Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

10-11-2023

Senate Meeting, October 11, 2023

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes

Academic Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 11, 2023
approved

Call to Order
Academic Senate Chairperson Martha Callison Horst called the meeting to order.

Roll Call
Academic Senate Secretary Mainieri called the roll and declared a quorum.

Public Comment: All speakers must sign in with the Senate Secretary prior to the start of the meeting.
None.

Approval of the Academic Senate minutes of 8/30
Motion by Senator Mainieri, seconded by Senator Holmes, to approve the minutes. The motion was unanimously approved.

Chairperson's Remarks

Senator Horst: Good Evening.

I wanted to start off with some happy news about our new assistant, Norsule Digema. He is now the proud father of a baby boy named Xavier Digema. Mother and baby are well. Norsule will be taking some time off for a couple of weeks to get to know his baby. I will do my best to cover his work. In the meantime, there may be some late minutes.

As most people know, a faculty union named United Faculty of ISU has filed authorization and membership cards with the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board. The process of clarifying lines of responsibility between the nascent union and the Academic Senate will be a long one.

With the formation of the union, there are many questions and few answers. Here are a few that have come to my mind:
1. What is the role of the Faculty Caucus now?
2. Will any parts of the ASPT document survive?
3. What policies should the Senate work on now?
4. What will happen to the AIF? Who will review the AIF if it remains?
5. Will there be DFSCs? And CFSCs? And will chairs and deans still serve on them?
6. Since the ISU constitution states that College Bylaws must have "procedures for the college council to handle curriculum and appointment-promotion-tenure matters or for college committees on curriculum, appointment-promotion-tenure, and for other committees as necessary," will all college bylaws have to be rewritten?
7. Should the Academic Senate transform because of this major change?
8. Will there be a major ISU constitutional re-write, and, if so, who will do it?

9.Since we have non-unionized NTTs and non-unionized faculty associates, should we continue to have University policies for grievance, and intellectual property, and everything else? Or, are these pockets of faculty now on their own?

At this stage, there are many questions and few answers. One thing is for certain – things are going to change. This is a historic event for the University. It will take years to sort it out and it will also take years for our culture to transform.

Things have already changed for me. I was informed by someone in Hovey that we couldn't discuss something because I was part of the "bargaining unit." I am now the "them." Shared governance at Illinois State University is going to be utterly transformed because of this decision. As one former chair of the Academic Senate put it, "How disappointing. Shared government used to be ISU's great example of working together."   As another former chair of the Senate described it, "The faculty abandoned shared governance and then complained about the lack of shared governance." Is hard for me to imagine how we work together if we are simultaneously strategizing how to gain advantage at the bargaining table.

It is also hard for me to imagine what happens to the Faculty Caucus or the Faculty Affairs Committee. Almost everything that these two groups do is almost certainly something that the Union will want to do. For the first time since the 1950s – and probably before that – the Academic Senate will, most likely, not be working on the ASPT document or the academic freedom policies and procedures. Seventy-five plus years of tradition gone without even a vote.

I have a couple of thoughts that I would like to share on how we could move forward.

First, we should all be proud of all of the work we have done. The Faculty Caucus has been the de facto bargaining unit for the tenure-track faculty for around twenty-five years. We have all stayed till well past 9:30 at night for weeks on end to make sure that we have the best ASPT document possible for this faculty. We did it all without lawyers or mediators or union support teams or, in most cases, course releases.

Jan Cook, a Senate chair in the 90s and the Academic Senate's first woman chair, said this about the Faculty Caucus when it was formed in the nineties:

"I believe the faculty do need a recognized Faculty Association encompassing all of us, but I believe we will have more maneuvering room if that Association is not dependent on the Senate. The functions of the Senate are quite specific. As we have seen lately, the issues that concern faculty do not always fit into the neat categories described by a Senate's committee structure. We need a separate voice, a voice for all faculty, supplemented by a strong liaison into the Senate."

I think she was on to something. The burden placed on faculty senators over the past twenty-five years has been too much. We have had to voice faculty concerns on salary compression, COVID policies, external review letter processes, ReggieNet, and on and on. Despite our best efforts, we couldn't manage the enormous policy portfolio assigned to us. In some way, I feel that a huge weight will be lifted off of the Senate's shoulders. Now, 650 faculty want to take over the duties

of negotiating a lot of stuff that is currently done through University policy. Thank you. It's about time. We have been here in Old Main for twenty-five years working on ASPT language and standing up for the faculty; I, myself, am tired of the Senate carrying this enormous load for the entire tenure-line faculty.

