MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-wide Curriculum Committee

May 18, 2023

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

Members Present: Leslie Bach, Dave Donahue, Aubrey Hall (attending on behalf of Robert Bromfield), Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Marisa McCarthy, Michelle Millar, Deborah Panter, Jeff Paris, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck

Members Absent: Solomon Abrams, Bill Bosl, Ashlyn Glancy, Cathy Goldberg, Nate Hinerman, Nick Leonard, Megan O'Banion, Claire Sharifi, and two TBA members.

I. **Welcome & Approval of the Minutes, Curriculog Deactivations for Concentrations (5 mins)**

Co-Chair and Associate Professor Jo Loomis welcomed all members and officially started the meeting. Co-Chair Loomis asked for corrections or additions to the minutes from the March meeting. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Jeff Paris motioned to approve the minutes. Leslie Bach seconded the motion. The Committee approved the minutes.

II. **[Adding USF 101 to the Core](#) (Lamonte Stamps and Leigh Meredith) (10 min)**

Leigh Meredith gave a brief presentation about USF 101, a one-credit course open to first-year students, primarily in their first semester. Main points were:

- Topics covered in the course are Jesuit values, wellness, creating a 4 year plan, exploring San Francisco and the USF campus, and developing practical competencies (e.g. study skills, financial literacy)
- Over 1600 students served since USF 101 was piloted in 2015

- Started out with four core foci in Jesuit values and recently experimented with the curriculum to focus on *belonging*, especially for first-generation students and minority students through:
    - More hands-on connections to resources on campus (e.g. visiting the library for a project)
    - More field trips (e.g. walking the urban trail, visiting star route farms, and visiting the Multi-Faith Meditation Room on campus)
- General goals for USF 101 are to:
    1. Help students increase their connection to and engagement with USF - USF 101 leadership noted success in connection piece from qualitative and quantitative student feedback in post-course surveys. Making USF mandatory to add to core would help us connect with all students. As an opt-in program, currently not all students are being reached. Research, and experiences from other institutions, show that students who are most in need of this programming are those who are least likely to opt in.
    2. Improve overall student success
    3. Increase retention - University of Nevada Las Vegas saw retention data improve when they made their first-year experience course mandatory for all students.
- Making USF 101 mandatory will:
    - Provide consistency with the first-year experience
    - Introduce critical topics (i.e. ADEI, wellness, and understanding how to connect with other students across diverse experiences)
    - Support practical competencies (i.e. how to develop four-year plans, how to find resources on campus)
    - Give students the space and time to make connections, engage with USF and their peers, and build foundational competencies
    - Be inexpensive - the current USF 101 model is inexpensive for all that it offers students

Leigh Meredith took questions and comments from the Committee:

- What coordination is planned with the Core Revision Taskforce? A: We are trying to figure out the process for making USF 101 mandatory. From preliminary conversations, it seems like the only way to make USF 101 universal is to make it part of the Core. These are the first few steps down that path and we will reach out to the Core Task Force.

- The School of Management is in the process of trying to redesign the business core and discussed making USF 101 mandatory for its students. It's a valuable course for everybody as much is packed into one-credit. Comment to endorse this initiative.

- When would students be required to take USF 101? A: Within the first year. This makes the most sense logistically with scheduling, rooming, etc.

- Would transfer students be required to take USF 101? A: USF 101 is currently open to transfer students. We are considering not making it a requirement for transfer students but offering it as an opt-in. We also think there should be a support course for transfer students (such as a section of USF 101) because they have different needs as typically more mature students.

- Suggestion to coordinate with CASA for programming on transfer students. A: This is a good idea.

- Are we seeing this as an addition to the number of Core units? Does the Core get larger? A: We need to work with the Core Revision Task Force as they may be trying to reduce the amount of required units. Adding USF 101 to the Core would not replace anything but it would be an addition.

- Suggestion: as part of the Strategic Plan Reimaging Jesuit Education Working Group One, invite all to reach out and to coordinate and collaborate on this initiative.

- Additional endorsement expressed for the program. It might also be a good summer program and is a great way to introduce students to Star Route Farms

where they may be inspired to utilize the farm for a future research project. A: The interdisciplinary aspect is a benefit of the program. The summer jumpstart USF 101 programs were successful and students reacted positively. However, it was decided not to continue during the summer due to financial implications for students. Currently USF 101 is a free unit and during summer we may have to charge students. Also, as a remote course, it would mean students may not get as much out of the program if they were not on campus.

