Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

Approved Minutes

Friday, September 27th, 2024   9:00AM – 11:00AM

156 University Hall

Attendees: Bitters, Chamberlain, Clark, Cole, Cravens-Brown, Crocetta, Dugdale, Fletcher, Fowler, Heckler, Hennis, Hilty, Jenkins, Joyce, Lee, Marsch, Martin, Mick, Nagar, Nathanson, Neff, Ottesen, Pradhan, Steele, Smith, Turner, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Westlake, Xiao

1) Discussion on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) software or other edtech assisted software in grading (Guests: T. Clark, J. Fowler, A. Heckler)
   - Clark: The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry teaches exceptionally large sections of courses such as Chemistry 1210, or General Chemistry I. We have recently become aware of an AI software being utilized by other higher education institutions called Stemble. Stemble utilizes AI to provide meaningful feedback to students at a scale that is currently impossible given the student-to-instructor ratio. We have been in contact with David Sweasey, IT Governance and Risk Management Director for the College of Arts and Sciences, to discuss how the software could be implemented within CarmenCanvas and address any security and access concerns related to this software. In July 2024, we were informed that a policy decision involving AI and AI software is a decision that would be determined at the College-level. We would like to be involved in this policy decision and believe that this body will need to make this decision.
   - Martin: As far as I am aware, there is not a conversation happening at the College-level regarding the use of AI software by instructors in our courses. Additionally, this body would not be determining software policy in courses. However, this body would need to be involved to determine the curricular impact of such policies.
   - Committee Member question: You mentioned that this software is being utilized at other institutions. What types of assignments are graded by the software at these institutions?
     - Clark: As an example, students will be provided a question and asked to answer completing assignments within their course textbook. The software will then analyze the student's response based upon a rubric provided by the instructor. The software will then provide feedback and students will be offered an opportunity to resubmit based upon the feedback provided. Currently, our courses are only able to assess

students utilizing easy-to-grade questions such as multiple choice and so our hope is that this software will increase student mastery of the knowledge and skills we expect them to learn.

- Committee Member question: How does this software compare to the AI software currently being utilized in textbooks provided by companies such as McGraw-Hill and Pearson?
    - Clark: The software in those textbooks is significantly less capable than Stemble. The textbook software provides questions and feedback at a very basic level, but the problem is that our students then expect this level of basic questions on our examinations, which are often requiring students to be more intimately familiar with the material. They become frustrated that their practice problems are then significantly different from the examinations we administer.
- Committee Member comment: I believe the key item that this committee should be concerned with is when the software can be used to assign grades. This is different from a peer grading system because we have guardrails in place to ensure that students are receiving adequate, correct feedback. When using licensed software, we don't have the same amount of control over how the grading process functions as compared to when instructors review all graded assessments.
    - Heckler: We agree with this point emphatically. This is why we are bringing these questions to this body, as we want to be extremely cautious about how we implement AI going forward.
    - Clark: To clarify, any software we decide to implement will be vetted at a very high level. Once we gain approval to use the software, we will not be implementing it broadly immediately. Our department will undergo a long process to ensure that the product meets our expectations. Given that this is a very long process, we wanted to ensure that the software will be approved for use prior to our internal review and vetting.
- Committee Member question: What is the rate of failure for the AI software?
    - Clark: While we do not have this information yet because we have not undergone the vetting process, I will say that we typically want to stay above 85%. If the software has 85% agreement, this is considered excellent and is a marker for what we hope to see.
- Committee Member comment: One of my main concerns is the future implications of implementing this software, especially as our world continues to adopt AI software into everyday life. We need to keep in mind the potential consequences this software can have on academic misconduct, especially given our university's official stance. Additionally, and on a more pessimistic note, I

worry what the implications will be on graduate students and their funding opportunities.

