

## MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

February 15, 2024

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, Michelle Millar, Megan O’Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Freddie Seba (for Bill Bosl), Carol Spector, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

**Members Absent:** Dave Donahue, Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, Marisa McCarthy, and two TBA members.

### Agenda Items:

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

Co-Chair Deborah Panter officially opened the meeting. Co-Chair Loomis asked for additions or corrections to the minutes from the November 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 comments or additions to the agenda. A motion to approve the agenda was called for. There was a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

#### II. Curriculog Deactivation: DNP Population Health Leadership Program (10 min)

Co-Chair Loomis explained the history of the DNP programs, including programs that were sunsetted. The program is not ending but rather adding concentrations such as the Population Health Leadership, Health Systems Leadership, Education and Simulation, Management, and the DNP without the specialty concentration. This deactivation is before the JUCC because all program deactivations come before JUCC. No faculty will be impacted. Co-Chair Panter asked if there were no questions, comments, or concerns. Questions were:

- For students moving through the sunseting program, will there be any difficulty with degree designation or transcripts?
  - No, students in progress of the current program will graduate in the program as named.
  - For WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) purposes, all DNP programs are the same.
- Will the new concentrations appear as majors on the transcripts?
  - Yes.

Co-Chair Panter called 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 if there were any in opposition or any in abstention. There were none. The motion to recommend approval to the provost was carried unanimously.

### **III. Program Modality Definitions (15 min)**

Co-Chair Panter explained that within Curriculog, originators of new program proposals are asked to identify the modality of the program. However, there are no university-wide definitions of program modalities other than WSCUC’s definition for online and in-person. Co-Chair Panter added that it would make sense to base program definitions on the [Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities](#) and suggested replacing “course” with “program” and “class” sessions with “course.” A brief discussion ensued:

- Some programs might utilize different modalities (i.e. some in-person classes and some hybrid classes)
  - This comes down to math provided by WSCUC. Programs that have 50% or more of courses offered online are online programs. For hybrid programs, it must be determined how many courses are offered in-person and how many are offered online.
- What is it that we are trying to achieve with this document?
  - We are trying to provide guidance to originators of program proposals when asked for the modality of their proposed program. We are trying to encourage programs to do that math so that they can accurately characterize the

programs in accordance with WSCUC's definitions and also communicate to reviewers how the program will be put together.

- As well as to communicate to students what kind of program they are entering into.
- As well it is important to be accurate in the marketing materials.
- And important to communicate to students that as a hybrid program, they need to know whether or not classes touch the ground on occasion.

Co-Chair Panter suggested that the Subcommittee convene before the next meeting in March to create a draft of the program modalities. This would allow there to be a dedicated discussion around the document and there would be a concrete document for the JUCC to vote on in March.

#### **IV. Update for Generative AI Syllabus Language (15 min)**

Co-Chair Panter recounted the activities of the Subcommittee, which met in November and pulled materials together and voted on its top choices for generative AI syllabus language. The Subcommittee planned to share the top choices with the JUCC and if approved, the JUCC would share the language with the Tracey Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) to possibly include among their resources. A discussion ensued:

- The Subcommittee discussed the importance of empowering faculty who use generative AI in different ways.
- The Subcommittee will send its selections to the JUCC.
- ITS has convened a task force to further the discussion on a university policy.
- Graduate faculty in the School of Nursing are looking for language to use in the syllabi and wondering if there could be some general suggested language for the syllabi.
- Perhaps the JUCC can recommend a policy that all faculty have to include some language of AI-use in the classroom so that we are not leaving

students in the dark about faculty policy regarding AI tools. Perhaps this is on a syllabus checklist.

- Can we ask the CTE Artificial Intelligence FLC that is investigating LLMs if we can look at language they might be working on? So that JUCC can come up with unique examples?
  - April Randle will reach out to Chris Brooks to ask about this.
- Great resources are being collated separately and this is an opportunity to connect with different units.
- It is a good idea to point faculty to what is already up on the CTE website.

The JUCC will consider this item on the next agenda. Members of the ITS Task Force can provide an update at the next meeting as well.

#### **V. Closing and Action Items (5 mins)**

It was suggested to move the JUCC meeting forward by 5-10 minutes. A brief discussion ensued:

- The meeting was recently moved and cannot accommodate all members' schedules.
- Late members can review the meeting minutes.
- It seems like the best option would be for most people to attend the meeting at the beginning.

A poll will be conducted as to whether the meeting time should be adjusted once more. We will choose the option that works for most members. Co-Chairs Loomis and Panter officially closed the meeting.