact check the information from the AI. Beale agreed: if we asked them to cite it when they use it, it both tells the professor to wonder and question if the student checked those sources, and it also should be a way to tell the student that they need to check those sources.

Chrisomalis noted the problem is citing usually implies that somebody would be able to confirm, and the challenge is that you cannot go to AI and ask for the list of all the prompts you used. If those same prompts are used, ChatGPT may create a different set of responses. Beale explained the ability to detect is another question, but the question of asking students to provide that information at least gives a way for faculty to share why they are concerned about that information and about verifying the sources that you are using. This reminded Brad Roth of a case he had years ago where a student actually took a paper from a friend’s hard drive and submitted it, and the friend had plagiarized. There is this sort of weirdness of the situation that you are plagiarizing from plagiarism.

Chrisomalis noted there are disciplines in which students collect field notes. His students, for example, conduct research collecting data about people that is not required to go through IRB because it is going to be published. If they submit their field notes to ChatGPT and ask it to write give ideas for their essay, those data now become part of ChatGPT. That raises a serious ethical

issue for anyone using data that normally would only be seen by the professor. Anthropologists and people who work in human field-work-based disciplines are discussing these issues. The copyright and IP lawyers are busy working on those issue, but the field-work question does not fall under IP but will bring a different kind of scrutiny.

Pineau noted the question of whether authorship is limited to a single individual. There was a webinar in which speaker Hannah Kapoor talked about the importance of AI literacy because it is needed to prepare students for the technological shifts that we may see as the workforce adapts to AI tools, boosting productivity by overcoming various limitations. She had asked in the chat what concerns people most about using AI and there were various responses—i.e., students not learning what they need to, data privacy concerns, wrongful use, instructors not valuing AI, AI's (in)accuracy, using AI with good intentions but still being accused of cheating. There is also the question of AI being used for surveillance, spreading misinformation and amplifying social biases. Kapoor suggested there should be transparency from instructors and from students if AI is used in designing courses or in doing assignments for courses. One way to be clearer about AI in writing is requiring drafts to be turned in early, requiring references annotated by bibliographies early, and having students use sources that come from library databases. See this source: <https://sites.google.com/view/practical-information-literacy/being-ai>.

The final week focused on letting students know whether we want them to use AI systems or not, and if we are going to prohibit the use of AI, we need to explain to them why in a particular course. It is important to teach students how to analyze the output that AI produces for validity purposes.

Pineau reminded Policy members of the nine recommendations the ad hoc AI subcommittee had put forward: (i) supporting students speaks to the Wayne Experience course that will hopefully return and may include themes about academic integrity as AI, (ii) the statement for plenary vote, which has been tabled, (iii) the Student Code of Conduct provision, including some language for AI and other definitions, which is making its way through the various Senate subcommittees, (iv) the academic integrity module update that has been posted, (v) revisiting the syllabi statement, which many are already using from our preliminary report, to include some conversation about biases and intellectual property/copyright implications, (vi) covering AI at new faculty and new student orientation, (vii) continuing the conversation about AI (currently in progress), (viii) providing instructor support (through OTL and Pineau's presentation of information) and (ix) considering university priorities including start of term announcements, AI detection, AI in hiring and admission practices, and privacy concerns.

Pineau had met with Policy in late August to discuss the subcommittee's next set of goals. At the time, he had suggested the subcommittee have conversations with Wayne State's privacy officer, Academic Affairs, DOSO and students about their experiences and concerns related to AI, and to understand what faculty are doing. He recommends this is still worthwhile to explore. At the May plenary, someone asked about guidance for online courses with the use of AI, and that is something we need to revisit as well. Additional topics include AI literacy; AI's effect on various disciplines; teaching responsible usage for AI and the need for faculty to understand what its capabilities are; understanding the lack of reliability of detection tools; ensuring that AI does not replace teachers; and ways instructors can use AI to help them to do their jobs.