- Committee Member comment: One of the main security concerns that will need to be discussed is surrounding who owns the data that is collected. Are these analytics available to the College or are they maintained by the company from which we license the software? If it is the latter, this will be problematic because they will be collecting data from our students and utilizing this data to improve their software. Therefore, a monetary value can be placed on our student's data. Additionally, it is a concern because there is no guarantee that our student data will be accessible in the future. The company that owns the AI software may also choose to sell our student's data. All of these details will need to be worked out before any software is approved, although this is outside the purview of this particular committee.
  - Fowler: Individual universities and institutions of higher education are at a structural disadvantage given that we do not have the scale of data that larger, more vast organizations (such as Pearson) have at their disposal. Given this, universities are going to be better served by deciding which company (or companies) we use. It is important that we have faculty input on this adaptation and faculty should be aware in the ways these technologies will assist assessment within their classrooms. Additionally, to this point, we are already providing our student data to these types of organizations. For example, many faculty and instructors utilize Turnitin to help detect instances of potential academic misconduct. This software is integrated within CarmenCanvas and utilizes our student data to improve their software.
- Committee Member question: Are the environmental impacts being considered when considering adopting AI software?
  - Clark: First, I think it's important to note that this software is being utilized by dozens of institutions of higher education. We are not early adopters of this software, and those other institutions certainly have considered the environmental impact as well, so I hope to use some of their data when making this determination. Additionally, as AI continues to improve, the current theories from governmental taskforces and experts in the field is that the environmental impact will lessen.
- Martin: I want to thank our presenters for their time in discussing this important issue. This is an issue that will need to be continuously discussed moving forward, especially as we determine the best way to train our students in the technologies of the future. Hopefully, once we have more information on the approval process of the software, we can discuss this topic again and further discuss the curricular implications of this issue.

2) Introduction of new ASC Office of Distance Education staff members Bob Mick & Kayla Hennis (Guest: E. Marsch)
   - Marsch: We recently have had two new staff members join the Office of Distance Education. First, I will introduce Kayla Hennis, Electronic Learning Development Senior Specialist. Kayla will be responsible for managing the ASC educational technology teaching toolsets, facilitating the review and requisition of both new and existing distance education tools, and coordinating with ASC faculty and instructors regarding their instructional needs. We hope Kayla can serve as a helpful resource to all of you as we continue to grow and expand our distance education offerings.
   - Marsch: Next, I am pleased to introduce Bob Mick, Distance Education Program Consultant. Bob is taking over for previous Distance Education Coordinator Jeremie Smith, although his role has been expanded. Bob will be assisting with online education curriculum development within the College as well as conducting the review of distance education coursework prior to it being reviewed by the Subcommittees. We hope that both Kayla and Bob will prove to be invaluable to the faculty and our instructors as they continue their work in developing exciting, innovative courses for the College.
3) Discussion of Software Approval Process (Guest: E. Marsch & K. Hennis)
   - Marsch: My office has been tasked with ensuring that all educational software utilized by instructors within the College has been vetted and approved. This is very important for several reasons, including student privacy, cost of the software, quality of the software, and other important factors. When a faculty member or instructor comes to us and expresses interest in a particular software, we are going to first see if there is a comparable software already approved for use by the College. If there is not, we can go through the approval process for new software applications, but please be aware that this process is long and can last a year or even a little longer. Kayla is going to be the primary point-of-contact for these requests going forward, so please let your colleagues know about Kayla and her new role.
   - Committee Member comment: I appreciate you providing this update to our committee. I know that my colleagues are unaware that there is a process for using software not approved within the College. When I have brought up this very issue in the past, I have always been surprised to hear how many of my colleagues do not understand the potential issues for utilizing non-approved software. I will make sure I am directing them to Kayla in the future.
   - Committee Member question: Currently, our subcommittees have been reviewing syllabi and noticing that they require specific software and applications. We have been sending them to your office and requiring them to meet with you before we approve the course. Should our policy moving forward be to simply let them

know they need to speak with you and not hold the course reviewed in the approval process?