Second, I want to encourage all Senators to join me in envisioning a new future for this body. We shouldn't wait until the union or the administration or the Board of Trustees comes up with a solution. This is an opportunity to reposition the Senate.

For instance, now that the Faculty Caucus is not going to be the de facto bargaining unit for the faculty, why continue to maintain all but one of the faculty seats for tenure-line faculty? Why not let non-tenure track faculty serve? We let them serve on most external committees; We endorsed a non-tenure track faculty to be chair of the Council on Teacher Education – a position normally reserved for a dean. Why not the senate? I was a regular faculty senator at East Carolina University when I was an NTT. We didn't have tenure-line senators and non-tenure track senators; we had faculty senators. Let the Senate fully represent all of the faculty – be it NTT or tenure-line or department chairs or faculty associates or non-unionized NTT.

And, if we are going to focus more exclusively on the academic mission of the University, why not open up some seats for advisors? Why not consider reconfiguring the senate? Northern Illinois University did just that after they unionized. Maybe we should consider restructuring. We could move to a faculty senate, or a university senate with smaller caucuses below it. Our current model was conceived for a university from 1970; it does not match the realities of this university in the 21st century.

But, we don't have to implement anything radical right away. We don't even have official notification that there will be a faculty union. After we receive notification, I think we should have a group of senators begin to examine how the Academic Senate will move forward. I am happy to organize some zoom sessions with various people like Joerg Tiede, national head of AAUP's shared governance division, or Gwen Kay, former Chair of the New York System Senate and President of the National Council of Faculty Senates; they can help us think about things and discover other models for shared governance used at places with faculty unions. If people are interested in being part of such a task force, please contact me.

We can also reach out to other Illinois state shared governance groups with standing faculty unions. On October 20, the IBHE-FAC and the Council of Illinois University Senates will have a meeting here at ISU. Lane Crothers and I are planning conversations with our colleagues from other Illinois public universities. Please come. We are not the only campus in Illinois to go through this. Northern and UIC just went through similar transitions.

In case you didn't know it, my husband was chair of this Senate for five years. I met him at a music event when I went to talk to Paul Borg, a former senate chair and music faculty. Our first date was filled with tales of the Wallace years and the war the Academic Senate had with the administration over the new constitution. Now, we love to run our dinner table using Roberts Rules. I have served on this senate and other senates for over fifteen years. So, in many ways, this event was personal for me. I believe in shared governance, and I feel as if the faculty have

turned their backs on it in favor of a system filled with lawyers and threats. But at this point, we need to help the senate survive and thrive by helping it adapt to this new reality. Let us not dwell on what we don't have any more and let us try to envision what the Senate can become.

Senator Blair: As a student senator, I'm just wondering if there will be impact for the student senators ability to serve in the senate.

Senator Horst: Well, what I'm saying is the Senate is going to fundamentally change and we should all start thinking about it now. But this is a 10-year plan. If you looked at the IBHE-FAC report from last time Eastern Illinois, I think in 2016 they started this process --- and they're still doing it. So, it's going to be a long process and what I'm saying is that the Faculty Caucus, and particularly the faculty senators, being defined exclusively as tenure line faculty, we really might want to rethink that and Northern, for instance, completely reconfigured their Senate. It's just things that we should think about. We don't have to do anything; there's no proposals. I'm just saying we should start thinking about these things.

Student Body President's Remarks

Senator Monk: Good evening, I'd like to begin my remarks tonight by expressing SGA's profound sorrow from the violence taking place in Israel and in Gaza that has resulted in a tremendous loss of life. This recent violence escalates a complex and long-standing conflict that has serious implications for our campus and global community alike. We hold the people of that region and any student impacted by this conflict in our thoughts and hope for a day when conflict will cease. We encourage students affected by this conflict to take advantage of resources on campus, such as Redbird Care Team, Dean of Students Office, Student Counseling Services, and if they are discriminated against, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access.

The Student Caucus has begun our second official policy review, kicking off with a discussion of the anti-hazing policy 5.1.13. We prepared questions and suggestions for Janice Blair, Donald Reed, and Jen Stevenson, who will be attending our November 1st Caucus meeting to help guide our review. The Mental Health Days Commission will be planning to meet this upcoming Friday to compile our final phase of research. We will send our research over and then await our follow-up meeting with State Senator Dave Koehler. With the first draft of the bill written by Senator Koehler's staff and expected to be officially filed shortly, we are hopeful to take the next step of the process in the coming weeks.

SGA is looking forward to celebrating our 100th Anniversary this upcoming Saturday. The breakfast is Saturday, October 14 from 8:30-9:30 a.m. in the Old Main Room, right before the Homecoming Parade, and will be joined by alumni from throughout SGA's history. I'd like to thank Jill Benson and the Dean of Students office for their help in organizing this exciting event.