Beale noted the AI ad hoc committee will be ongoing for this year, so there will be opportunities to bring questions back to Policy and the other standing committees. Policy could send out an announcement to the Senate members telling them that if their unit wants to have a report on the

kinds of issues that are being discussed by faculty across different areas, Pineau can come speak about it.

## II. APPROVAL OF POLICY PROCEEDINGS

The proceedings of the October 30, 2023 Policy Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

## III. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Acting provost: Acting Provost Clabo explained that a process will unfold that does not involve her. She is grateful to be back with colleagues who provide academic leadership across the university. Her hope is that we continue to steer the academic ship of the university together. This organization has lasted 150 years and will last 150 more because of people's commitment to our students and our academic mission. She noted her support for shared governance. In response to a question concerned about the many speculative rumors going around campus and asking about the investigation leader and timeline, Clabo explained she does not have that information to share. She suggested that Policy meet with the president this week. She will work with Beale and the president's office to arrange a Zoom meeting since the president is out of town.

VPR search: Four finalist candidates will come to campus the week after Thanksgiving. This is an important hire for the university. She will chair the search while the Provost is out. Beale asked when Policy would meet with the candidates but Clabo will have to check the draft schedule.

Campus to Career announcement: Clabo provided an update from the president's Campus to Career initiative announced last week. She understands that this was the president's announcement of a vision but not of a structure. An initiative of this type clearly requires the leadership of the academic side of the house, and Policy may want to consider meeting with Ahmad Ezzeddine (VP Academic Student and Global Engagement). There is an opportunity for the Policy Committee and academic leadership to shape what this initiative looks like moving forward and make sure that it is driven from the rigor of our academic programs. Beale agreed and noted that she had talked to President Espy about this last Friday. Obviously, if there is a presidential task force headed by Ezzeddine, we want to have impact on what that looks at, where it goes and what it does, because this is primarily educational and academic, as well as part of community engagement and service to students. It is something to which we will pay attention. The Curriculum and Instruction, Faculty Affairs and Student Affairs committees should have a role in considering any recommendations that come out of the task force, and of course ultimately the Senate plenary. Clabo offered to use her role as chair to facilitate that: this cannot work without a strong academic voice and academic leadership.

Beale noted the most inspiring piece of Espy's College to Career event was the students who spoke. They were great illustrations of the success students can have at Wayne State. Espy gave a talk about her first hundred days, with some emphasis at the end on our career-ready students. One of the reasons some students are not applying to, attending or continuing with college is that they do not see it as a pathway to a career, and we need to address that.

Clabo agreed, noting that the students illustrated two points: (1) making sure that our students are career ready and (2) demonstrating our value to the community to garner ongoing support for Wayne State, including the entrepreneurial fundraising side. What we heard from current students and alumni was how career-ready they were. They referenced specific faculty members,

some many years out. Clabo was struck by the idea that the strongest voices for the community engagement aspect are indeed our current students and alumni who talked about our faculty. That is the piece we have to make sure does not get lost. This is not about an internship program, for example. It is about a much richer experience, and that experience must be led by academics with an academic voice.

Danielle Aubert asked whether President Espy had done something similar in San Antonio. Clabo confirmed she came from an institution with many similarities to Wayne State. She has been particularly aware of the fact that she does not yet know the city of Detroit and that she is reliant on us and on others in the city to bring that knowledge to her. Clabo was struck by that knowledge coming from our students, from our recent alumni, and the specificity with which each of them was able to say that they would not have gotten that preparation in another institution.

As a faculty member, Beale explained it is heartwarming when you get that letter from a student two years out who writes and says they realize your class gave them the pathway to where they are now. Clabo was reminded of something that an academic mentor said to her as a young assistant professor—what makes you most valuable to students is setting the bar incredibly high and then giving students every confidence that you stand beside them to help them meet that bar. Those were the stories that students told. For her, that whole experience was affirming and connected to the academic mission of the university. It made her feel confident.

