

MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

September 19, 2024 | 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Robert Bromfield, Johnathan Cromwell, Dave Donahue, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Marisa McCarthy, Megan O’Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Freddie Seba, Carol Spector, James Taylor

Members Absent: Nate Hinerman, Kate Lusheck, Natacha Ruck, Shivani Shukla, and four 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 agenda and if there were any additions. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis called for a show of hands to approve the agenda. There was a unanimous show of hands. Co-Chair Loomis called for any changes or edits to the minutes from the May meeting. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis called for a motion to approve the minutes as written. There was a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter called for a show of hands in favor of the motion, in abstention, and then any in opposition. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Deactivation Proposals in Curriculog (5 min)

- A. [Simulation Education Certificate](#)
- B. [Simulation Operations Management Certificate](#)

Co-Chair Loomis gave a brief overview of the deactivation proposals in Curriculog, which were two certificates in the School of Nursing and Health Professions (SONHP) that were no longer in effect. The related degree program was deactivated in 2020: the Masters in Healthcare Simulation; the SONHP was deactivating the opportunity to obtain a certificate that was connected to an already deactivated degree program. Co-Chair Panter called for a motion to recommend approval of the two deactivations. There was a motion for approval. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter called for a show of hands to approve the motion. The motion carried with a unanimous show of hands. There was one question after the vote:

- Do all program deactivations come before the JUCC even if they don’t impact more than one school/college/unit?
 - Yes, because while one campus unit may think that there is no impact beyond their own unit, other campus units may disagree.

III. Discussion and Vote in Fall 2024: [Proposed Changes to the Academic Integrity Committee By-Laws](#) (25 min)

Co-Chair Loomis provided background information for the proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) By-Laws. The proposal included the addition of co-chairs with the goal of providing AIC coverage during the summer months, when full-time faculty might not be present. The proposal also included changes to the language to emphasize the possibility of using AI inappropriately when it could be considered as plagiarism or as cheating. A brief discussion was held. Key points were:

- The reference to “alleged student” should be changed to “accused student.”
- The policy language regarding use of AI should be clarified. There is a possibility to interpret a clause in the new language to say that AI is prohibited.
- How might the policy be unfairly applied to students when the use of generative AI is permitted across a spectrum from course-to-course, according to each syllabus?
- Language to the policy should be added to remind faculty that it is their responsibility to be explicit about the permissions for using generative AI in their course syllabi. As well, language should be added about cheating detectors for use of AI. They are not 100% effective and can result in unfair consequences for groups of students such as multilingual students.
- Typo: “Offenses for which a letter of censure is an appropriate include...” in the last paragraph on page five should be “Offenses for which an educational consequence is appropriate include....” ?
- There is some casual diction such as “wiped” that should be changed to “removed.”
- Agreement with the proposed change to the AIC structure: to add staff for summer coverage to ensure case resolutions.

Co-Chair Panter offered to send the JUCC’s comments and suggested changes to the AIC.

IV. Appointments for Administrative Members [By-Laws of the JUCC](#) (10 min)

Co-Chair Loomis explained that there may need to be some changes to the JUCC By-Laws. Specifically language may need to be added that covers the appointment process of administrative members. Currently the By-Laws do not clearly describe how administrative representatives are appointed. A brief discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Some of the administrative representatives are appointed because of their positions such as the Registrar or the Associate Director of Curriculum Management.
- Is it implicit in the By-Laws that administrative representatives serve at the pleasure of the Provost and deans? Or is it something that we should look into amending in the By-Laws?
 - It would be useful if the By-Laws specified this group of membership in order to avoid any confusion about terms of service.

- We might amend the By-Laws to be specific about those that are appointed by the Provost or the Deans and who stay on until they roll out of their positions.
- Regarding term lengths, are administrative representatives - such as Associate Deans of the schools - designees until they leave their positions?
 - One member confirmed service on the JUCC until the appointment is changed by their dean.
- It might be useful to edit the JUCC webpage to add the terms after each member's name. The faculty co-chair is elected (and Co-Chair Loomis was re-elected) so it would bring clarity for all to see the term dates on the webpage.
- Part of the confusion is that there was the Pre-JUCC, where we were figuring out our scope and mandate.

Co-Chairs Panter and Loomis planned to bring some new proposed language for the By-Laws regarding the appointments and terms for administrative members to the next JUCC meeting for discussion.

V. Collection of Feedback for Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities (10 min)

Co-Chair Panter provided an update on the status of the feedback document. There were no new comments. Co-Chair Panter asked members to add any feedback on behalf of their constituents to the document. Co-Chair Loomis explained that the document was indeed to be kept open for a year. Comments were:

- This is the kind of thing that you want to bring back to department meetings, or to the chairs of the departments.
 - And to faculty meetings and union meetings.
- It seems like the definitions are going smoothly and that the JUCC rewrote them with enough leeway for faculty to do what they need to do within the confines of the four definitions.
 - There is always room for improvement so any feedback would be helpful.
- We continue to acculturate the definitions. The Continuity of Instruction Policy was recently updated to be consistent across the modalities.

VI. Closing (5 min)

The Co-Chairs officially closed the meeting at 12:15 pm.