I am excited to announce a collaboration event between ISU and Illinois Weslyan's Student Senate for the highly anticipated exhibition match in basketball between ISU and IWU on the 29th of October. We will be hosting a program in the Legends Room before attending both games and supporting the men's and women's teams alongside IWU's Association. We are thrilled to begin building a relationship with our crosstown counterparts and set the foundation

for potential collaboration in the future, so I'd like to thank Senator Hartman for his efforts and the Athletics department for their generosity in supporting this event. With that, I'd like to wish everyone a happy homecoming and I will happily answer any questions.

Administrators' Remarks
- *Interim President Aondover Tarhule*

Interim President Tarhule: Like President Eduardo, I too would like to begin by expressing my profound sadness and sorrow. That, the tragedy that we see unfolding in Israel and Gaza, I know many of you probably have families or friends or relations or people that you know in the region and that this must be extremely traumatic for you. I think in the communication that I put out earlier, I listed a number of sources that people can turn to if they need help. But for all of us, I think I would invite you to pray and think about whatever you can do to support the great tragedy to help bring comfort to someone in the region that you might know. I know that there was an event this afternoon to which I was invited pretty close rally, close to the time I couldn't clear my calendar in time to make that happen because I had a prior commitment to speak as well, but I remain open to talking to anyone if they would like to talk to me about those events. I'm happy to meet with them. So again, very sad and I hope like President Eduardo said that we are long for the day when we can seek peace in that part of the world.

Other than that, I just want to wish everybody happiness. And you come out during this homecoming weekend to participate in one of the many activities that we have arranged. There is a 5K run, there is a blood drive, there was a rumble yesterday and many other events as well. So this is a very exciting time, family and friends at campus, and we all look for an opportunity to engage with them and show the highest use spirit. I hope you will all come out on Saturday and help us beat the Sycamores. Then in the evening, watch the volleyball match against Moral State. Whatever you decide to do, do it safely and have fun. Thank you.

Senator Horst: I wanted to thank you for the university communication about the political events. I thought it was very strong and very wise.

- *Acting Provost Ani Yazedjian*

Acting Provost Yazedjian: Thank you. This fall, we launched an enhanced interim grade collection process, streamlining the process and the technology to mirror the final grade collection process. So earlier alert grades were due on Monday at noon, and I'm excited to say that 88 percent of those have been submitted. Implementing a new process always brings about a need for additional modifications. So, I'm grateful to those of you who reached out after my message last week. We did hear some faculty concerns about the required attendance field, and we were actually able to deploy some fixes during the early alert collection process. So, in collaboration with our partners and technology solutions, we plan to make the additional improvements that we weren't able to make right now while also staying in compliance with our federal financial regulations that require us to report student attendance for those who are not passing their classes. So thank you again for your participation and I really wanted to highlight that when you and your faculty colleagues

submit these grades, someone does act. You know, sometimes you just submit it and you wonder what happened. But somebody does act and, in fact, with these early grades submitted academic advisors, and now our student success staff are busy following up with students who can benefit from this additional support. So, for example, peer success and advocates in University College will be calling 500 to 600 specifically identified students to help them each developed student plans and supports for improvement. In addition, other targeted students will be invited to join club success, which is a weekly session specifically designed to help students mid semester improve upon their grades. So again, thank you for your participation. Even though the deadline has passed, I would encourage you and your colleagues to continue to turn in those submissions, because it really is a partnership to help our students succeed; there is going to be another round of interim grade collection. So please share this with your colleagues. One of our primary goals is to support all of our students through to graduation, and interim grade collection is an evidence based best practice that we know works and allows students to get the support they need. So thank you for your partnership. Appreciate it.

Senator Helms: The students are going to be reached out to, you said about 500 students are going to be reached out to by University College. Are all freshmen advised by University College or students from across campus, even those being advised by academic departments?

Senator Hurd: So University College will reach out to their advisees, and then the departmental advisors reach out to theirs.

Senator Helms: Follow up -- the mechanism that has been shared with school or departmental advisors to do this, the mandate to do this has been brought to the chairs' and directors' attention?

Senator Hurd: So you're wondering if we have reached out to the chairs, ask the chairs to have their advisors do that?

Senator Helms: That is correct. Was this a C mandate? the idea of reaching out is a wonderful thing, but reality of academic advising within the departments and schools is there's frankly not always time.

Senator Hurd: So the way that this has been handled has been long standing; so those departments that are reaching out to their students are the ones that have always been doing it. And I know there are some that don't do it at all.

