UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

May 16, 2024 | 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Johnathan Cromwell, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, Deborah Panter, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Freddie Seba, Carol Spector, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

Members Absent: Solomon Abrams, Robert Bromfield, Dave Donahue, Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, and two TBA members.

Agenda Items:

I. **Welcome, Approval of the Minutes & Agenda (5 min)**

Co-Chairs Deborah Panter and Jo Loomis officially opened the meeting. Co-Chair Loomis asked committee members to review the minutes from the April meeting and if there were any corrections or additions. There was a point of clarification from a Committee member in the April meeting minutes under section III. Process for Core Approval: *The iterative process would have two touch points … 2. Touchpoint #2 …The Core Advisory Group was split on the process of the second touchpoint.* The Committee member clarified the matter of the Advisory Group's split, that it was regarding the vote question as to whether the final proposal went to a full-time faculty vote via the USFFA or whether it could go directly to JUCC, and that the Advisory Group's split was not regarding whether there was a touchpoint #2. Co-Chair Loomis called for a motion to approve the minutes with the correction. There was a motion to approve the minutes with the correction. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion with one abstention. The motion passed. Co-Chair Loomis asked committee members to review the agenda. Co-Chair Loomis asked for additions or corrections for the agenda. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. **Proposal in Curriculog (5 min) [Health Systems Leadership Doctor of Nursing Practice, Education and Simulation Concentration, DNP](#) (New Program, Multiple Schools)**

Co-Chair Panter introduced the program pending JUCC approval in Curriculog. The Health Systems Leadership DNP Education and Simulation concentration collaborates with the School of Education on some of the classes that are offered in this concentration of the DNP. The JUCC approved the overall Health Systems Leadership DNP program previously and the concentration that collaborates with the School of Management. Co-Chair Loomis added that this concentration for the DNP will be attractive to nurses who are interested in becoming faculty and that the SONHP wanted to enlarge the student experience by collaborating with the School of Education. There were no issues of note with this proposal.

Co-Chair Panter asked if there were any questions or if Committee members wanted to discuss the proposal. There were no questions and no requests for a discussion. Co-Chair Panter asked for a motion to recommend approval to the provost. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in favor and for any abstentions or any hands not in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

III. **[USF Syllabus Statement Options for Generative AI & Faculty Considerations](10 min).**
Guest: Jill Ballard, Instructional Designer, Educational Technology Services

Guest Jill Ballard introduced the USF Syllabus Statement Options for Generative AI & Faculty Considerations document to the Committee. Feedback from sessions in the ETS GenAI Symposium infomed the document. Faculty wanted to have options for communicating Generative AI use in their courses but also needed a framework for understanding. The document was developed over time and informed by different bodies across campus (e.g., the Generative AI Taskforce and the Tracy Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence FLC, Pedagogy for the Age of AI: Responding to and Learning From AI-generated Content). The second part of the document (page two) is geared toward helping faculty make sense of what they are choosing between the three statement options (page one). This includes an understanding of the complexity involved when considering a policy, what faculty should and shouldn't know as far as equity concerns, and wider campus requirements. The goal was to present the document to the JUCC with the possibility that, if approved by the JUCC and then the provost, it would be made available to faculty to make choices for fall 2024. Key points from a brief discussion were:

- How will this be communicated to instructors who don't use Simple Syllabus?
  - Distribution of the document is unclear at this point. It could be communicated through the provost's newsletter
- It is useful for the statements to be customizable so the instructors can adapt them to match the tone of their syllabus
- The JUCC Generative AI Subcommittee previously looked at websites that were geared towards helping instructors understand the reasons behind their policies. A specific website around heuristics in Generative AI use was well-received by members of the Subcommittee. Suggestion to link this site to in the document - or some other such site - if appropriate
  - More links to ensure best practices can be added including internal links
- The second option is helpful for when instructors want to be able to use generative AI in only one assignment
- If this is added to Simple Syllabus, perhaps a fourth customizable option can be added in order to allow the instructor to use their own language

Co-Chairs Panter and Loomis called for a motion to recommend adoption of the document. There was a motion to approve the document for use in Simple Syllabus. The motion was seconded. There was an amendment to change the motion so as not to limit use in Simple Syllabus but rather to authorize the document to be used in USF syllabi. The motion was amended. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a show of hands in favor and for any abstentions or any hands not in favor. The motion passed with one abstention. Co-Chair Panter will communicate the JUCC's approval of the document to provost Fung.

IV.   **Processes for Core Approval (20 min) [SPWG#1 Process-Related Recommendations](#)**

The JUCC had a robust discussion on the process for approving the final redesign of the core curriculum in April, following a summary of the Strategic Plan Working Group #1's (SPWG#1's) recommendations – to increase community trust in the process and to maintain transparency of the process. Member Kate Lusheck presented feedback from the Core Advisory group which recommended that the USF community should have a chance to weigh in on the redesign. The method of the feedback will be decided by the Core Redesign Task Force. Further discussion by the Committee ensued. Key themes and points were:

