MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

November 16, 2023

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

Members Present: Solomon Abrams, Robert Bromfield, Johnathan Cromwell, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Natacha Ruck, Freddie Seba (for Bill Bosl), Carol Spector, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

Members Absent: Dave Donahue, Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, Diane Roberts, and two TBA members.

Agenda Items:

I.   **Welcome, Approval of the Minutes, Curriculog Proposals (20 min)**

Co-Chair Deborah Panter officially opened the meeting at the new 11:30 a.m. start time. Co-Chair Loomis asked for additions or corrections to the minutes from the October meeting. There were none. There was a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously. Co-Chair Loomis called for any additions to the agenda. Member Bromfield added a link to an article the chat (https://www.chronicle.com/article/course-correction) explaining its relevance to the recent JUCC discussions around the ASUSF Attendance Policy Memo and the Definitions and Guidelines for Instructional Modalities. A motion to approve the agenda was called for. There was a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

A. **Deactivations in Masters in Asia Pacific Studies**

Co-Chair Panter introduced five deactivation proposals in Curriculog that were pending approval by the JUCC. All were pathways within the Masters in Asia Pacific Studies that the College of Arts and Sciences planned to teach out and integrate into the International Studies program. It was added that the deactivations were long-discussed

and vetted within the College with the full support of the Dean's Office. It was noted that the proposals were thoroughly written. Co-Chair Panter asked if there were any questions, comments, or concerns. It was asked how many students would be affected by the deactivations. 11-12 students would be affected. A motion was called for to recommend approval of the deactivations to the provost. There was a motion to recommend approval. The motion was seconded. There was a unanimous show of hands in recommendation for approval and Co-Chair Panter stated that she would document the JUCC approval in Curriculog for all five proposals.

B. **Process for Proposals for Programs that Impact More than One School (e.g. New DNP Concentrations)**

Co-Chair Panter provided background on the JUCC approval process and workflow for program proposals in Curriculog that impact more than one school/college. The JUCC planning committee (JUCC Workgroup) had agreed that the JUCC's recommendation should come after the Deans Office's review and approval step but before the provost's step so that the JUCC can make a recommendation to the provost per its charge. Co-Chair Loomis provided an overview of new such proposals coming through Curriculog, Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) concentrations that will involve more than one school/college, specifically the School of Management (SOM) and the School of Education (SOE). Co-Chair Loomis shared her screen to show an example of the course list included in the proposal plan for the new management concentration of the DNP. No new courses would be created. It was pointed out that the JUCC was the only body that reviewed cross-school program proposals and so these proposals were appropriately before the JUCC. It was added that a new program form could be created in Curriculog to route approvals to more than one Dean's Office. It was suggested that the originating Dean's Office would weigh in first before the non-sponsoring school could weigh in, followed by the JUCC. A discussion ensued. The main points were:

- A strategy in Curriculog that naturally does some redirection would be ideal, including for proposals that are 4+1 programs.
- How would 4+1 programs that pre-date Curriculog be managed?

- Shouldn't all 4+1 programs to come before the JUCC?
- There is currently no official mechanism in Curriculog for new proposals that span the schools as this type of proposal has been infrequent and custom routed.
- A formalized process that includes the JUCC would be useful as the implementation of the Strategic Plan calls for more innovative programming across schools.
- At what level or step of this process does the discussion occur about the impact on courses in terms of the numbers of students being added faculty availability?
  - Investigation and research occur and are documented at the level of the proposal's originator. The JUCC would be an appropriate step to evaluate this.
- For retention and advising purposes, the provost is interested in seeing Curriculum Patterns in the Catalog and these would need to be put through Curriculog.
  - Currently, programs write their own curriculum patterns and descriptions for the Catalog, with various levels of detail.
  - The ROTC does a good job of mapping out their curriculum from the first day that may or may not have some flexibility for electives. The ROTC may be a useful model for some programs.

A motion was called for approval of the discussed workflow for programs that span schools in Curriculog. There was a motion in favor of the construction of a Curriculog form. The motion was seconded. With zero abstentions and zero in opposition, the motion was approved for the construction of a new form in Curriculog for new and modified programs that impact more than one school.

II.   **Vote to adopt [Updates from Instructional Modalities Subcommittee](#) (20 min)**

Co-Chair Loomis gave an update from the Instructional Modalities Subcommittee, which met in October to review the language in the Hyflex guideline as well as to consider the suggestion for an additional modality that is 100% online and asynchronous.

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

The Subcommittee moved to recall the proposal after Robert Bromfield presented slides with Subcommittee members that showed how the modalities were displayed to students in the Schedule of Classes for each of the delivery models. The Subcommittee decided that the current definitions were sufficient and that they already included the possibility of the 100% Online & Asynchronous modality as written.

There was a motion to return to the current four definitions and to not add the 100% Online & Asynchronous modality. The motion was seconded. The motion was passed unanimously to keep the current four definitions and to not add the 100% Online & Asynchronous modality.

