

## MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

October 19, 2023

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

**Members:** Solomon Abrams, Bill Bosl, Robert Bromfield, Dave Donahue, Cathy Gabor, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Megan O’Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Carol Spector, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

**Members Absent:** Johnathan Cromwell, Ashlyn Glancy, Laura Hannemann, Nate Hinerman, Michelle Millar, and two TBA members.

### Agenda Items:

#### I. Welcome, Approval of the Minutes (5 mins)

Co-Chair Deborah Panter officially opened the meeting and welcomed everyone, including meeting guests. JUCC Members introduced themselves to guests, John Bansavich, Director of Instructional Technology and Training, and Rebecca Hong, Vice Provost for Student Success, Inclusive Excellence and Curricular Innovation. Jonathan Hunt, Professor of Rhetoric and Language, joined later in the meeting. Co-Chair Jo Loomis asked for a motion to approve the agenda, or otherwise for additions or corrections to the agenda. April Randle moved to approve the agenda. Megan O’Banion seconded the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a show of hands for approval of the agenda as written. There was a unanimous show of hands and the agenda was approved. Co-Chair Jo Loomis asked the Committee to take a look at the minutes from the September meeting as well as for corrections or additions. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Kate Lusheck moved to approve the minutes. Natacha Ruck seconded the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a discussion. There was none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a show of hands for approval of the minutes as written. There was a unanimous show of hands and the minutes

were approved.

## II. [ASUSF Attendance Policy Memo](#) Continued Discussion (5 min)

Co-Chair Loomis introduced this topic and asked if the Committee would like to take action on the Memo or else continue discussing it. Comments were:

- The students directed the Memo at the JUCC and deserve a response including the following points:
  - Point to [the University Policy in the Catalog](#).
  - Attendance should be stated in the syllabus.
  - Acknowledge confusion, stress, and anxiety around attendance in light of making health decisions and attending classes.
  - Remind students to seek alternative avenues of learning and make-up opportunities.
  - Remind students that education is a partnership.
  - Direct students to follow up with the Provost and Deans; clarify a pathway for them to communicate.
- The Committee should acknowledge receipt of the Memo and take its requests under consideration for a larger discussion at another time.
- How should the Committee respond to the way education is framed in the memo, that it is a product which students are paying for and that they are consumers?
- There are concerns for instructors' rights around taking attendance in light of student needs and then the needs of the coursework (i.e. balancing the huge mental health crisis with the need to come to class to learn).
- Is this a university-wide issue? Students were responding to policies but the Memo seemed not to indicate a general problem but rather a problem for specific classes in a specific school.
- Students also talk about student engagement and mental health in the Memo.
- The JUCC might have a discussion about a campus-wide attendance policy.

- In the class attendance policy in the school catalog, the practice of class attendance is left in the hands of the faculty. Students are expected to attend and the university does not require faculty to take attendance.
  - Adjunct or part-time faculty may be required to take attendance.
- There is a space for the attendance policy within the Simple Syllabus template.
- Requiring attendance should be left up to the faculty based on the nature of the coursework.
  - This could be a difficult position for adjunct or part-time faculty.

Co-Chair Loomis asked if the Committee needed a motion or if it would rather move the item to a future agenda and draft a response. Co-Chair Panter commented in favor of the latter.

### **III. State of Generative AI and Large Language Models (LLMs) use on Campus, Developing Institutional Policy, Guidance, or Resources with Guests John Bansavich (Educational Technology Services) & Jonathan Hunt (Rhetoric & Language) (20 min)**

Co-Chair Panter welcomed guests John Bansavich and Jonathan Hunt. Professor Hunt served on the Academic Integrity Committee and oversaw a substantial revision of the USF Honor Code, for which the JUCC may be able to eventually assist in formalizing. Professor Hunt has worked with John Bansavich over the past year, serving on several panels and presentations about generative AI and LLM use, specifically regarding academic integrity. Professor Hunt made the following points:

- A policy for generative AI is not a good idea. Rather it would be a good idea to support faculty in making effective policies at the course level, as well as for USF to revise its Honor Code.

- The Honor Code prohibits academic dishonesty but it is out-of-date. As with any policy, the Honor Code needs to be updated to keep up with the pace of technological change.
- As a university, we might remind ourselves of the Jesuit value, *Age Quod Agis* “Do what you are doing.” Do not allow AI to do it for you.
- AI can help students be better writers but can also help them cheat. Generative AI is simply a new tool. We did not have a special policy for older such tools.
- Professors need to decide for themselves how AI will be used in their classes.
- Students need to be educated to understand that there will not be a strong consensus on use of AI from class-to-class.
- Under the current Honor Code, analyses of the patterns of reporting students for violation and of the patterns for penalties show wide disparities. It is unpredictable what can happen to students.
- As it is implemented, the Honor Code has big disparities in outcome and those disparities fall heavily in an unequal way in our most vulnerable students.
- It’s an urgent task to revise the Honor Code in such a way that it gives support to students in all situations and that focuses on values that we promote.
- Faculty need support in making decisions about students’ use of AI for themselves and ETS has developed a robust set of resources.