- ***Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson***

Vice President for Student Affairs Levester Johnson: Good evening everyone. Sorry to disappoint and break my one meeting streak of no announcements, but I do have two quick ones. I'm happy to report that we are already seeing excellent engagement by our students and employers at events hosted by Career Services. Almost 500 students and 52 employers attended the fall Internship Fair, and more than 520 students and 119 employers attended last

week's career fair. This is an increase in the number of red birds and employers participating over last.

The second announcement that I have is 1 from health services and the Mennonite College of Nursing, and they're holding their final flu shot clinic for students, faculty and staff this coming Friday, October the 20th in the Bone Student Center Old Main room from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM. Please feel free to go ahead and schedule your appointments by logging into the ISU secure health portal, or just drop through. Typically, they're not too busy, but get your flu shot and help out the community. That concludes my announcements.

- ***Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens***

  Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens: I have no remarks but happy to answer any question.

  Senator Horst: Don't you have a big announcement?

  Vice President for Finance and Planning Dan Stephens: Yes, it is a very bittersweet situation and if you give it an opportunity to return back home, I've got family in in Georgia, lived away for 40 years, and I've got a son now and Birmingham, AL. So, my wife and I have decided it's about time that we return back to our home state and have an opportunity to spend time with our family and especially my parents before they pass away, so it very much is bittersweet. It's almost seven years here, and so my family has always been where I work, so I'm sitting around my family as we speak, but I'm anxious. My wife and I are anxious to actually have an opportunity to be near our immediate family in sometime at the beginning of next year.

  Senator Horst: Thank you so much for your service.

  Senator McHale: I just want to reiterate the gratitude I have for Dan work and to congratulate him on retirement. So thank you very much for your work, Sir. We appreciate you keeping us solvent.

Information Items:

From Academic Affairs Committee:
09.28.23.01 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Current Copy)
09.28.23.02 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Mark Up)
09.28.23.03 Code of Student Conduct Plagiarism Definition (Clean Copy)
09.30.23.01 Report from the Student Caucus
09.28.23.12 Alternate definitions from Academic Affairs Committee

Senator Nikolaou: Our task was to review the portion of the Code of Student Conduct about plagiarism, and whether any changes were needed to be made to address artificial intelligence. So in your material you will see there is a Student Caucus report, and then we also have the

markup from the Academic Affairs Committee. So for the Student Caucus report, the initial recommendation was that there was no initial need to adjust the definition of plagiarism. We also talked about it in the Academic Affairs Committee.

Part of what we did is that we looked at other universities and how they adjusted either their policy or their recommendations. This is one of the other documents that it is included. So you will see there are eight other universities that include an explicit or they include in a policy explicitly, the term artificial intelligence. There are 90 something plus other universities that we looked at. That they do not include it in the policy, but they are in a situation similar to where we are right now. Similar to our CIPD where they say this is the language that you can include on your syllabus to make clear that students know that this might be plagiarism or not. They have similar language. So based on this information, we proposed 2 changes in part A and in part C. We're pretty much, we added:
Possessing or utilizing any means of assistance and in parentheses along with all the other means, we explicitly state "generative artificial intelligence (AI)".

So, to make clear that if students use any other material that is generated by AI and it has not been authorized by the instructor, it's going to be plagiarism. And then in part C We also added "all content created by a generative AI system" to also clarify that it is not only the unacknowledged appropriation of another's work, but it is the unacknowledged appropriation of the content created by its generative AI system.

When we looked into the generative versus the non generative AI, the difference that we found (and it's actually what it is included on the CIPD's website too) were pretty much generative AI it is content created. It's a content that would resemble that it has been produced by humans; and it is the creation of new knowledge. It wouldn't necessarily be when we are in Word and they recommend, "OK, there is this typo, you need to adjust it." Or now in the emails when we start writing something and, based on what we've written in the previous emails, they might predict the next two or three words.

But also at the same time what we mentioned in the committee is, "well, there might be some courses where using let's say Grammarly it would be against the course learning objectives, because if it is course about learning about grammar or syntax." Then it might be unacknowledged use of AI created content. So by default if we are using AI it is going to be plagiarism unless the faculty explicitly states that for our course you are allowed to use XYZ.

