CCRI FACULTY SENATE

**General Education Committee**

DRAFT MINUTES

**Date**:   Friday, 11/22/2024

**Time**:   8:30-10am

**Place**:  Zoom:

Outlook invitation forwarded to Jessica Araujo for inclusion on Faculty Senate website

1. **Call to Order: 8:35a**
2. **Roll Call:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Carruba, Chris (BSTM) CHAIR | PHYS | y |
| Cobb, Regina (HARS) | RHAB | y |
| Gaboury, Renee (AHSS) | ENGL | y |
| Gelsomino, Julie (BSTM) | MATH | y |
| Stewart, Tim (AHSS) | ENGL | y |
| Turchetta, Lou (AHSS) | PSYC | y |
| Gable, Sara Beth | Ex officio | y |
| Henriques, Shilo | Ex officio | Replacement? |
| Killgore, Leslie | Ex officio | y |
| Stargard, Bill | Ex officio | y |
| Webb, Lauren | Ex officio | y |
| Student TBD | Ex officio | None appointed |
| Charles Kell | Ex officio | Unable to attend |

1. **Approval of**[**Minutes from 10/25/2024**](https://ccri-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/personal/lmkillgore_ccri_edu/Documents/GEC/AY2024-2025%20Meetings/20241025%20DRAFT%20Minutes%20GEC.docx?d=w65bfd0f66266424e8f39113c42c54d29&csf=1&web=1&e=l7GPVH)**meeting**
   * Motion to approve: Cobb
   * Second: Gelsomino
   * Discussion:
   * Question about authorship of language change for 4A
   * Confirmed as Stargard; no change to minutes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |

1. **Approval of POLS 1030: State and Local Government**
   * Motion to TABLE approval POLS-1030 as a gen ed (1A/2A) (catalog AY2025-2026): Killgore
   * Second: Cobb
   * Discussion:
     + Department chair has not added the CLOs; proposal cannot be evaluated

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |

1. **General Education Policy: Ability 2**: [https://forms.office.com/r/QVWTQdPt7y](https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fforms.office.com%2Fr%2FQVWTQdPt7y&data=05%7C02%7Clmkillgore%40ccri.edu%7Cc85ab1ce175d45a65f0708dced498f35%7Caf75351b37eb4405bf7a7327cec380a5%7C0%7C0%7C638646148203460648%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2FdqbQ%2BZPOu7%2Fa91fvGrYGejiQBJ7QM8H69%2BDzLNZ9Fk%3D&reserved=0) **(tabled from 10/25/2024)**

