

## MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

April 18, 2024 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m. | Remote Meeting

**Members:** Solomon Abrams, Robert Bromfield, Dave Donahue, Cathy Gabor, Laura Hannemann, Erika Johnson, Jo Loomis, Kate Lusheck, Michelle Millar, Megan O'Banion, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Freddie Seba

**Members Absent:** Johnathan Cromwell, Ashlyn Glancy, Nate Hinerman, Marisa McCarthy, Deborah Panter, Carol Spector, James Taylor, and two TBA members.

### Agenda Items:

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

Co-Chair Jo Loomis officially opened the meeting. Co-Chair Loomis led the meeting as Co-Chair Deborah Panter was away at a conference. Co-Chair Loomis asked committee members to review the agenda. Co-Chair Loomis asked for additions or corrections for the agenda. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked 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 Loomis asked committee members to review the minutes from the March meeting and if there were any corrections or additions. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis 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. 3 Pending Proposals in Curriculog (10 min)

- A. [Public Administration, MPA](#) (New Program Multiple Schools)
- B. [Public Administration, MPA](#) (Program Deactivate)
- C. [Public Administration, Healthcare Management Concentration, MPA](#) (Program Deactivate)

Co-Chair Loomis introduced the three proposals in the JUCC Curriculog queue. The proposals impacted more than one school and were related. The Master of Public Administration (MPA) was not a new program and would move from the School of Management (SOM) to the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). The second two proposals were deactivations of the MPA program in the SOM and MPA Healthcare Management Concentration in the SOM.

Co-Chair Loomis asked if there were any representatives from the SOM or the CAS that were involved with the proposal and might speak to it. Member Cathy Gabor added that the deans in the CAS and in the SOM agreed that the move of the MPA program made sense as the work of the MPA degree was consistent with other Graduate degrees in the CAS (i.e., Urban and Public Affairs). The faculty associated with the MPA program would be moving their home from the SOM to the CAS, a process that had been ironed out. Member Robert Bromfield added that the program move would take effect in the fall 2024 semester with 11 or 12 continuing MPA students. Three students would graduate in December 2024 and seven students would graduate in May 2025. 17 students applied to the MPA and those students would only know the program as being housed in the CAS while matriculating. In the coming weeks, the current 11 or 12 MPA students would be asked whether they prefer to graduate with a degree from the SOM or with a degree from the CAS. Member Michelle Millar added that the faculty transition from the SOM to the CAS has already worked itself out and was moving forward.

Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the first proposal, the move of the MPA program from the SOM to the CAS. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked for any abstentions or disagreements. There were none. The proposal passed.

Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the second proposal, the deactivation of the MPA program in the SOM. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked for any in opposition. There were none. The second proposal passed.

Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the third proposal, the deactivation of the MPA Healthcare Management Concentration in the SOM. There was a motion to approve the proposal. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. Co-Chair Loomis asked for any in opposition. There were none. The third proposal passed.

### **III. Processes for Core Approval (30 min)**

Member Kate Lusheck presented feedback from the Core Redesign Advisory Group. One of the recommendations around redesigning the Core from the Strategic Plan Working Group #1 was endorsed in spring 2024 by the Core Advisory Group. The key features of the recommendation were for an iterative process wherein faculty and community members' trust could be built and wherein faculty and community members could be kept informed during the second phase of the Core Redesign Process as well as have the ability to give feedback.

The iterative process would have two touch points:

1. Midway touchpoint - a draft proposal of the redesigned Core Curriculum by the Core Curriculum Redesign Task Force would be sent to the JUCC, deans, Core Advisory Committee, and to the community for review and discussion.
2. Touchpoint #2 - the Task Force would make revisions and then provide its final proposal either to the JUCC - or - to the USFFA and then the JUCC.

The Core Advisory Group was split on the process of the second touchpoint but agreed that a full-time faculty vote was critical, either by the USFFA - or - as long as decisions were communicated and processes were transparent, by the faculty representatives of the JUCC. The Core Advisory Group agreed that a strong percentage of vote was necessary: either a  $\frac{3}{4}$  vote of full-time faculty or full-time faculty on the JUCC - or - at least a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote.

A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Language in Article 21 of the USFFA CBA - *Curriculum and Program Changes* and Article 24.1 - *Changes that Impact More than One College* does not specify the need for a full-time faculty vote. However, a vote from both the full-time and the part-time faculty unions would be informative to the JUCC if the JUCC were the only voting body.