#### IV. REPORT FROM THE SENATE PRESIDENT

Communication consultant: Beale reported that Espy had brought in a communications consultant, Gary Susswein (whom she had worked with in San Antonio), to talk to the senior administration, deans and some faculty. Beale met with him last week to talk about what has gone well, what faculty see as problems with marketing and communication and the complaints that we all have had over the last decade about the many marketing failures tell a good story about Wayne State. She was very open in sharing her views, noting it is not necessarily the view that everybody will have so he might talk to other faculty. This is at least a good indicator of Espy's awareness that our communications have not succeeded in telling our story and need to improve.

College to Career: While discussing College to Career with Espy, Beale expressed her disappointment that this was not discussed with the Senate in any way before doing a high publicity event about an academic-oriented initiative. It is not clear what Espy expects the task force led by Ezzeddine to do or who will participate on it. Beale hopes that the centrality of the Senate role will not be forgotten as this initiative progresses.

VP for Research search: The four finalists who were selected by the search committee have rather different backgrounds. It will be important for all Policy members to participate in the interviews if at all possible, because there are real questions about which one is the best fit for this university in this context.

Enrollment: Although it is still early, master's and Ph.D. enrollments continue to disappoint.

Law facility: The Michigan legislature provided Wayne State a \$30 million capital projects grant that will be used for a new law facility. Dean Bierschbach hopes to raise enough money to build a \$100 million building.

Cybersecurity training: An email from C&IT was sent to faculty, staff and students regarding the mandate to complete cybersecurity training by December 31.

Student Senate resolution on divestment: Beale does not see a need for any further response from the Academic Senate to the Student Senate regarding their resolution to divest from arms manufacturers who support Israel's armory. It is not within the Academic Senate's educational policy jurisdiction to respond. Further, Wayne State's investment is primarily through a separate foundation board that oversees a third-party strategic investment manager. Investments mostly consist of diverse funds, although the board has briefly discussed whether there is some way to move corporate investments as much as possible into ones that pay attention to environmental, social and governance (ESG) issues.

There had been some dispute regarding the Student Senate vote using a secret ballot. The executive board set the final agenda for the meeting on a Tuesday, and the meeting was held on a Thursday. That provided little time for people to decide their position, but it is not clear whether it was appropriate for DOSO to insist on a secret ballot.

School of Medicine accreditation: The School of Medicine received accreditation for another eight years, which Beale announced at the November plenary.

Clabo shared the College of Nursing received a ten-year accreditation for programs. Of the 140 key elements, there were zero compliance concerns—a perfect scorecard. Nursing will be having a party on Wednesday for faculty, staff, students to celebrate a perfect accreditation. It was also announced that Ramona Benkert has agreed to be acting dean of nursing, and Clabo is incredibly grateful for her willingness to step into a role that she has zero desire to do. Benkert's commitment to the organization and the students is huge.

## V. DRAFT RESOLUTION ON SYLLABUS INCLUSION OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES

Policy discussed the proposal from Faculty Affairs and Curriculum and Instruction to have the long list of university policies removed from the syllabus template and replaced by a link to university policies that would be automatically generated and updated in Canvas. Members agreed to put a resolution in support on the December plenary agenda.

hoogland explained that Faculty Affairs would like to see this implemented in January for the winter term. The seven pages of university policies that are currently attached to the syllabus detract from the course information for students. Because it is overlong and included on every syllabus, students are not likely to read it. It also adds to faculty workload because there are annual updates that faculty must cut and paste into certain sections. It would be more efficient if that were done automatically through the Office of the Provost. Beale noted that some faculty do not use Canvas for their courses so they would need that same link to the set of university policies to be incorporated into their syllabi: it likely should be available as an easily identifiable link on the Office of the Provost's website and DOSO websites. Clabo suggested having two primary links: one for university policies and one for support/resources: if she were a struggling student, she would not expect to find support resources at a link labelled university policies. Noreen Rossi suggested there could also be a required form for students to acknowledge once a year that they have read the policies/resources.

