Washburn University
Faculty Senate Agenda
April 8, 2024

I. Call to Order

II. Approve minutes from the March 25, 2024, meeting of Faculty Senate (pp. 3 - 7)

III. President's Opening Remarks

- Notes on suggested Executive Committee changes
- Visit from President Mazachek

IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update

V. VPAA/Provost Update – Fritch

VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports

- Approve the minutes of the March 18, 2024, meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee (pp. 8 – 10)
- Approve the minutes of the September 18, 2023, meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee (p. 11)
- Approve the minutes of the February 5, 2024, meeting of the Graduate Council (pp. 12 – 13)

VII. University Committee Reports

- Receive the minutes of the February 12, 2024, meeting of the General Education Committee (pp. 14 – 15)

VIII. Old business

New Program proposals

- 24-55 Bachelor of General Studies, BGS (pp. 16 – 22)
- 24-56 Skilled Trades, AAS (pp. 23 – 26)
- 24-57 Family & Human Services – Early Childhood Professional, AAS (pp. 27 – 29)

Program Inactivation

- 24-58 Family & Human Services – Early Childhood Professional, AA (pp. 30 - 34)

Existing Programs – Addition of minor requirement

- 24-59 Spanish, BA (pp. 35 - 38)
- 24-60 French, BA (pp. 39 - 42)

Existing Program - Significant Edits

- 24-61 FHS – Graduate Level Trauma and Recovery Certificate (pp. 43 - 45)

IX. Informational items

- 24-62 CE 300: Special Topics in Community Studies; Course Change (p. 46)
- 24-63 Pedagogical Use of Generative AI: Issues & Recommendations from the Washburn University AI Group (pp. 47 – 86)

X. Discussion Item

- Details of the approval process for the Scientific Literacy and Inclusion and Belonging general education requirements
- Process issues for promotion to Senior Lecturer (pp. 87 - 88)

XI. Announcements

- WSGA administration transition and introductions

XII. Adjournment

Washburn University
Faculty Senate Minutes
March 25, 2024

Present: Altus, Camarda, Cook, Cook-Cunningham, Dahl, Grant, Harnowo, Heusi, Holt, Kay, Kendall-Morwick (J.), Kendall-Morwick (K.), Kowalska, McHenry, Moddelmog, Ricklefs, Rivera Scofield, Sneed, Steffen, Toerber-Clark, Wagner

Absent: DeSota, Friesen Hakenewerth Hansen, Hartman, Lolley, McGuire, Miller, Porta

Guests: Ball, Broxterman, Erby, Hutchinson, Lanning, O'Neill, Stephenson, Martinez

I. Call to Order

II. Minutes from February 19, 2024, meeting of Faculty Senate approved.

III. President's Opening Remarks

- Secure transitions of Faculty Senate Executive Committee
    - Currently working on a proposal to change roles and terms of president and vice president; a name change from vice president to president elect; and the addition of a past president.
    - Camarda asked about those who will not be returning to Senate and want to take on one of the roles. These individuals could add a one-year term to ensure they remain in the Senate. Can extend their term by up to five years (Wagner). Ricklefs confirmed that other universities have done this.
    - Moddelmog asked Ball's perspective on this as she had been president in the past. Ball also confirmed this is regularly done in other places and it is a good idea.
    - Cook suggested that having someone acting as past president without being a senator may be a good idea. Not sure about the requirement of being an active member as people may be ready to be done.
    - Altus asked if there are course releases for the roles. There are. Currently not all can take releases who have them (Ricklefs)
    - Steffen would like to ensure the past president has a clearly defined role when this is proposed.
- Last year the Education department worked with those across Kansas to create an associate in education to ensure consistency and an easier transfer.
    - Business, computer science, nursing, and social work are working on similar efforts. There is Washburn representation on these committees as well.

- The associate in education is 60 hours; the agreements ensure transfers will only need to have the remaining 60 hours when they come to Washburn (Steffen).
- These agreements do give some flexibility; there will be a list of courses that count as required courses. Do not foresee this affecting accreditation (Ricklefs).
- Regarding the associates in elementary education, the new general education package may make their program look different than others on campus (Steffen). Ball added that this is one of the exceptions that may come up with the general education package due to accreditation or licensure.
- Cook thinks this is both a good idea and may be a first step in consistency across the state for all programs.
- Not all community colleges are on the same page (Steffen). Ball clarified in some situations that this is due to resources not necessarily because they do not want to.
- The end of April is the deadline for these plans to move forward for review (Ricklefs).