- What constitutes a passing vote in the JUCC ByLaws?
  - JUCC ByLaws:
    - <https://myusf.usfca.edu/sites/default/files/documents/SVPAA/JUCC/JUCC%20ByLaws/ByLaws%20of%20the%20JUCC%20Final.pdf>
    - Article 3 Procedures: *A quorum is required to hold any committee votes and it shall consist of a majority of members, regardless of representation.*
- There should be adequate listening sessions for full-time faculty before the JUCC would come down to a decision.
- Part-time faculty members teach the majority of Core classes and should be part of the iteration and feedback sessions; Their voices are important and should be included.
- How would the quorum vote of the JUCC be reconciled with the faculty “owning the Core?”
- Do all JUCC members vote or only the full-time faculty representatives on the JUCC?
- How many full-time faculty serve on the Committee and is that enough of a representation of the full-time faculty?
  - Full-time faculty members of the JUCC do not seem representative of the entire faculty.
- Regardless of the JUCC ByLaws, if we are to represent our constituents, the JUCC faculty would need the guidance of the larger segment of the full-time faculty for how to vote.
  - There is also a need for outside input for faculty representatives on JUCC (and their constituents) who are not teaching in the Core.
- Article 21 of the USFFA CBA - *Curriculum and Program Changes* calls for open deliberations for a 45-day period and states that the final authority for all curricular decisions rests with the provost. (JUCC would make its recommendation to the provost.)
- It may be within the JUCC’s purview to invite the faculty unions to share the results of their member votes as part of the advising and counseling process.

- Limiting the vote to only full or part-time faculty members of the JUCC violates the JUCC ByLaws (ratified by USFFA). Article 2 - Term of Office and Responsibilities: *All voting members of the committee have equal voting rights on all JUCC recommendations.* However, there is room to make a process where the JUCC invites the unions to conduct their own votes and ask the union presidents to come before the JUCC to share the thoughts of their constitutions on the Core revision.
- Perhaps there needs to be something in-between to open up listening sessions.
  - This was the process of the redesign of the student evaluations of teaching effectiveness instrument, BLUE.
- The Core undergirds the curriculum at large. Perhaps JUCC should consult the Policy Board on the process as well.
- Did full-time faculty vote on the redesign process 20 years ago (current Core)?
- Whether teaching in the Core or not, faculty should have some input in the decision. Students spend half of their time doing the Core and their experiences of it impact teaching non-core classes.
- Considering getting to a successful conclusion, what will be done if the binding vote does not pass? How does that affect the process?
  - The transparency of the process, wherein concerns are allowed to be surfaced, should add to our confidence in it.
  - The spirit of the Core Redesign Task Force has been to be transparent as it has held multiple listening sessions, and provided reports and slide desks.
  - There will not ever be a curricular proposal that will receive 100% support. If we see a 60% support of a draft, it will be up to the elected members of this body to vote to make a recommendation to the provost.
- Are we asking for a vote on a draft of the core? Or for a vote on how well the core achieves a set of outcomes?

- The charge of the Task Force is to revamp and require Core learning outcomes (if they see fit to make any changes at all). The Task Force is also meant to come up with a student-facing schema.
  - Individual classes meeting those outcomes will be chosen by the faculty of the Core Advisory Committee.
- The JUCC may weigh one or more ideas. The iterative process is recommended for that reason. The vote is on the final proposal of the Task Force after the midway touch point. It will be approved or not approved as a recommendation to the administration; The iterative piece is a draft everyone sees together. The Task Force takes feedback from that and writes the next, final draft to be voted on and then recommended.
- The Part-time CBA seems to require deliberations to be public.
  - The JUCC Meetings are held publicly. However, they are not open for comments from an audience.
- As a representative of the JUCC, on the department and college level, what is the best strategy to communicate JUCC discussions and to gather feedback?
  - Add the JUCC as a regular item on monthly committee meetings
  - Take discussions to department and school meetings
  - The USFFA Policy Board invites the JUCC faculty Co-Chair to give regular reports to the Policy Board which then provides information to groups in colleges (FASONHP, COSEC, Arts Council in CAS) and likewise for FGC in SOM
  - Notes are taken in a document that is shared with the part-time union and taken to a Faculty Learning Community
  - Emails to colleagues
- The JUCC should do its due diligence and think through the implications of the approval process a bit more before making a recommendation for a process today.
  - This will be a long process; the JUCC may not be voting until spring 2025

- The JUCC will come up with ideas and plans for the next meeting and continue the conversation then.
- We need to be well-informed and know what others think before voting.
- What shape will a recommendation take?
- What is the process for the JUCC vote? Where does it fit in the process?
  - The JUCC needs to develop the process.

Co-Chair Loomis recommended the conversation to continue at the May JUCC meeting and asked members to bring feedback then.

#### **IV. Report from AI Taskforce (10 min)**

Member Freddie Seba provided an update on the AI Taskforce. The AI Taskforce held sessions with faculty and students. A proposal would be generated prior to the May JUCC meeting to be presented to the JUCC. The proposal will give faculty options to choose from simple language samples to use in their syllabi, including one which says “no” to students’ use of generative AI content, in order to encourage faculty to further consider what they want for their classes. The concerns of the taskforce were all student-centered as policies students encounter will vary widely and need to be clear within each syllabi. The university-wide policy was updated as well to respect faculty autonomy.

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

Co-Chair Loomis officially closed the meeting.