Lewis relayed that CIC supports this initiative. We likely should not try to specify how it is implemented, but it will be important that be a specific office delegated to maintain current information at the link(s). (It has been a mix of DOSO and Provost's Office in the past.) CIC is

continuing to work on additional syllabus ideas. Some faculty have interactive syllabi that CIC is learning about, and there may be resources to help faculty create better syllabi.

#### VI. SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH WORKING GROUP APPOINTMENTS

Mark Schweitzer (VP for Health Affairs), who is continuing to chair what has now been termed the School of Public Health Executive Committee, has asked for Senate representatives to a variety of working groups intended to fill out ideas in necessary areas to move the concept forward, assuming that there is a sufficient Michigan budgetary allocation to provide a five-year startup fund that will allow enrollments (especially in the Masters in Public Health areas) to fund the continuation of the school. Policy discussed potential Senate representatives for each of the School of Public Health working groups. Beale will contact the persons identified to see if they are willing to serve.

#### VII. UROP FACULTY COORDINATING COUNCIL PROPOSAL

Beale noted that pre-pandemic, the Senate had created an ad hoc committee to ensure that there was proper faculty review of UROP proposals, since it seemed that staff were essentially asking particular faculty to review particular proposals, raising some concern about potential bias. That process worked well for a while, but during the COVID pandemic, the number of proposals declined significantly and the committee did not have a substantial role.

The question is how this should be structured going forward. Beale had suggested that it might work similar to the Article XXX process, where names are solicited from each school to ensure there is a peer faculty group available to review proposals. Darin Ellis (VP Academic Affairs) and Kelly Dormer (Assoc. Dir., Strategic Academic Initiatives) have drafted the proposal to establish a permanent process. Policy members generally approved the approach but considered it important to make some areas clearer. Policy will work on an edit and send that back to Ellis and Dormer.

#### VIII. DECEMBER 16 COMMENCEMENT CEREMONIES SENATE SPEAKERS

The following Policy members agreed to speak at the three commencement ceremonies:

- 9 a.m.: Pramod Khosla, Professor and Academic Senate Policy Committee Member
- 2 p.m.: Naida Simon, Ph.D. and Academic Senate Policy Committee Member
- 7 p.m.: Linda M. Beale, Professor and Academic Senate President

#### IX. DRAFT SENATE PLENARY DECEMBER 6 AGENDA

Policy members discussed the draft of the December plenary agenda. They agreed to include a panel on free speech and academic freedom, if possible. Beale will also work on lining up a Board of Governors member to speak with Bryan Barnhill being asked first.

#### X. NEW BUSINESS

Rossi provided a Research Committee update. At the last meeting Monica Malian (Director, HRPP) and Amanda Jointer (Assoc. Dir., IRB Administration) explained the response to the Senate's request for streamlining the form for expedited and exempt approvals. They were able to eliminate large portions of the form that were not relevant for those approvals, which should make the process much smoother. Committee members noted the importance of educating



students about filing IRB forms, because many faculty have had students file the form even though most students are not familiar with the process and make mistakes that delay the approval for the planned research. In her role as the person responsible for overseeing the research curriculum for medical students, Rossi met with Malian after the meeting to arrange for her to participate in that curriculum. Rossi noted it is also important for faculty who are supervising students, at least at the School of Medicine, to have some instruction on how to fill out the forms: Malian's report showed to the Research Committee that faculty have signed off without scrutinizing the protocols sufficiently to ensure the form as filed is ready for the IRB committee to review.

Rossi expects to invite Pineau to come in December to discuss AI. In January, Gail Ryan (AVP, SPA) and AVPR Philip Cunningham will delve further into the foreign relationship issue that Policy has been discussing for some time. As Policy noted in asking the Foreign Influence Policy group to develop a link for the listed countries, Cunningham indicated that the website will be updated regularly to reflect the rapid changes in that list.