

MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

March 21, 2024 | 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members: Solomon Abrams, Robert Bromfield, Johnathan Cromwell, Dave Donahue, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Kate Lusheck, Michelle Millar, Megan O’Banion, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Freddie Seba, Carol Spector

Members Absent: Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, Jo Loomis, Marisa McCarthy, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

Agenda Items:

I. Welcome, Approval of the Minutes & Agenda (4 min)

Co-Chair Deborah Panter officially opened the meeting. Co-Chair Panter asked whether Committee Members had the chance to review the agenda and, if there were no corrections or additions, for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Co-Chair Panter asked Committee Members to review the minutes from the February meeting and to provide any corrections or additions. There were none. Co-Chair Panter called for a motion to approve the minutes. There was a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

II. New Meeting Time as Result of Survey (1 min)

Co-Chair Deborah Panter confirmed that due to the recent poll, subsequent JUCC meetings would be held at 11:40 am. Co-Chair Panter asked if there were any questions. There were none.

III. Two Pending Proposals in Curriculog (10 min)

A. Doctor of Nursing Practice (Degree Program)

B. Health Systems Leadership Doctor of Nursing Practice, Management Concentration, DNP

Co-Chair Panter introduced the current proposals in the JUCC queue. The proposals before the JUCC impact more than one school. The proposals are new programs which are reorganizations of an existing program: the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) in the School of Nursing and Health Professions (SONHP). The DNP will have three concentrations and will involve the School of Education (SOE) and the School of Management (SOM) to an extent. The three schools involved have collaborated during the proposal process to ensure alignment with the modality of how the courses are being offered. The proposals are:

1. Health Systems Leadership DNP Management - Before the JUCC and impacting the SONHP and the SOM; takes the core DNP with several Master of Business Administration classes for health systems leaders wanting more experience and education managing businesses
2. Health Systems Leadership DNP Education and Simulation Concentration - Not yet before the JUCC; impacting the SONHP and the SOE
3. Core courses of the DNP - Before the JUCC as the concentrations involve classes from the SOM and the SOE. DNP students will sit in SOM courses and SOE courses
4. Population Health Leadership DNP - Not in the JUCC queue because it only impacts the SONHP

Co-Chair Panter asked whether Committee Members had a chance to review the proposals. There was one question:

- Is the DNP a STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) program?

- No DNP concentrations carry the STEM designation. The Department of Homeland Security determines which program [CIP codes](#) are STEM-designated. Currently, no nursing CIP codes are STEM-designated.

Co-Chair Panter asked for a motion to approve the DNP Core Proposal to be moved forward to the Provost for review. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no votes in opposition or in abstention. Co-Chair Panter asked for a motion to approve the Health Systems Leadership DNP Management to be moved forward to the Provost for review. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no votes in opposition or in abstention.

IV. [Program Modality Definitions](#) (15 min)

Co-Chair Panter explained that there are currently no definitions for program modalities to guide originators proposing new programs in Curriculog. The Subcommittee put together program modality definitions to guide originators as they determine the modalities of new programs. Co-Chair Panter explained that since the definitions cannot capture all possible variations of modalities, a text box will pop up and ask the originators to describe the format of the program. A discussion ensued:

- The draft of the program modality definitions was modeled on the course modalities in the [Definitions & Guidelines for Instructional Modalities](#), voted on by the JUCC and approved by the Provost.
- Why is Hyflex missing from this set of definitions?
 - The JUCC determined that Hyflex is not a modality but a classroom management tool.
- Within the “up to 10% online instruction,” will that 10% need to be further indicated by the originator as asynchronous or synchronous?
 - The idea behind the text box is to provide a space for the originators of proposals to explain their intentions.

- The “greater than or equal to 50% online” tipping point is tricky; it is important for everyone in the proposal process to pay attention to how to add up the [course] modalities of the program.
 - Offering the program 50% or more online means the program becomes “an online program.”
- The Subcommittee also added language within the modalities to inform originators and approvers about the implications of remote education on our student groups (e.g., veterans and international students).
- The JUCC might want to consider guidelines related to state authorization with the frequent development of online programs and distance education offerings.
 - This will be added to a future JUCC agenda.

Co-Chair Panter asked for a motion to approve the Program Modality Definitions to be reviewed by the Provost. There was a motion to approve the Definitions. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously with no votes in opposition or in abstention.

V. Process for Approving Core Redesign (15 min)

Co-Chair Panter explained that once the Core Redesign Task Force has finished its phases and has recommended an update or reconfiguration of the Core, that recommendation will come before the JUCC. The JUCC will need to vote on how it should be involved in the approval process of the new Core. Will the JUCC approve the recommendation on behalf of the faculty body or will the two faculty unions be involved? Co-Chair Panter reviewed the *Proposal for the Core Curriculum* that was written by the Joint University General Education Curriculum Committee (JUGECC) and that was presented to the Board of Trustees in June of 2002. This was the first time USF offered a core curriculum, shifting from what was general education. The faculty community was involved during the last redesign cycle in 2001-2002. The JUGECC Proposal for the Core Curriculum went to the faculty for approval before it was finalized and approved.

Committee Member Katie Lusheck introduced the work of the Core Redesign Advisory Group, a group of 10 full-time faculty (including Lusheck) acting in an advisory capacity to the Core Redesign Task Force and Rebecca Hong, Vice Provost, Student Success, Inclusive Excellence, and Curricular Innovation. In addition to advising the Core Redesign Task Force, the Advisory Group discusses important issues and questions related to the Core.