Senator Holmes: So, in Student Caucus we talked a lot about how do you plan to enforce that, because AI detectors are not reliable. They give you false positives all the time, and I fear that you're going to give a faculty member what they think is the power to give someone a zero on an exam or not an exam on an essay or something because they think it was written by AI. But really, the person's native language, just as in English, which is like, that's a documented thing. AI detectors flag people whose first language is not English as writing with AI constantly, and I don't want students to go through that. So what's the plan to enforce AI as plagiarism.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, that's similar to any other type of plagiarism. So even if it is not AI, if let's say are you turning in assignment and I think that a student plagiarized. I will still need to

provide evidence that, OK, this paragraph let's say comes directly from that specific website. So then if it is generally AI part of it, it might be that it is matching exactly other websites. So the idea is that you would need to still justify that, OK, these constitutes plagiarism. It is not going to be oh, I think you cheated you're getting a 0.

Senator Horst: My understanding is that the systems that are used to potentially check to see if it's AI have been discredited. So that wouldn't necessarily be something a professor could say, "oh, I ran it through one of these checks and I think it's created by AI" -- that wouldn't necessarily hold water with the Student Code of Conduct, correct?

Senator Nikolaou: That's something for the SCCR, how they're going to decide. The committee would not know how SCCR would treat it. It's similar to any other plagiarism case where they need to review the individual information. If someone claims that they plagiarized because of Artificial Intelligence use, they will need to wait the appropriate data.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, Senator Holmes, there is a process involved, a faculty member, for example, would send a copy of the paper. In cases of plagiarism, they would send a copy of the paper plus the evidence along to the Dean of Students. It's a very formal process that doesn't involve the faculty member. And the faculty member does not enter a grade until that determination made. I understand your concern about that. We've discussed that in the committee about determining if something is created by generative AI. However, we discussed it in the actual enforcement is beyond the purview of the committee. So, we held off on that, but just to keep the policy current, we had to update it that point.

Senator Myers: Is there a chance the Academic Senate will maybe be able to hear from the Dean of Students in this regard in terms of implementation on this policy in regard to AI and how that will be determined on the back end?

Senator Johnson: Again, I think what we need to focus on here and what they are saying is that AI is going to be treated no differently than any other aspect of people being accused or a student, or anyone being accused of plagiarism. There would be a process by which if someone suspects that that is what has happened, they will indicate what gave them that impression, what evidence that they have. Render a decision on it and then pass it over on to Student Conduct. Student Conduct then would take that information, see if they can verify one way or the other as to whether that's legitimate or not, and make a determination on that. And in addition to that, a student or a person who's being accused would have means for appeal for those decisions. Then so just like anything else that a person is accused of, there are means by which you will have opportunity to present your side of the case. The evidence will be presented on its own. And there will be other individuals who will be assisting in making that determination. So, it's not just one person, and I think that's where this fear or where some of the concern is coming from. So, either we go with the process that we have for any allegations that are made against anyone who's accused of whether it's plagiarism or violating any aspects of the conduct code, there are means by which a person can be heard and present information and evidence in order to be, I guess, found responsible or not.

Senator Holmes: So I understand that there is a system in place. We met with Janice Blair and she explained the system as it works right now. She explained that basically they have cases where they think it was AI, but they think it was AI because the sources were made-up and so that is already plagiarism under the current definition of plagiarism. So what my gripe with adding AI to this? Like naming AI in the policy itself is there is no evidence you can give to directly support the fact or the idea of the fact that somebody used AI to do this. There is no credible AI checker, and you can't turn that into the Student Code of Conduct to tell them that they use AI unless the student admits to using AI. There is no credible evidence and currently from my understanding.

Senator Horst: But what if the students admits to using AI. Is that plagiarism? That's the question.

Senator Holmes: Janice Blair, the way that she explained it, is they currently already interpret another as being AI.

Senator Horst: Can you talk about how you use the word "another" and why you thought it important to include these words?

Senator Nikolaou: So for another's work, we thought that it refers to an actual person, and that's why we are referring to content created by generative AI. So even the simplest case that was just mentioned that if a student states that, oh, I use AI for this specific paragraph, if it is not included here it means that it is not plagiarism. So even in the simplest case, it means that it would be counted as plagiarism unless the faculty has already said you are free to use AI as a learning tool.

Senator Roy: kind of going off that last thing, is there a reason why you guys decided to make it that the whole faculty have to explicitly say you can use AI rather than allow AI and encourage faculty to not allow AI in their syllabus? When we kind of looked at them Student Caucus, that was the interpretation we had is that faculty should use their syllabus to enforce it rather than it being the code of conduct.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, we are referring to the unacknowledged appropriation. So, that's why it appears into both parts. So, if it has not been authorized by the instructor because it's the same way when we say if you cannot go, let's say, in an academic paper and then just take the paragraph and include it in your paper. It's the same idea the paper was created by a person. If there is a paragraph that was created by a non-person, it's the same rationale.
And the other part is that it also follows what currently is the recommendation from the Center for Integrated Professional Development, where there is an explicit statement like for the language that can be included on the syllabus where it says that that would constitute Academic misconduct.

