

UHD Faculty Senate Minutes
Meeting: 2/7/23
Hybrid meeting (UHD and Zoom)
Minutes recorded by: Dr. Candace TenBrink

Guest and senator roster are at the end.
Meeting opened at 2:30 p.m.
Meeting minutes from January 17th, 2023: approved.

Dr. Gehring – opened a discussion on ChatGPT

(Note from TenBrink: this is a free, online chatbot that helps to build dialogues via AI in a chat-like format. It is a language model.)

Dr. Quander – we are learning about ChatGPT here at UHD. Involvement and discussions will include conversations with SGA, ethics implications (FAC), and CTLE.

Dr. Moosally – not sure how we will or be able to use our tools to detect the work of others outside of the traditional Turnitin service. George Detiveaux is looking at how we may deal with AI.

There was a general chat on how the Dean of Students, faculty, and the chairs may deal with and use AI (i.e., is it ethical, will it be cited, is it a pedagogical tool?).

FS- tried ChatGPT and said the results looked iffy as they lacked appropriate citations. However, in computer science it is easy to find solutions.

Moosally – she thinks it will be a matter of what the faculty will allow in a classroom. That is, AI may be a valuable tool at times and in other cases it may not be. Thus, the faculty member may want to put forth whether or not AI is acceptable.

Dr. Greg Dement - CTLE support and ChatGPT – gave an overview of ChatGPT.

- It is conversational.
- The user can select a tone.
- It does not do well with citations. It may make them up.
- It is verbose.
- It may not always make sense.

Keep in mind this is just one AI tool of many. These issues may likely morph over time. In CTLE, one of the questions they are thinking of is how we make AI more positive. Such as, how can we use AI pedagogically to move forward with an activity or to build on given output?

The CTLE will host a webinar series on this type of AI beginning on Feb. 17th.

FS- we should also think about and encourage student ethics. Students need to be honest in their work.

FS- technology is evolving. We need to consider how we can evolve with it.

FS- How do we encourage intellectual curiosity? Maybe if we encourage honesty, we will have fewer issues.

Dement – we will gather resources and work through this.

FS- (student) honor and valuing the degree are critical as we move forward.

Guest updates / presentations

1. Dr. Moosally, Associate Vice President for Programming and Curriculum - LMS transition

The LMS transition team has sent out their recommendations. The team wants us to support the recommendations. The major revision from our last faculty senate meeting incorporates one large item: they are now backing a later auto open schedule. Now they plan to auto open all shells the day before the classes start (at midnight), instead of the Friday before as previously discussed. The idea is that this later auto-open schedule will help semester creep and adjunct risk (that they build a course and then it is canceled). The rest of the recommendations remain as presented at the last senate meeting.

How will training occur? *Growing with Canvas* is a module-based Canvas learning series with short quizzes at the end of each module. The LMS transition team believes that all faculty must pass the quiz.

For the soft launch: Faculty must complete the training, *Growing with Canvas*, one month before they teach if they want their course in Canvas.

FS – Will new faculty launch in BB or Canvas?

Moosally- Most likely Canvas. It needs to be a conversation with chairs and new hires.

Moosally- Faculty to date believe it is easier to begin from the scratch rather than just migrate and adapt.

BB will disappear at the end of 2023. It will not be with us after this year. Save anything that you may need.

FS – will organizations from BB be moved?

Moosally – They are looking into this.

FS – motion to enable FSEC to modify/accept LMS transition changes, if any occur after this meeting – passed

FS – motion to support and recommend the accepted framework and that if any substantive changes is brought forth, it will go through FSEC – passed.

2. Dr. Andrew Pavelich

In reviewing the course evaluation policy, PS 3.A.26, APC sent out a survey to see if faculty want to change our survey instrument. APC recommends that we keep IDEA as faculty are not all on the same page. About 100 took the survey. The responses indicated four viewpoints (~%):

- Any student course evaluation are not worthwhile (25%) (but state law says that we must have a survey of some type)

- Surveys are biased in one or more ways, but IDEA is okay to use (25%)
- IDEA is not good (25%)
- Really liked IDEA (25%)

APC will recommend that: IDEA is kept, that we should use the short version, and we should increase response rates.

Guest- It is a best practice to avoid using student surveys to evaluate faculty. It is hurting junior faculty in particular.

FS- it could be a good tool longitudinally, but not for evaluating faculty.

FS- increasing response rates needs to be a priority.

Guest – Dr. Katharine Jager – re negative personal comments from students

Could we have a chair redact student comments from our evaluations? Can we have a resolution to remove these damaging and discriminatory comments? It is damaging and it may be a matter of faculty retention.

FS- it does not seem to be in policy.

Jager – no – you must include the comments by policy.

Gehring- by policy it must be in R&T and for annual evaluations it is up to the department.

FS- students only have one way to offer feedback and it is this survey. They need a voice.

FS- it seems like we only want positive comments. How do we get a holistic view?

Jager- to be clear, it is not about negative comments but the ability to redact aspects of protected status (skin color, accent, etc.)

FS- we should really try to increase the response rate if we want to hear student feedback.

There was a discussion about extending the meeting or picking this up again. FS decided to pick this matter up again as it was important and needs more time.

The meeting closed at 4:02 p.m.

FS = faculty senator

Guests:

Provost Bordelon, Michelle Moosally, Judith Quander, Darlene Hodge, Stephanie Coleman, Johanna Schmertz, Robin Kessler, John Lane, Akif Uzman, Georges Detiveaux, Fabiola Vacatoleo, Gregory Dement, Jerry Johnson, Ron Beebe, Andrew Pavelich, Katharine Jaeger, Dagmar Sharold, Christine Stempinski, Lisa Braysen, Kristin Anderson, Antoinetter Wilson

Senators and Senate Leadership:

Count	Senate Member	Pos/ Dept.	7-Feb
1	Krista Gehring President	President	x
2	Bernardo Pohl	President-elect	x
3	Edmund Cueva	Past President	x

4	Candace TenBrink	Secretary	x
CHSS			
5	Ayden Adler	A&C	x
6	Carolyn Gascoigne	HHL	x
7	Katrina Rufino	SOS	x
8	Natalia Matveeva	A&C	x
9	Nell Sullivan	ENG	x
10	Paul Fortunato	ENG	x
11	Raquel Chiquillo	HHL	x
12	Stephanie Babb	SOS	x
13	Travis Crone	SOS	x
14	Luke Fedell*	CHSS	x
CPS			
15	Diane Miller	UE	x
16	Franklin Allaire	UE	x
17	Heather Goltz	CJSW	x
18	Kevin Buckler*	CJSW	x
CST			
19	Adriana Visbal	NS	x
20	Gabriella Bowden	NS	x
21	Katherine Shoemaker*	M&S	x
22	Ling Xu	CSET	x
23	Youn-Sha Chan	M&S	x
24	Kulwant Singh	CST	x
MDCOB			
25	Arpita Shroff	ACCI	x
26	Austin DeJan	FNIS	x
27	Paul Fulbright	GMSC	x
28	Prakash Deo	FNIS	x
29	Scott Davis	GMSC	x
30	Don Holmes	ACCI	x
31	David Epstein	MGT	x
<i>*Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members</i>			