Member Lusheck explained that the Advisory Group resulted from one of the recommendations of the Strategic Plan Working Group #1: Reimagine Jesuit Education (SPWG #1). The SPWG #1 was tri-chaired by Lusheck. The SPWG #1 recommendations included guiding principles and processes related to the Core, which may be relevant to the JUCC as it deliberates its role. See [SPWG #1 Recommendations around the Core](#) (pp. 1-16).

The goals of the Advisory Group are to build faculty trust around the Core Redesign processes and to act as a conduit to major groups around campus (i.e., Jesuit Community and JUCC).

The Task Force has been working on its "Mirror and Window Findings" and it is now considering recommendations for the Phase II: Design working group. Committee member Lusheck offered to act as a liaison between the JUCC and the Advisory Group, which can provide recommendations to the JUCC if requested.

Co-Chair Panter asked for an idea of what the SPWG #1 proposed as a process for approval of the Core. Member Lusheck commented that one of the recommendations around principles was that the Core redesign remains a faculty issue given the "ownership of the curriculum." Another recommendation was that the community had input. The Advisory Group is trying to obtain more input from the community and will be holding two listening sessions. Members of the JUCC are invited to attend the Community Listening Sessions on the Core Curriculum Redesign (facilitated by the Core Redesign Advisory Group) on Monday, March 25 from 12:00 to 1:00pm (via Zoom) and Wednesday, March 27 from 12:00 to 1:00pm (McLaren 252).

Following conversations from the community led by Provost Chinyere, the SPWG #1 recommended a two-part process involving the participation of the JUCC, the faculty, and the larger community. The process was meant to be iterative in order to get feedback from community members before a vote is taken. The SGWG #1 did not take a stand on whether the faculty or the USFFA should vote. However, there needs to be community input between the recommendations of the Core Redesign Task Force and the JUCC recommendation. A discussion ensued:

- Was the 2001-2002 *Proposal for the Core Curriculum* voted on by all faculty, including part-time faculty members? Was it an email vote?
 - The JUGECC developed the proposal and as part of the process, they gathered input and support from the faculty. 70% of the full faculty approved the Proposal by the JUGECC. However, it is not clear whether this included part-time faculty members. The JUCC can talk about whether or not it thinks the part-time faculty should be included. Part-time faculty members teach Core courses.
- Do we have a sense of what is a percentage that would constitute passing the new Core? (e.g., $\frac{2}{3}$ or 50%)
 - Perhaps the JUCC can make a recommendation about this.
- Considering the JUCC's role:
 - The redesign of the Core affects more than one school/college. The JUCC's role is to ensure that the due diligence that needs to be observed is observed. And to ask any questions that haven't been asked during the process.
 - JUCC faculty members are elected from the faculty
 - Should the JUCC offer a vote/recommendation to the full faculty?
- The 2002 Core Curriculum was a change from the 3-unit standard to the 4-unit standard (a significant change). It is essential that the faculty as a whole has a chance to vote on changes, as opposed to just the recommendation of the JUCC.

- Does this include full and part-time faculty?
 - Consider the level of involvement of part-time faculty within the schools and college. For example, in addition to teaching the Core courses, do part-time faculty participate in curriculum design or on curriculum committees?
 - Are there any part-time faculty serving on the curriculum committees in the schools?
 - No
 - 60-69% of the classes on campus are taught by part-time faculty. Part-time faculty teach Core classes. It would be an asset to include their voices; it is important to let the people who are doing the work have a say in how the work should be done.
 - Kate can bring this back to the Core Advisory Group and report back to the JUCC, and can communicate this to the Task Force to gain other perspectives
- At what point in the process does the faculty weigh in? What is the order of approval?
 - The JUCC should ensure due diligence, ask questions, then move the Core recommendation to the Provost, who could then submit it before the faculty-at-large to weigh in.
 - If it approves, the JUCC (which includes faculty members elected by the faculty) recommends the proposal of the Core Redesign Task Force to the Provost. If the Provost approves the proposal but less than a majority of the faculty approve it, what then?
 - Can this be modeled after the process of the BLUE Teaching Effectiveness Survey?
 - What if the Task Force comes up with more than one model? (e.g., Option A, Option B). Perhaps the faculty could vote for an option to move to the JUCC then the Provost?

- In summary, the JUCC discussed: what is approval process, defining any multiple iterations, who votes, % of vote to pass

Co-Chair Panter asked JUCC Members to bring these conversations back to their constituencies. In April, the JUCC will see if it can come up with something concrete to pass to leadership.

VI. [Update for Generative AI Syllabus Language](#) (10 min)

Co-Chair Panter commented that the Academic AI Taskforce was putting together a draft policy to submit to the provost for review around AI guidelines in the classroom, which will then be sent to the JUCC for review, feedback, and approval. The JUCC Generative AI Subcommittee collected some sample generative AI syllabi language for anyone looking for guidance. The Subcommittee concluded that it would be better for the JUCC to recommend that faculty members add a statement about generative AI use to their syllabi (Simple Syllabus) and that the JUCC not indicate what that statement says. The recommendation might prompt faculty to consider 1) What is your policy on the use of Generative AI? and 2) What are the risks of using certain Generative AI programs, such as risks to the student and intellectual property?

Co-Chair Panter recommended that the JUCC send the Subcommittee's language to the Tracy Seeley Center for Teaching Excellence.

VII. Closing and Action Items (5 mins)

Co-Chair Panter officially closed the meeting.