* MOTION to approve (vote to approve makes changes part of presentation to full Faculty Senate): Carruba
* 2nd: Killgore
* Discussion:
* Carruba/Killgore: Update on how policy will be presented to Senate; overall plan for revision approvals
* Incorporating AI into Skill Category 2B: Information Literacy
* Carruba: I support integrating AI into the GEC policy (DEP) under Skill Category 2B. The only issue with the suggested language. I prefer adding an “OR”; otherwise it requires students to use it
  + Gelsomino: Agree. It implies you have to use it
  + Stewart: That's the question. Is the college saying we should be using it. The "and" is a mandate; the "or" implies voluntary use
* Gaboury: Is ICC writing such a policy?
  + Killgore: The ICC does not have authority to write policy. It would be looking to this Senate committee to do so, if the committee believes it is appropriate
* Cobb: I think faculty need to be trained before they are required to train students
  + Killgore: Absolutely. This is one of the topics we need to pursue
  + Stewart: Agree with Cobb. We look at the info literacy piece. I'm not an expert but I need my students to get expertise, I direct them to the Library. Everyone's expertise is all over the place; we need professional development and this language assumes we already have some expertise
* Killgore: I'm hearing that incorporating AI into 2B is a good idea, but one that is not ready for prime time
  + Cobb: Fair statement. Using "or" may be necessary in the short-term
  + Stewart: Why doesn't current language suffice
  + Gelsomino: I sent the form to my department. If it's OK, I'll read the 3 comments I got
    - "I agree that AI should be integrated, but phrasing indicates AI and online tools are the only way to develop said literacy. Maybe, "develop digital and online and non-online tools"
    - It seems to imply that the use of generative AI is going to be required, whereas we want students to know it's an option
    - Liked language suggested by PRAAC
    - Better synonyms of these words need to be included in the policy
  + Webb: I'd say from an assessment perspective, using "or" or reducing it to a dependent clause would give us time to get up to speed ourselves. The Library isn't ready. Faculty aren't widely ready. The LO for the skill category—for the faculty who don't use it yet—we'll get a lot of "this assignment doesn't address this outcome", which we can lean on as faculty develop skills over time
* Cobb: Is it the college's intention to pay for that AI? This is the golden standard.
* Killgore: Yes, the ICC has discussed this too, to avoid equity gaps for students.
  + Stewart: And for faculty as well.
  + Killgore: There also is a need to coalesce around a specific platform for which CCRI would accept financial responsibility. For students, as well as non-students.
* Cobb: We have SafeAssign in Blackboard. How do we assess whether the student's work is authentic?
  + Killgore: the research on anti-cheating tools says they all are problematic. Not reliable and students are concerned about possible (and real) false charges of dishonesty. Faculty cannot produce AI-proof assignments. We need to shift our attention to helping students learn how to use AI productively, responsibly... so they can go into the workforce and not be immediately exposed.
  + Carruba: Largely agree. I try to integrate into the classroom; I've started to with labs. I walked them through what I did and students took it and used it. To me, that's the big thing. I realize the college needs to get out ahead of this, but the language or policy, I don't think all the faculty will be onboard. Leaving it optional for faculty is more paramount than anything. Option to either use it or not. For example, speaking with another professor, he was asking about Scantron sheets. Some faculty are just not there; they will retire without ever using AI. We need to leave it optional.
  + Stewart: I also suggest that AI... is it helping the students. Is teaching student how to enter a better prompt helping them become a better person. I think the use of "or" fixes a lot of the discussion here.
* Cobb: I'm using Scantrons but I'm playing around with AI and taking my information and throwing it in there and seeing what it produces. It mainly just rearranges my words. I think if we allow faculty more time to transition, that's better. Speaking to Lauren, our program and syllabus have a bazillion goals and objectives and we're being asked to reduce. I'm asking AI to size it down and it does. Helping faculty is the biggest thing to help them.
  + Webb: I was using the clapping icon. It's such a great example of using AI. 😊
  + Carruba: No one can argue that's it's not a remarkable thing. I'll handwrite my lecture notes and put them in AI. It will find things I missed and it tells me what needs adding to my notes. As a helpful tool, it is incredible. College-wide we need some guidance and making it optional is the way to go. I think Turchetta questioned whether it should be in front of "other online tools"
* Stargard: It might help this committee to see what our sister, or other community colleges, are doing.
  + Killgore: Andrew Goodman is on an OPC committee, along with reps from our sister institutions. I haven't heard much, but I think RIC/URI are just getting started (e.g., they are at a point similar to ours or are behind us). There is a team of 5 faculty, me and Chris included, who are attending an AACU Institute on AI, Pedagogy, and Curriculum. My perception—Chris should chime in—is that we're on the leading edge of this group. Many are barely even beginning to think about the issue
  + Carruba: Agreed
* Stewart: I just put the language into ChatGPT and asked it if it were part of info literacy or critical thinking and it says not. I think the more general we are, we will be better. We can add more specifics later.
  + Gaboury: Question. Can we add it as a "c" category? If all others have only 2, but that would make it inconsistent.
  + Stewart: I'm fine with the wording as it currently is; no changes from 2020 version.
  + Gelsomino: Looking at the comments from MATH. Two indicate that maybe "locate, evaluate, synthesize" should come first and then "using..." Should come later
    - [Multiple voices agree.] I feel the language as is general enough to fill in with AI later, but I'm also great with the language Julie just read out.
* Gelsomino: Do we need to add language about ethical use?
  + Killgore: Already LO #6 in 2B
* Stargard: Do we need to reduce "synthesize and use" to just "synthesize"?
  + Stewart: Do we lose anything by eliminating "use"? I don't think so.
  + Stewart: Do we want to limit to just "generative AI"? There are so many
  + Killgore: Agreed. ICC brought it up earlier this week as well
* **Summary agreement: Develop digital and information literacy to locate, evaluate, and synthesize information using online tools and/or AI to accomplish a specific purpose.**
* Carruba: I sat with Kristen Swithers/President, Faculty Senate and she suggested we open PolicyStat and make changes as we agree on them. Another point: These changes that we've made, I personally think we not present to the Senate as a collective whole.
* Killgore: The Senate, with previous policies, also organizes an all-college Open Comment meeting.
* Carruba: Yes. I think doing both is good. I'll open up in PolicyStat and we can go over next meeting so we all agree that the changes are what we voted on. Then we can open to everyone for discussion.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |

1. **General Education Policy: Ability 4 (tabled from 10/25/2024)**

* Definition of an Educated Person, Ability 4: [as amended at meeting on 10/25/2024](https://ccri-my.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/personal/lmkillgore_ccri_edu/Documents/GEC/Policy%20and%20Pages/GEC%20policy%20change%20-%20Ability%204.1%20-%20large%20format.docx?d=wb686a85131b5421cb34f26714c907fd9&csf=1&web=1&e=mMfgLT):
* MOTION to TABLE (vote to approve makes changes part of presentation to full Faculty Senate): Killgore
* 2nd: Carruba
* Discussion:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |

1. **General Education Policy: Requirements for Students (tabled from 10/25/2024)**

* MOTION to TABLE to Requirements for Students, as indicated here: [https://forms.office.com/r/bwPBLNhNGE: Turchetta](https://nam02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fforms.office.com%2Fr%2FbwPBLNhNGE&data=05%7C02%7Clmkillgore%40ccri.edu%7Cc85ab1ce175d45a65f0708dced498f35%7Caf75351b37eb4405bf7a7327cec380a5%7C0%7C0%7C638646148203520940%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C0%7C%7C%7C&sdata=%2BjP%2B%2FZOEdag%2BLekUG4ryKQEl7m2hNypYYhkYXJSAeeI%3D&reserved=0)
* 2nd: Gaboury
* Discussion:
  + Stewart: Strange that 4A not covered in ADNU requirements
  + Killgore: Yes, the accreditor has locked things down and the required courses simply don't cover it in their alignment
  + Stewart: Is the policy change overall a problem?
  + Killgore: No. It affects only the JAA/Transfer programs. And if departments choose to change their alignments, part of my role is to
  + Killgore: As committee request, I’ve [gathered some data](https://ccri-my.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/personal/lmkillgore_ccri_edu/Documents/GEC/Policy%20and%20Pages/2025%20Policy%20Update/20241115%20Support%20for%20expanding%20to%208%20Skill%20Categories.xlsx?d=we32fa02b5d0d41adb99a2e6f3b60e3b2&csf=1&web=1&e=yQAnBP) on how many students are completing all 8 Skill Categories prior to the change.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |

1. **ADJOURNMENT**

* Motion to Adjourn: 10:04a; Gaboury
* Second: Stewart

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| VOTE: | Yes: 6 | No: 0 | Abstain: 0 |