

MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-wide Curriculum Committee

February 16, 2022

11:45 a.m. – 12:30 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Solomon Abrams, Leslie Bach, Bill Bosl, Robert Bromfield, Dave Donahue, Cathy Goldberg, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Nick Leonard, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, Deborah Panter, Jeff Paris, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Claire Sharifi

Members Absent: Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, April Randle, and two TBA members.

I. Welcome, Membership Changes, & Approval of the Minutes (5 mins)

Co-Chair and Associate Professor Jo Loomis welcomed all members and officially started the meeting. Co-Chair Loomis welcomed new administrative Co-Chair, Deborah Panter, Associate Vice Provost for Educational Effectiveness. Co-Chair Loomis welcomed new members, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, and Claire Sharifi.

Co-Chair Loomis asked for announcements or changes to the agenda. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Bill Bosl moved to approve the agenda. Jeff Paris seconded the motion. The Committee approved the agenda.

Co-Chair Loomis asked for corrections or additions of the minutes. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Diane Roberts motioned to approve the minutes. Leslie Bach seconded the motion. The Committee approved the minutes.

II. Core Task Force Recommendation & Process (10 mins)

Guest speaker and former administrative Co-Chair Shirley McGuire gave an update. Provost Chinyere has been working with administrative Co-Chair, Shirley McGuire, and faculty Co-Chair, Cathy Gabor, for the Core Redesign Task Force. The Task Force will begin with the *discovery* stage, then will move into the *discernment* stage, then the *implementation* stage.

The Co-Chairs have been meeting regarding the membership of the Task Force. There was a call for membership out with 20+ nominations, including 10-12 faculty nominations. The Co-Chairs will create the Task Force based on representation making sure that all three undergraduate schools will be represented and that the College of Arts and Sciences will have representation in the Sciences, Social Sciences, the Arts, and the Humanities, and that the School of Nursing and Health Professions and School of Management will each have representation.

The Co-Chairs will plan to include students and staff as members of the Task Force. The representation from schools, staff, and students, will be crossed with the call to represent the greater areas of *Jesuit Experience*, *Social Justice*, *Global Experiences*, *Environmental Justice and Sustainability*, *ADEI*, including the list of areas in the charge of the Core Redesign Task Force. The *discovery* stage in the charge for the Core Redesign Task Force generally parallels the “Jesuit Experience” in the Strategic Plan. The JUCC may later on recommend an advisory board to the Provost.

JUCC Co-Chair Deborah Panter asked what the role of the JUCC will be in the Core Redesign process. Core Redesign Task Force Co-Chair McGuire explained that the JUCC will be involved at the end of the process. The Task Force will send the result of its recommendations to the JUCC for review and the JUCC will then send its recommendations to the Provost and to the Deans. The Task Force may consult the JUCC along the way (e.g. questions and issues). The President and the Board of Trustees will provide a final review.

Task Force Co-Chairs Gabor and McGuire would be amenable to holding a joint meeting with the JUCC and Core Redesign Task Force in fall 2024.

III. Considering a [Policy](#) & a [Policy Idea](#) Regarding AI Technology and ChatGPT (20 mins)

Co-Chair Panter introduced the topic of ChatGPT, which was launched and open to the public in November 2022. Education Technology Services (ETS) held a “Lunch and Learn” on the topic, led by faculty members Chris Brooks, Cathy Gabor, and Jonathan Hunt. Attending staff and faculty held a discussion with mixed reception and reservation for allowing and incorporating ChatGPT in the classroom. Co-Chair Panter introduced two examples of policies for using ChatGPT. A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Would a policy be needed to address ChatGPT?
- The Honor Code might cover this need but might be due for a review
- Chat GPT is a tool and a ban would limit its pedagogical use
- Any policy can be outlined at the class level
- Faculty should have control of use of ChatGPT
- Concern for ChatGPT abuse in classes that require students’ strong critical thinking, imagination, and creativity
- The issue is about conveying to students the rules around individual assignments
- Idea for the University to design an introductory first year course for proper use of ChatGPT in an academic setting, including ethics
- How has Turnitin responded? - ETS has a web page dedicated to this
- What are resources or examples from other faculty for using ChatGPT successfully?
- If not a policy, perhaps a task force is necessary to address how ChatGPT will be changing the classroom at USF; what is the potential for teaching and learning?
- We can look at this through the framework of equipping students to succeed and thrive in a world where AI is something that is not going away; this is akin to the practice of information literacy, which understands the tools available, knows which tools to use, knows the limitations of the tools, and engages with them critically

- The Academic Integrity Committee can make changes to the Honor Code. It requires the Academic Integrity Committee to approve change, then send its recommendation to the Provost's Circle for approval
- Is there a standard way to communicate the issues of ChatGPT to students?

IV. Collecting Feedback on Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities over the period of one year (5 mins)

Co-Chair Loomis reminded the Committee to discuss the definitions and guidelines for instructional modalities at the school level and to solicit feedback. The JUCC set up a feedback form for when feedback is given between meetings. Two issues were discussed:

- The origin of the 10% deviation - It is not intended to capture when a faculty member has an emergency or when they need to move to a remote session (e.g. quarantine exposure); it is already the practice for faculty to consult with their deans in emergencies. Rather, the 10% deviation is intended for structural flexibility with instruction (e.g. having an impromptu visitor or arranging for online breakout rooms for pedagogical reasons). Instructors should have conversations with their deans. The JUCC will revisit the 10% deviation after a year
- The Hyflex #4 guideline - Is causing confusion and it is not clear from the wording in the guideline that Hyflex is a classroom management tool. The JUCC should review the wording. The Instructional Modalities Subcommittee can try to clarify this. The Subcommittee is open to taking suggestions from the Committee

V. Closing / Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chair Panter will present at the Council of Deans to talk about ChatGPT and will update the JUCC at the next meeting.

A draft of the course enrollment policy was circulated at the part time faculty union. Will the JUCC review this current draft of the policy? A draft was sent back by the USFFA. Co-Chair Panter asked whether the JUCC would be a good setting to circulate and discuss the draft and at an upcoming meeting. Co-Chairs Panter and Loomis planned to discuss this issue at the Co-Chairs' meeting.

Co-Chairs Loomis and Panter officially closed the meeting.

Minutes by Katie Hoffman