- o Marsch: While this is certainly a faculty decision, I would very much recommend against holding courses up for this reason. Ultimately, if they do want to go through the approval process of using new software, this process can take a very long time, and we would not want a course to have to sit for a year or potentially longer before being approved.
- Marsch: For your information, there will be an announcement shortly about an advisory group that my office is forming to have these conversations about educational technology moving forward within the College. Please reach out if you are interested in joining this committee.

4) Revision to the Screenwriting Minor (Guest: E.J. Westlake)
- Arts and Humanities 2 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee reviewed a request from the Department of Theater, Film, and Media Arts to revise the minor in Screenwriting. They are adding one course (FILMSTD 4890: Advanced Screenwriting) and will be simplifying the requirements for the "Screenwriting Concentration category". The changes will provide greater flexibility to students, spread enrollments across screenwriting courses, and eliminate over-enrollment/waitlisting in specific screenwriting courses. The Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee unanimously approved the request and advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
- Westlake: When the minor was first approved, there were concerns about the division of the coursework into these distinct areas. Janice Aski, at the time, noted that we should continue to monitor this issue, and it has now been identified as causing problems for our students.
- Committee Member question: Do you know how many different majors are enrolled in the minor?
    - o Westlake: Unfortunately, I do not have that information currently. However, I can ask our program coordinator if you'd like an answer.
- Arts and Humanities 2 Letter, Crocetta, **unanimously approved**

5) New Certificate: Civil Discourse for Citizenship (Guests: P. Turner & K. Joyce)
- Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee reviewed a request from the Center for Ethics and Human Values to create a new undergraduate certificate in Civil Discourse for Citizenship. This new, interdisciplinary, type 1B certificate will require 12 credit hours of coursework, including one required core course (3 credits) and 9 credits of electives from an approved list. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee unanimously approved the request and advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.

- Turner: This certificate also has strategic ramifications with the creation of the upcoming Chase Center for Civics, Culture, and Society. We would like the College to become leaders in the field of civil discourse and we believe this certificate offers us the opportunity to meet this goal while utilizing our existing infrastructure.
- Committee Member question: Is this certificate looking at civil discourse in a U.S. context? If so, are there any opportunities to include a global perspective?
    - Turner: We like to view this certificate as one on the subject itself. If there are courses that integrate a global perspective, we would be happy to consider these offerings. I am not sure if, when we were developing the program, we identified any courses meeting this criterion. Of course, if you know of any courses that may be a good fit, please reach out to us.
- Committee Member question: How are you advertising this certificate?
    - Turner: We are utilizing the infrastructure of the College. ASC Marketing and Communications is a key strategic partner. Additionally, we are well-connected to our undergraduate students and can successfully commit to advertising at a local, grassroots level.
- Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

6) Approval of 08/30/2024 Minutes
- Cravens-Brown, Crocetta, **unanimously approved**

7) ASCC Annual Report (I. Nagar, R. Steele, & B. Vankeerbergen)
- Nagar: The ASCC report highlights all the excellent and strategic work that we were able to accomplish last year. I am, personally, very grateful to be part of this work and want to thank you all for your continued service to the College.
- Committee Member comment: We had a very high-volume of work last year, especially with the General Education. I know that there are many of our colleagues that are frustrated with the approval process and believe that we operate too slowly. Perhaps there is a way that we could disseminate an abbreviated version of this report to the faculty and administrators of the College to highlight the sheer volume of work we have received?
    - Martin: I will reach out to ASC Marketing and Communications and find out what avenues of communication would be best for this request. I believe this would be beneficial and may help to ease the frustration of our colleagues.
- Podalsky, Crocetta, **unanimously approved**

8) First-year Seminar Report (T. Bitters)
- Bitters: Last year, with the launch of the 1-credit hour GEN Bookend courses, we expected to see enrollments drop in the First-year seminars. However, I am pleased to report that while there was a slight decrease in enrollments, the numbers have held steady. The program continues to be a strong way to introduce

first-year students to faculty members and their exciting, innovative research and help students to build and connect to faculty early in their career. I am excited to see this program continue.