IV. WUBOR/KBOR Update

- KBOR continues prioritizing the faculty award.
- WUBOR
  - Budget decisions have been taking place. Mazachek will be at the April 8th meeting of Faculty Senate to discuss.
  - The Henderson renovation and CAS Dean search have been major responsibilities.
  - Enrollment updates.
  - The last meeting included recognition of those who received promotion, tenure, and emeritus. Ricklefs took time to recognize these individuals as well.

V. VPAA/Provost Update

- Ball presenting as Fritch is at an EAB meeting and sends his greetings.
- Rusty Monhollon – Washburn University alum – is the new VPAA for KBOR. Has been communicating with those at other universities and is in the know regarding what is going on.

VI. Faculty Senate Committee Reports

- Minutes of the February 12, 2024, meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee were approved.

VII. University Committee Reports

- Minutes of the February 29, 2024, meeting of the Assessment Committee were received.
- Minutes of the February 22, 2024, meeting of the International Education / International WTE Committee were received.

VIII. Old business

- New Interdisciplinary Minors / Certificates
    - 24-31 Sports and Health Psychology, Minor
    - 24-32 Sport and Media, Minor
    - 24-33 STEM, Certificate
    - 24-34 Storytelling and Narrative Arts, Minor
    - 24-35 Storytelling and Narrative Arts, Certificate
    - 24-36 Multidisciplinary Studies, Minor
    - 24-37 Sustainability and Environmental Studies, Minor
    - 24-38 Sustainability and Environmental Studies, Certificate
    - 24-39 Technical Communication, Minor
    - 24-40 Technical Communication, Certificate
        - These were presented as a package deal and should be taken as such (Kendall-Morwick, K.). Altus asked for clarification on the multidisciplinary minor.
        - There was concern how the new general education package would affect programs with minors in terms of going over on hours (Cook). Moddelmog confirmed that as most programs in CAS are now requiring a minor, this can facilitate meeting that requirement.
        - Altus suggested that more thought and planning should go into certificate proposals, e.g., details, data, and robustness. Erby clarified that these were provided when the certificates went through to CourseLeaf; the form used in the past is no longer being used. It was suggested that the coversheet for items be more robust. Steffen voiced agreement.
        - There are adjustments that could make CourseLeaf better, but currently we do not have the ability to address them (O'Neill). The Executive Committee will work on the CourseLeaf needs and will report back.
        - All items approved.

- Program Change
    - 24-41 Requirements Common to All CAS Minors and Certificates approved.
- Existing Programs / Requiring Minor (plus edits)
    - 24-42 Art History, BA
    - 24-43 Art, BA
    - 24-44 Music, BA
    - 24-45 Bachelor of Musical Arts, BMA
    - 24-46 Theatre, BA
    - 24-47 Physics, BA
    - 24-48 Anthropology, BA
    - 24-49 Sociology, BA
        - These consist of added minors and adjusted hours (Moddelmog).
        - All items approved.
- Existing Programs / Edits
    - 24-50 Biology, BEd
    - 24-51 Biology with Secondary Education Specialization, BS
    - 24-52 Middle Grades STEM, BEd
    - 24-53 Mathematics Secondary Education: Advanced Mathematics 6-12, Bed (includes inactivation of BA / BS)
    - 24-54 Exercise & Rehab Science, BS
        - Erby asked about the grouping of the items coming forward. This was done to be helpful in terms of viewing the items (Grant).
        - Changes to Math were submitted last year and just made it through; Biology materials consist of name changes.
        - Items approved.

IX. Announcements

- Electoral committee update (Kay)
    - There are three at large positions available. Please encourage people to self-nominate or nominate someone with their consent. Nominations can be sent to Kay with a bio and statement of explanation. Applications accepted through April 1st.
        - No more than one can come from CAS or nursing; all other units cannot have more than two at large.