Guest John Bansavich talked about the Educational Technology Services (ETS) resources for faculty that are focused on teaching and learning around the use of generative AI. Mr. Bansavich highlighted some of the points in the *Guidelines for Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence at USF* by Instructional Technology Services, explaining that

- Faculty and staff should be using generative AI wisely and judiciously.
- The goal is to support faculty and staff around appropriate and effective use of AI tools.
- There is a growing concern for data security when using popular AI tools.

- It's critical to maintain a responsible and ethical approach to utilizing AI that aligns with USF's core values.
- The Guidelines are intended to be guardrails to foster secure, ethical, and productive use of generative AI.

Co-Chair Panter commented that Provost Fung asked the Committee to specifically provide feedback on the Academic Integrity Section of the ITS Guidelines as well as to make sure that no Committee members have any issues with it. Co-Chair Panter asked the Committee to provide feedback to the JUCC Co-Chairs or provide it directly to Vince Villarama, Director, Information Security Compliance, Information Technology Services. A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- While it is inevitable and we will have to change assignments, learning outcomes, and courses to integrate generative AI, it will be nice to have some tool to fall back on such as a document (new) regarding academic integrity.
- Faculty members have the authority and power to file an incident report via the current model at USF.
- Students, as well as faculty, are confused about generative AI. Just like we allow faculty to determine their own absence policies—and require them to be stated on the syllabus—we should take the same approach with generative AI.

The Committee meeting time of 45 minutes came to an end. By show of hands, the Committee voted to extend the meeting to an hour. The Co-Chairs asked for a motion to hold future JUCC meetings for one hour. Kate Lusheck moved in favor. Cathy Gabor seconded the motion. Co-Chair Panter asked the Committee members to write to the Co-Chairs or to Katie Hoffman with any feedback about this change. Co-Chair Loomis suggested a Subcommittee as next steps. The discussion continued. Key points were:

- The Honor Code is overseen by Student Life and is something students pledge to. Julie Orio would be the person to whom the JUCC might give its recommendation for an updated Honor Code.

- Provost Fung is also looking for guidance and/or a recommendation on use of generative AI from the Committee.
- Faculty need guidance for their syllabi as to the use of generative AI.
- Sheila Smith McKoy, Vice Provost of Equity, Inclusion and Faculty Excellence, would need to be consulted if there were a recommendation to require a statement about use of generative AI in the syllabi.
- Maybe there needs to be a required course for faculty on use of generative AI.

Co-Chair Loomis called for participation and leadership of a Subcommittee that addresses this topic moving forward. Co-Chair Panter asked Committee members to reach out to the Co-Chairs and/or Katie Hoffman if they were interested in participating. The scope of the subcommittee would include discussing:

- development of policy and/or guidelines
- encouraging a revision of the current academic integrity policy
- developing a relevant statement on the syllabus

**IV. Vote to Adopt Updates from Instructional Modalities Subcommittee (10 min)**

**A. Additional Modality 100% Online & Asynchronous (Refer to Slides, *How Modalities Appear in the Schedule of Classes*)**

**B. Hyflex Guideline**

**C. Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities Application to Courses versus Programs**

Co-Chair Panter opened the topic explaining that the subcommittee revisited the idea of adding a new modality of 100% asynchronous. Committee Member Robert Bromfield had further thoughts that this modality was not needed. Committee Member Bromfield considered how the modalities are displayed to students in the Schedule of Classes and made the following points:

- Students basically want to know how a class meets, where it meets, and when it meets.

- The definitions may be of interest to students, but they are really more important for the Deans and faculty as they determine how to deliver a particular class.
- A new modality of 100% online synchronous or 100% asynchronous will likely confuse students.
- We can ask the students directly what they are looking at that makes them confused about the modality.
- Maybe the language around marketing the new modalities could be improved.

**V. Closing, Vote to Hold Future JUCC Meetings for 60 Minutes, Action Items (5 mins)**

The Committee meeting time of 60 minutes came to an end. Co-Chair Panter suggested that the vote to adopt updates from the Instructional Modalities Subcommittee be moved to the top of the next meeting agenda.