B. Hyflex Guideline

The Subcommittee tried to clarify the Hyflex guideline. Co-Chair Loomis asked for feedback on the updated language as written. A discussion ensued. Main points were:

- Considering item (a) the pre-planned class - where it is cross listed with one section that is online synchronous and one section in-person makes sense. However, the version where there is an in-person section and an online asynchronous section could be a cause for concern around faculty workload. Is the faculty member getting credit for teaching two different classes? For example, if they are developing and delivering both an in-person class and developing and launching a class in an entirely different modality that is asynchronous, will they receive due credit? Clarity is needed before we can fully support this new language.
  - Two sections of the same class in a Hyflex setting are not two separate classes for purposes of compensation and load. The inclusion of in-person and asynchronous was the result of faculty members desiring flexibility

and a faculty member in this situation will probably understand they will only be paid for one course.

- If codified by the JUCC, there is the possibility that this guideline, although originally created for faculty flexibility, could be used unfairly, for example in the case where a dean might direct adjunct faculty toward the Hyflex setting that is in-person and asynchronous to justify adding more sections in service of students.
- The article referenced earlier stated that students wanted an asynchronous offer of the section they may miss.
- If the asynchronous materials are already developed and easily deployable, there could be a desire among faculty to utilize Hyflex in the setting that is in-person and asynchronous.
- To develop two different modalities of a course requires different supports for faculty. Perhaps the JUCC should define why the Hyflex synchronous and in-person course is not a separate course and why the Hyflex asynchronous and in-person course is a separate course.
- Either way, it is additional work that needs to be acknowledged. If a Hyflex course has two sections it should be compensated as two classes.
- As the group of faculty members teaching in this setting – Hyflex in-person and asynchronous – is a small percentage, the JUCC should remove mention of it from the language and only include guidance for Hyflex in-person and synchronous.
- A sentence should be added to the end that says other options can be pursued but need to approved by the dean on a case-by-case basis.
- Is there any language that can be added to this guideline such as "compensation for additional workload can be discussed with the dean?"
  - That would not be supported by the provost.

- There are practical reasons why we have sections, such as to manage enrollment in the overall course. It's about both pedagogy and enrollment. As well, it's about tracking how students are matriculating through programs.
- What if we added "faculty may set up … as a cross-listed course" to make it a faculty election?
- Course sections are helpful for graduate classes with students who commute and where there could otherwise be class-size restrictions if the class were held only in-person.
- Looking at the 50% vs 51% of a hybrid course, in the case where the course is offered over two classes a week, one in-person and one online, is that going be designated as a non-hybrid course/an online course?
  - The 50% or greater mark is a WSCUC guideline; if the course is delivered 50% online then it will be considered an online course by WSCUC's definition. You will need change something about the delivery so that you will tip it over the half-way point to be 51% delivered in-person for the course not to be designated as online.

The Hyflex guideline was edited during the meeting to 1. Remove mention of the Hyflex situation that is in-person and asynchronous, 2. Add the language, "Other options may be pursued but require approval from school/college Dean," and 3. Add, the language "faculty may set up as a cross-listed course." A motion was called for to vote on these changes to the Hyflex guideline. There was a motion to vote for the re-written guideline. The motion was seconded. With one abstention, the motion passed for the JUCC to adopt the new language of the Hyflex guideline.

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

The Subcommittee discussed replacing the word "course" with the word "program" in the four definitions. This would allow the modalities to additionally be used in Curriculog, where currently, definitions for hybrid programs are missing. It was

suggested that the Subcommittee draft this change and then provide the update to the Committee at the next meeting.

II.   Updates from the Subcommittee on Generative AI (15 min)

The Generative AI Subcommittee met in November and came up with some resources and suggestions for syllabi language around the use of generative AI in the classroom. As the JUCC was running out of meeting time, it was asked if there was precedent for an email vote. There was no precedent.

The item to be voted on would be the Subcommittee's recommendation that a specific policy on generative AI would not be mandated for USF faculty but that USF faculty would be required to have some statement in their syllabus about generative AI and to work in concert with the Tracey Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), which has several suggested models for syllabi language around use of generative AI in the classroom. The idea was to lend flexibility for faculty to determine what is best for their class but also to hold a requirement that there is some language around generative AI in the syllabus about expectations for use in order for students understand the perimeters for each class. The Subcommittee looked at 105 models of syllabi language and came up with a top three for the JUCC to review before proposing the CTE include them among their resources.

The Subcommittee also discussed the importance for departments to have conversations about how the generative AI-use syllabi language can look different depending on the course and even the class. For example, the faculty member may want to embrace generative AI as an analytical exercise in one class or they may want generative AI to play a minimal role in another. Co-Chair Panter asked Cathy Gabor to send the Subcommittee's document to the JUCC so that it could be discussed via email. This was suggested to occur after the JUCC November meeting because faculty were looking for some guidance for the spring semester.

III.   Closing and Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chairs Panter and Loomis officially closed the meeting.