        - Have been down by one at large seat; was unable to be filled in the fall.
    - Voting will take place April 21st through 28th.
    - All unit leaders received the details regarding the number of senators needing to be elected as well as the information about terms.
- Math announcements (Cook)
    - KBOR is working to make changes to math pathways; will be contacting people to define a specific math path for their degrees. This week, SOBU is working on their pathway; Dean Frank is representing SAS and nursing on these efforts as well.
    - Working towards removing MA095 as KBOR has ensured prerequisites are not covered by state funding. People will be able to take MA112 or MA116 but will need to take a corequisite if they don't meet a certain threshold on the placement test. Ball noted that his has been a nationwide trend.
- Aperion is April 19th (Moddelmog)
- This is the last meeting the current WSGA administration will attend in their official role. The welcome and inclusion have been appreciated. Martinez plans to bring the new president and vice president to the next Faculty Senate meeting (Martinez). Ricklefs voiced appreciation for their work.
- April 2nd at one o'clock Ricklefs and Enos will be provided another actives shooter training (Ricklefs)
- Lunch this Friday in the union at 12:45 (Ricklefs)

X. Adjournment
- 4:05

Academic Affairs Meeting Minutes
Monday, March 18, 2024 at 4:00pm
In-person, Memorial Union – Lincoln Room

Attendees: Deborah Altus (chair), Beth O'Neill (ex-officio), Karen Camarda, Sarah Holt, Dion Harnowo, Kara Kendall-Morwick, Lara Rivera, Michelle Heusi, Barbara Scofield

Guests: Kelly Erby, Mary Sundal, Park Lockwood, Cherry Steffen, and Janet Sharp.

The meeting was called to order by Deborah Altus at 4:00 pm.

Deborah noted that College of Arts and Sciences requested to remove the Pre-Law, Minor from the agenda. It would not be considered this meeting.

I. Approvals
   a. Minutes from the Academic Affairs meeting held on Monday, February 12, 2024 were presented.
      i. A motion for approval was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Karen Camarda.
      ii. The motion was passed unanimously.

II. Action Items
   a. Program Changes – Requirements Common to All CAS Minors and Certificates
      i. A motion for discussion was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Sarah Holt.
      ii. Kelly Erby provided an overview and took questions from the committee.
         1. Kelly noted that oversight for the new minors and certificates being proposed in this meeting will be through the CAS Dean's office.
         2. There was a concern noted that there were certificates being considered with only 9 credit hours. Committee discussed the variety of certificates currently being offered by Washburn and how each varied across the Colleges and Schools.
         3. The committee discussed the proposal.
      iii. The motion passed with one abstention.

   b. New Interdisciplinary Minors / Certificates
      i. A motion for discussion for the Sports and Health Psychology, Minor and Sport and Media, Minor proposals was made by Tonya Ricklefs and seconded by Kara Kendall-Morwick.
         1. The committee discussed.

2. The motion was approved unanimously.

ii. A motion for discussion for the STEM Certificate proposal was made by Tonya Ricklefs and seconded by Barbara Scofield.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

iii. A motion for discussion for the Storytelling and Narrative Arts Minor and Certificate proposals was made by Tonya Ricklefs and seconded by Kara Kendall-Morwick.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

iv. A motion for discussion for the Multidisciplinary Studies, Minor proposal was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded Sarah Holt.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

v. A motion for discussion for the Sustainability and Environmental Studies Minor and Certificate proposals was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Tonya Ricklefs.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

vi. A motion for discussion was made for the Technical Communications Minor and Certificate by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Sarah Holt.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

c. Existing Programs / Requiring Minors

i. A motion for discussion was made for the Art History, BA and Art, BA proposals by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Lara Rivera.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

ii. A motion for discussion was made for the Music, BA, Bachelor of Musical Arts, BMA and Theatre, BA proposals by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Sarah Holt.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

iii. A motion for discussion for the Physics, BA proposal was made by Karen Camarda and seconded by Kara Kendall-Morwick.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

iv. A motion for discussion for the Anthropology, BA and Sociology, BA proposals was made by Sarah Holt and seconded by Kara Kendall-Morwick.
    1. The committee discussed.
    2. The motion was approved unanimously.

d. Existing Programs / Edits (Education)
    i. A motion for discussion was made for the Biology, BEd, Biology with Secondary Education Specialization, BS, Middle Grade STEM, BEd and Mathematics Secondary Education Advanced Mathematics 6-12, BEd proposals by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Tonya Ricklefs.
        1. The committee discussed.
        2. Committee asked Cherry Steffen, Department of Education chair, if she had the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the proposals submitted. She confirmed she had.
        3. The motion was approved unanimously.

e. Existing Programs / Edits
    i. A motion for discussion for the Exercise & Rehabilitation Science, BS proposal was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and Sarah Holt.
        1. The committee asked Park Lockwood why the Kinesiology department dropped IL 170 as a required course. Park noted that there were a couple Kinesiology classes that covered the same material as IL 170.
        2. The motion was approved unanimously.