Senator Bever: Just kind of start off that point, line 13, it brings up possession or utilizing of any means of assistance. The word "possessing" terrifies me a bit because it says possessing. What does that mean? If I'm completing an assignment for one class and I have Chat GPT open, am I possessing generated AI assistance, even though I'm not using it for assignment? I just think

that's just a means for going after students. Even though they're not using generative AI for classroom assignment, the word possession I think is just a very poor choice.

Senator Cline: Sorry, I need to go a couple of students back Senator Holmes. There are verified ways. OK, I'll tell you I'm not saying an automated way. I got an E-mail from a colleague of mine in Connecticut about two weeks ago and she sent me a paper with a student who had quoted me. There was something that she didn't think sounded quite right because she knows my scholarship. She knows how I think about things and AI can generate quotations from books that either exist or don't exist because they have uploaded sort of the grand totality of human knowledge into these systems. So, this student had quoted me, there were question marks around it. It was fully cited from a book that doesn't exist in words that I never used. So, there are ways… you say there's no verifiable way. I can promise you that this, this kid did not have authentic use of material. So, there are ways, and I think that this sort of sense that we're trying to come after students, all this is saying is that by using some other device other than your own brain that is a form of plagiarism. And I think that the systems that we use with our students, you can decide that the system is unfair, but recognizing that use of an outside piece of material, in lieu of your own mind, to complete as an assignment is what they're trying to get at. It was my understanding, Senator Nikolaou, that this suggestion came from Student Government. Is that right?

Senator Horst: No, we included their report in here, but they did not support this.

Senator Nikolaou: But then but then when we talked in the Academic Affairs Committee, our student members, they understood that it is about the unauthorized use. So that to make clear that if it is a non-person, it is still plagiarism. And it's not that we are trying to get after any students; we're just adding more clarity. If you didn't create it yourself (and that's why the generative is included) it is a form of plagiarism…. Unless the instructor explicitly allows it, because it might be that it is a course totally on AI. So, in that case, for sure you're going to be using AI.

Senator Cline: One of the things that we brought up in the Executive Committee, I just wanted to say on the floor is that I think it's very important that it be included in this list of things that students are considered to be plagiarism rather than putting the burden on a faculty member in each and every case to have a seven page document about the things you are not allowed to use in class. Because if you say that you, the faculty member, has to explicitly say you can't use it, this is far less of a fair thing for the faculty than to say that the faculty has to explicitly say you can use it. It's relying on an external device or system or whatever to assist with your work. And, as you say, there might be classes that's what they want and that's OK and that should be part of the syllabus.

Forcing faculty to explicitly say you know all of the things that you're not allowed to use in each and every syllabus will become a real burden on faculty. Because many ways that people have discovered to get around rules, it becomes kind of an endless whack-A-mole, and we have other things to do.

Senator Horst: Can you please talk about the word possessing?

Senator Nikolaou: So we didn't make any changes in the other language because the Code of Student Conduct is with SGA, and we were told that we are only explicitly looking if we can add AI or not. My reading for the possessing -- Well, it might be that it needs to be clarified for when the revision comes, but pretty much if we have an exam, unless we say that it is an open book exam, you cannot have books. If we say that is an exam where you can't use AI, you cannot use AI. So that's my understanding of what the possessing means, but that's not something that we were looking at. It is another chance that we have to review the Code of Student Conduct, but we are not going to review the whole code until we get all the feedback from SGA.

Senator James: My understanding for plagiarism or I guess to avoid plagiarism, is to cite your sources correctly. So let's say that I do use AI for some reason or another, is there a way that I can properly cite these sources of AI without being in trouble?

Senator Nikolaou: So the same way that you would cite… For example, let's say you get an explicit excerpt from a textbook or a book, and then you say in parentheses (Nikolaou, 2023). Similarly, you could say that it is from whatever like Chat-GPT generated and that's also the language that CIPD includes. For example, they do say "Using them to create text for a written assignment would be plagiarism if that content were not cited as being AI generated content." So as long as you knowledge that, OK, I use these artificial intelligence in order to generate that content, then you do acknowledge you don't claim that it is yours.

Senator James: I know professors do use citations to go and check people's work. Since it's AI generated and it's individual, do you think that they would be possibility of being able to pinpoint that and be like yeah, it was AI generated or not?

Senator Nikolaou: That would be speculation. I cannot answer that.