- Seconded support for USF 101 for the reflective, meta-learning aspect and also for transfer students as a way to alleviate anxiety in the mindframe of belonging.
- Cost of USF does not include PHP, PHP2 faculty or full-time faculty. How would this change when USF 101 is standardized? A: This is a great point as we consider making USF 101 part of the Core.
- What are the number of course sections in fall and spring and would some of them be remote? A: The plan is to continue to offer USF 101 in person as the value of the class is co-presence on campus. There would be about 80 sections spread across two semesters, with a course cap of 20 students to facilitate bonding, etc.

Co-Chair Panter suggested that Leigh Meredith return to the JUCC in the fall semester after checking in with the Core Revision Task Force.

III. [Update from Subcommittee on Hyflex Guideline](#) (10 min)
Co-Chair Loomis talked through the update from the Instructional Modalities Subcommittee which was to clarify the definition for Hylfex. [The current guideline](#) states, *Hyflex is considered a pedagogical context where the function of Hyflex can be made available through cross-listing in-person or hybrid/online synchronous sections. Students register for the instructional modality that they will use for the semester in a Hyflex pedagogical context.*

The Subcommittee attempted to further draw out and explain the two different uses of Hyflex as:

1. A pre-planned set-up as a cross-listed course
2. A mid-semester adjustment - enacted during the semester as a short-term classroom management tool to provide alternatives to students

Co-Chair Loommis asked the Committee for questions and comments. Questions were:

- Considering the second explanation, will instructors be given a choice to utilize Hyflex from time to time or will it be a requirement? A: The Subcommittee intended to describe Hyflex on-the-spot management as an optional classroom tool or accommodation.
- Was the wording around faculty illness and COVID-related quarantining removed and should it be added back in? A: Language for contingency plans is included in the definitions of the modalities (e.g. 10% of the semester is available to shift online for an in-person class). The Hyflex guideline is focused more on student contingencies.

Co-Chair Loomis encouraged the Committee to take the updated guideline back to their schools and committees to ask for comments. Co-Chair Loomis asked the Committee to utilize the [feedback form](). Co-Chair Panter suggested that the Committee vote as to whether to adopt the updated guideline at the first fall meeting.

IV. Suggestion for Additional Modality (100% Online & Asynchronous - Jeff Paris) (10 min)

Jeff Paris opted to defer this agenda item until the next meeting in order to turn to the student attendance policy.

V.   **ASUSF Attendance Policy Memo (5 min)**

Co-Chair Panter introduced the memo to the Committee, which impacts students across the university. The memo asks faculty to be generally flexible regarding student absences. A discussion ensued:

- Students will miss classes for many reasons (i.e. anxiety). One way to address this might be for the instructor to build some redundancy into the curriculum as well as to offer make-up work. There might even be resources available to faculty around make-up assignments. Co-presence is important and there is a way to support student-learning around absences
- In the memo, students did not address the lack of clarity in attendance policies offered by faculty. There ought to be a college-wide or university-wide discussion to review the kinds of attendance policies, not to inhibit faculty autonomy but rather to make sure the breakdowns and what counts as a participation is clear on every syllabus
  - There are different attendance policies even within different classes (e.g. labs and lectures). A university wide-policy would be difficult to address needs for all the different types of classes.
  - What standard language could be helpful (as opposed to harsh) to students in support of stricter attendance policies?
- The accountability question is different for different faculty such as when students did not pass the COVID health check that was self-administered
- How can we scaffold learning despite the varying health needs of students?
- Are we doing students any favors by accommodating students who are just not coming to class? More discussion is welcome around accountability and encouraging students to come to class
- Are students inviting faculty to talk about competency-based education and seat-based education in this memo?

Co-Chair Loomis suggested the Committee take these issues back to their departments and consider group or program policies. Co-Chair Loomis also suggested that the Committee replies to the memo to say it has created awareness and that Committee members will take the issues back to their departments, and the discussion will be resumed in the fall.

VI.   Closing / Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chair Panter officially closed the meeting.