- Committee Member comment: I wonder if there would be a way to increase enrollments in these seminars by allowing other levels of students to enroll within them, such as second-year students. This could be a way to help boost enrollments but also help alleviate faculty disappointment if their seminar does not enroll enough students to teach.
    - Bitters: This certainly can be considered, and I believe it would be an excellent idea. We have considered launching a Sophomore Seminars program. However, this idea has never been solidified.
- Cravens-Brown, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

9) Informational Item: Portuguese Minor (I. Nagar)
- Nagar: The Portuguese minor is making a few minor modifications. Specifically, they are updating the minor to reflect the acceptance of the new Seal of Biliteracy. Additionally, several courses have been updated and withdrawn, and the minor sheet now reflects this change. Finally, given the size of the department, Spanish and Portuguese is limited in the number of upper-division Portuguese courses they can offer each term. It has been difficult for students to find both an Advanced Language/Linguistics course and a Literatures and Cultures course. Therefore, they are combining these categories to allow more flexibility in student scheduling.

10) Informational Item: Communication Minor (I. Nagar)
- Nagar: In 2021, the Strategic Communication major was updated to allow the completion of either COMM 3333 or COMM 3444 as a core requirement. The School is now extending this flexibility to students pursuing the minor by allowing them to choose either 3333 or 3444 to meet the minor's requirements. This change will provide students within the minor with a more tailored educational experience that will better meet their interests and career goals.

11) Informational Item: Diversity Statement (R. Steele)
- Steele: The Diversity Statement, which is a recommended statement, has been updated for the 2024-2025 academic year. The statement is mostly the same, but additional protected classes, as well as links to the Office of Diversity and Inclusion, have been added to the statement. During course review, we will recommend that syllabi update to this new statement should the old one be present.

12) Subcommittee Updates
- Arts and Humanities 1
    - Arabic 5405 – approved
    - Classics 2206 – approved

- English 3395 – approved
- French 3803 – approved with contingency
- German 3434 – approved
- History of Art 3610 – approved
- Music 2200.13 – approved with contingency
- Music 8920 – approved
- NELC 3168 – approved
- Religious Studies 3168 - approved
- Religious Studies 3777 – approved
- Religious Studies 3888 – approved with contingency
- SASIA 3635 – approved
- Theatre 3712 – approved
- WGSS 4574 – approved
- Arts and Humanities 2
  - ASL 4452 – approved with contingency
  - French 3802 – approved
  - German 3354.01 – approved with contingency
  - German 3354.01 – approved with contingency
  - History 7902 – approved with contingency
  - History of Art 2007 – approved with contingency
  - History of Art 3060 – approved with contingency
  - Scandinavian 3354.01 – approved with contingency
  - Scandinavian 3354.02 – approved with contingency
- Themes I
  - Anthropology 3360 – approved with contingency
  - Astronomy 2020 – approved
  - English 3260 – approved with contingency
  - English 3262 – approved with contingency
  - Geography 3703 – approved with contingency
  - Political Science 4139 – approved with contingency
  - Political Science 4139E – approved with contingency
  - NELC 3168 – approved with contingency
  - Religious Studies 3168 – approved with contingency
  - Religious Studies 3777 – approved
  - SASIA 5241 – approved
  - Slavic 4595 – approved with contingency
- Themes II
  - Classics 3224 – approved with contingency
  - Ethnic Studies 3408 – approved
  - Ethnic Studies 3572 – approved

- History 3224 – approved with contingency
- History 3500 – approved with contingency
- History 3700 – approved with contingency
- History of Art 3408 – approved
- History of Art 4240 – approved
- International Studies 2800 – approved with contingency
- WGSS 4403 – approved
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
  - Anthropology 2210 – approved with contingency
  - Anthropology 3310 – approved with contingency
  - Communication 2985 – approved with contingency
  - Psychology 7865 – approved with contingency
  - Speech and Hearing Science 6566 – approved with contingency
- Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
  - AAAS 2295 – approved with contingency
- Natural and Mathematical Sciences
  - N/A