Senator Holmes: So I'd like to go back to Senator Cline's point about her anecdote about being reached out from a professor from Connecticut. And that's what Janice Blair talked a lot about is AI will make up citations, and that fits under our current definition of plagiarism. It's the misappropriation of someone's work and it's not your work. It doesn't exist, so it's the citation is wrong. And the way that Janice Blair explained it was that they've already been using that sort of evidence under the current policy to quote unquote prosecute for the use of AI. It's not termed under the use of AI, because you cannot provide evidence that somebody used AI. You can provide evidence that they did their citations wrong, they cited something wrong, but that they actively used AI. Like if the AI is not citing things, how are you supposed to know that it was used by AI? It's just words. It's like I could write the same thing that the AI writes. And as AI gets better, you will not be able to tell the difference. You already can't, and I fear that adding the words AI into it just it creates a weird world that we don't need. I'm not saying that the misappropriation of the use of AI is not plagiarism. I'm just saying that I don't know if it belongs in the policy right now, because you cannot tell. You cannot tell me when somebody uses it effectively.

Senator Horst: I'm going to remind everybody we're in an information session and so we're trying to uncover what the committee talked about.

Senator Roy: You kind of hinted on this earlier with the Grammarly discussion. But how I use AI personally I don't use it to say write me a paper on a topic. I'll provide a paper I wrote and ask it to grammar check and only grammar check, because it's like free Grammarly. And I guess I'm wondering if the etcetera would count as like if Word has underlying blue and that says "add a comma", would that be counted as plagiarism if not outlined in syllabuses? I know I can't think of a single professor who says you can use Word spell check in a syllabus, so with every single example of that be plagiarism? and if I were to use an AI to grammar check with that be plagiarism?

Senator Nikolaou: So that's why we have the degenerative AI, because the generative is about creating new knowledge. So the spell checking it is not new knowledge, which goes back to the basic example that I mentioned in the beginning, --- that if you have an English course which is about grammar in that case, it would count as plagiarism potentially, but then that that's where it would be a case by case, and that's where it should be. We also looked at the "Faculty Responsibilities to the Students policy, where one of the responsibilities is that on the syllabus, the faculty need be clear about what are the expectations. So if my expectation is that you are not going to be using any like Word type of program where they might be correcting your grammar, then it is the faculty responsibility.

Senator Pancrazio: Yes, Senator Horst, I was just going to mention that some of the ideas are beginning to repeat themselves, so that if we're not going to have new information, we should probably move on.

Senator Horst: I am also just wondering if it might be good to include a definition of generative AI. Maybe this will be something that people will know in the future, but it might not be common knowledge right now.

Senator Midha: I just have one comment based on a ruling that came out two months ago from federal court, which states that AI generated content is not copyrightable. So if our definition of plagiarism is not using your own work, it works. But if the definition is not using other's work then the others needs to be defined if it is someone or it is anything. So if it is someone then according to that ruling, it is not copyrightable because it is not created by someone, so that could cause some confusion in legal terms. So you may want to check with the legal about that.

Senator Blair: I'm on the Academic Affairs Committee and I just wanted to add just a little bit of context. Number one, this goes back kind of more to the beginning, but I don't feel like it was ever answered with why specifically we said we need to include generative AI in that paragraph A. It was simply because it says of "another", and as we mentioned the interpretation now is that "another" would include AI. 15 years from now, it might not, and others is a vague term, so we wanted to put AI specifically in there to make sure that it was clear that if a student was using AI in a way without citing it and without instructor approval, that it could be considered plagiarism. It is, even though it's not a human being that creating it. We were still classifying it as a tool that can generate content in that way.

Then the other thing, and I just want to this is from my understanding. But when it comes to some of the things that Senator Holmes mentioned, there is no evidence that you can use. Well,

even if that's the case, we can still include this in the policy. And if there is no evidence that can definitively state that a student plagiarized using AI, then the Code of Conduct is unlikely to actually enforce any punishment on that. So I don't see that any student would be negatively harmed by that, because if the professor cannot provide the evidence, then the Code of Conduct is not going to penalize the student. That's my understanding.

Senator Bever: We definitely do need a definition to generate the AI, because this is just all over the place. But I'm also concerned about students using generative AI to get research. For example, I use ChatGPT to get research papers. There's plugins for that; is that cheating? If I'm pulling research articles using ChatGPT and then summarizing for me and then listing main points, is that going to be classified under generated AI? It is generating content but it is also finding it for me; but it's also reliable content, so it's in this gray area; I feel like generative AI is a blanket term is a very poor decision in this case.

Senator Nikolaou: Well, you mentioned that you are finding the papers through Chat CPT, for example, right?

Senator Bever: yes.