- *Maintain an iterative process*
  - Will next year's Task Force hold a series of community input sessions with updates and with progress reports? This would allow for input from the USF community
  - Consider a poll(s) to gather feedback from the faculty community and make the process more iterative
    - Faculty can share the poll(s) with their students
    - The JUCC could help craft the poll or the Task Force might design the poll
  - Earlier timing of feedback from the community would make the feedback more useful during the crafting of the design process rather than as verdict on the end result of the process
  - The faculty vote(s) might be timed so that the Task Force can have time to rework the designs based on that feedback
  - The Task Force presents final document (after holding listening sessions/broad community engagement)
- *Determine the process/voting power*
  - Feedback from Core Advisory Group and from the Arts Council was that there was a strong feeling regarding a JUCC-only vote and that there needed to be a

full time faculty vote through USFFA or some other body of 75% of those who vote to approve

- ○ The Arts Council and Core Advisory Group feedback was that faculty should be able to weigh in on the proposed Core redesign(s) and that it would be a great deal for the few faculty members of the JUCC to have to speak for the whole university
- ○ The Strategic Plan Working Group's recommendation contemplated final approval (before the provost) being made by the JUCC. It did not mention a faculty vote though there was mention of robust community feedback.
- ○ It would use useful info for the JUCC to see the results of a part-time and full-time faculty vote in order for the JUCC to look at all data, vote, and advise the provost
- ○ It is important to recognize that the faculty has two bodies (full and part-time)
- ○ Consider the CBAs and the faculty ownership of the curriculum
- ○ Will faculty involvement, whether by a formal vote or a poll, occur before the JUCC?
    - ■ Yes, the JUCC would be the final vote
    - ■ Would the faculty vote before the JUCC undermine the JUCC's vote? The JUCC members were elected to make these decisions
- ○ Is a full-time faculty vote on the Core indicated in the USFFA CBA and therefore distinct from the JUCC?
    - ■ The USFFA would likely organize general meetings to look at the full draft(s) of the Core revision proposal(s) and would likely talk it through to ensure their JUCC representatives are in attendance so that the JUCC representatives understand where the USFFA members stand and what the larger constituency thinks. This could happen in addition to early community-wide polls
    - ■ The same could happen with the USF PTFA
- ○ Registrar Bromfield mentioned the usefulness of listening sessions in the Student Evaluations of Teaching (BLUE) redesign process during the April meeting
- ● *Determine the percentage of the vote*
    - ○ It would be restrictive if the JUCC voted down a model when the faculty voted 64% in favor
    - ○ It seems rare for 75% of a population to agree

- ○ Why did the Core Advisory Group recommend a 75% approval?
  - ■ 3/4 is a turning vote for large departments
  - ■ a 50% vote is a weak vote
  - ■ What percentage can people say, "I'm not sure?" and what percentage shows sure approval and support across the university?
  - ■ For the 75% faculty vote, is that for full-time and part-time?
- ○ How would the JUCC make use of an up or down vote by the faculty?

Co-Chairs Loomis and Panter asked whether the JUCC was ready to make a recommendation on the process. There was a motion to approve the process as laid out in the document by the SPWG#1, adding a request for additional involvement of the JUCC to define the polling of faculty. The motion was seconded. The motion was amended to extend gathering faculty information beyond a poll to: approve the process as laid out by the SPWG#1 recommendation, adding the JUCC recommendation to define faculty community input such as a poll or vote or other mode of gathering information. The amendment was agreed upon. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in favor, not in favor, or for any abstentions. The motion passed all in favor and with no abstentions.

V. **Complete Service Terms and Appointment Processes (15 min) [By-Laws of the JUCC](#)**
  A. **April Randle - College of Arts and Sciences (Sciences) - Faculty Representative - 2021-2024**
  B. **Solomon Abrams - Graduate Student Senate - Graduate Student Representative - 2022-2024**
  C. **Ashlyn Glancy - ASUSF Senate - Undergraduate Student Representative - 2022-2024**
  D. **Robert Bromfield - Academic Affairs - Administrative Representative - 2021-2024**
  E. **Cathy Gabor (serving term for Jeff Paris) - College of Arts and Sciences - Administrative Representative - 2021-2024**
  F. **Megan O'Banion - School of Nursing and Health Professions - Administrative Representative - 2021-2024**
  G. **Michelle Millar - School of Management - Administrative Representative - 2021-2024**
  H. **Erika Johnson- Gleeson Library - Administrative Representative - 2021-2024**

Co-Chair Panter explained that some JUCC members are concluding their terms as per the by-Laws though all members have the option of serving a second term. The by-Laws are silent as to the length of the terms of the administrative members of the JUCC. The provost appoints the administrative representatives of the JUCC while the unions nominate the faculty representatives. Committee members indicated that the unions will organize around voting in new representatives or renewing terms of current representatives. Co-Chair Loomis asked representatives to take this topic back to their constituents to make sure the mechanisms are in place.

VI. **Closing and Action Items (5 min) For Summer Review, Discussion and Vote in Fall 2024:**
Proposed Changes to the Academic Integrity Committee By-Laws

Co-Chair Panter introduced the last item on the agenda, the Proposed Changes to the Academic Integrity Committee by-Laws. The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) recently provided the changes to the JUCC with the understanding that there wasn't enough time for the JUCC to review and make recommendations during the May meeting. The AIC asked the JUCC members to review the changes over the summer. Co-Chair Panter stated that the AIC's proposed changes would be added to the September 2024 meeting. Questions were:

- What is the AIC's motivation behind these changes?
- Will the JUCC have time to devote a discussion to these changes? A: Yes