Senator Nikolaou: Then, it is up to the type of the course; because it is a course where you need to learn how to identify primary and secondary sources and you need to you know, and they have given you specific instructions. You need to go to the library and then find your field of study and then identify papers based on your topic, and then you go to the ChatGPT for this class, it might count as plagiarism. But then, if it is that, well, I'm writing a research paper and instead of going to Google and I write, I'm going to look at the impact of health and wages. I put it on ChatGPT and I just find a list of topics, but then you go you read the articles and then you summarize it yourself. In that case it wouldn't be a plagiarism because it didn't generate the new content; you actually read you generated the content and you submitted your own personal work.

Senator Barrowclough: Quick food for thought. I just asked AI to create a policy on plagiarism and it doesn't talk about AI so I don't know.

From Faculty Affairs Committee:
09.28.23.07 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Current Copy)
09.28.23.08 Policy 3.2.12 Ombudsperson (Mark Up)
08.10.23.01 Memo from Interim President Tarhule
10.05.23.01 Summary from Faculty Affairs Committee

Senator Lucey: So Faculty Affairs Committee presents a motion to strike the Ombuds policy. This comes from a discussion that Academic Senate had on October 12th, and Faculty Affairs sent a letter to President Tarhule with a plan for striking the policy. You were sent a memo to the Executive Committee. You were sent a copy of President Tarhule's letter. And you're also sent copies of the markup policy and the original policy. We had conversation with General Counsel about the legal considerations and we solicited feedback from the Civil Service Council as well.

Senator Horst: I do have a letter that the AP Council and Civil Service Council chairs and I are prepared to sign that basically formally request not to delete the policy until a professional ombudsperson is in place.

Internal Committee Reports:
- *Academic Affairs Committee: Senator Nikolaou*

  Senator Nikolaou: Well, the Academic Affairs Committee met this evening and we talked a little bit about the plagiarism policy at the beginning. And also we talked about policy 2.1.19 verification of student identity, 4.1.15 solicitation of academic assignments. We are going to be sending one of out of the three policies tomorrow.

- *Administrative Affairs and Budget Committee: Senator Mainieri*

  Senator Mainieri: Tonight we discussed an item on our Issues Pending list concerning a request for us to consider Fall break and Thanksgiving break. And do we need more break in October and things along those natures. We spent the time really just laying the foundation for this discussion and have a few questions to ask back to Executive Committee which will come via e-mail.

- *Faculty Affairs Committee: Senator Lucey*

  Senator Lucey: Faculty Affairs had updates on the Faculty Affairs possible charge given the recent developments of prospects of a Union, we had an in-depth conversation about faculty hiring, procedure Policy, 3.3.2, and then we also had an extensive conversation about the honorary degree policy, which will be going to the Executive committee.

- *Planning and Finance Committee: Senator Valentin*

  Senator Valetin: We welcome guests Mike Gebecki, a VP of Facility Services, Eric Hodges, Director of Emergency Management, David Marple, Director of Risk Management, Adam McCrary, Director of Environmental Health and Safety, and Aaron Woodruff, Chief of the University Police, to discuss the status of and progress towards the requests outlined in the committees' Priority Brief on Pedestrian Safety.

- *Rules Committee: Senator Blum*
  Senator Blum: the Rules Committee passed the changes to Milner Bylaws tonight and that has been sent. And we also discussed some constitutional changes and we should probably wrap those up next month.

- *University Policy Committee: Senator Sheridan*

  Senator Sheridan: We discussed the personal plus time, and I'll have that to the Executive Committee tomorrow and we were thankful to, Janice Bonneville, Associate Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer for answering our questions. It also

happens to be on our committee, so that was very convenient and we are wrapping up policy 1.15, the whistleblower policy, and we'll have that concluded at our next meeting.

Communications

Senator Mainieri: On Wednesday, October 25th, the School of Kinesiology and Recreation will host our annual Esther Larson McGinnis Scholar Lecture. This year, we are at the thrilled to be joined by Doctor Kemba Noel-London, who will deliver address about looking outside to understand within the complexity of play, recreation, sport and youth development. Now, I would never encourage anyone here to miss a Senate meeting, but it does conflict with the Senate meeting, so maybe pass it along to students if those areas seem related to the ones that you're experts in. Thank you.

Senator Cline: Just because I give an annual update, I just want to say congratulations to the five Fulbright applicants that were sent off to the federal process today, two alumni and three current students have applied for Fulbright awards to Malawi, Belgium, Spain, the UK and Finland, and we wish them luck.

Adjournment
Motion by Senator McHale, seconded by Senator Bever, to adjourn. The motion was unanimously approved.