III. Deborah noted that next Academic Affairs meeting was scheduled for Monday, April 1.

IV. There being no further business to discuss, a motion was made by Kara Kendall-Morwick and seconded by Tonya Ricklefs to conclude the meeting at 4:30 pm.

Minutes taken by Holly Broxterman.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Minutes

September 18, 2023

3:00pm – 4:00pm

Lincoln Room – Memorial Union

Members Present:

Von Hansen, Vanessa Steinroetter (for Eric McHenry), Sarah Cook, Ross Friesen, Linsey Moddelmog, Liviu Florea (for Dion Harnowo), James Barraclough, Erin Grant, Jody Toerber-Clark, Thomas Sneed, Barbara Scofield, Danny Wade (ex-officio)

Guests: None

1. Call to Order at 3:03 pm by Vanessa Steinroetter
2. Introductions
3. Appointment of Committee Chair. Linsey Moddelmog self-nominated herself. There was no discussion. Committee approved.
4. Discussion
    a. Questions and discussions regarding protocol of this committee. Items for consideration will usually come from Faculty Senate, the President's office, or Faculty Handbook.
    b. The committee had no other topics or items of discussion.
5. Announcements
    a. Next meeting is scheduled for Monday, October 2, 2023, at 3:00pm in the Lincoln Room.
6. Adjournment
    a. With no further business Erin Grant moved to adjourn the meeting and Jody Toerber-Clark seconded. Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 3:13pm.

Notes taken by Beth Mathews

Approved: 4.1.24

Graduate Council Minutes
Monday, February 5, 2024
Via Zoom

Attendees: Jennifer Ball (ex-officio), Leah Brown (ex-officio), Tracy Routsong, Jim Schnoebelen, Danny Funk, Tracy Davis, Becky Dodge, Sarah Holt, Dave Provorse, Michele Reisinger, Barbara Scofield, Michael Rettig, Pat Dahl, Lydia Diebolt

Not present: Zenova Williams

Notes taken by: Beth Mathews

Guest: Kassy Swain and Travis Perry

The meeting was called to order by Jim Schnoebelen at 12:03pm.

I. Approval of Minutes
   a. A motion was made by Sarah Holt and seconded by Barbara Scofield to approve the November 6, 2023, minutes as presented.
   b. Motion passed.

II. Old Business
   a. Graduate Certificate in Communication and Leadership update
      i. Jim Schnoebelen informed the committee that this new certificate was moving forward through the approval process.

III. New Business
   a. New graduate application platform – Leah Brown, Kassy Swain, and Travis Perry
      i. Leah Brown informed the committee that Slate had been chosen to provide communication and application processing for the university. It will replace Recruit and CollegeNet for undergraduate and graduate programs.
      ii. She will be sending out invites for group training meetings for all of those currently using CollegeNet.
      iii. Leah Brown will provide periodic updates on the transition to Slate to the graduate council.
      iv. Kassy Swain shared they expect to start integration of Slate in the April time frame since this is currently a busy time for applications and processing.
      v. She will set up individual meetings to set up applications.
      vi. She shared that Washburn would have full functionality for Slate and would be able to provide almost immediate assistance.
      vii. Travis Perry is working on the communication and marketing side of the platform and shared it would help with student engagement and work more seamlessly than Recruit.

viii. He also shared Washburn will have unlimited licenses to allow anyone to work within the platform.
ix. He will have one email template that can be modified to respond accordingly by department.
x. Danny Funk asked how incomplete applications will be transitioned. Kassy Swain advised that at end-of-life for existing applications they will import those documents.
xi. Dave Provorse asked if admins will be included in the training meetings. Leah Brown advised that she has a list of CollegeNet users and will send invites for training to everyone listed.

IV. Discussion
a. CollegeNet application forms – Beth Mathews reminded everyone that any edits or changes to the current application forms will be available until the CollegeNet contract runs out or when Slate is fully implemented. Jennifer Ball added that the CollegeNet platform contract expires in October. Any updates needed to current applications should be sent to Beth Mathews.
b. EN208 – Barbara Scofield
i. Melanie Burdick confirmed that English department would be willing to provide a professional-level writing class and could be implemented by summer 2025.
ii. Barbara Scofield said there were two questions to be addressed. One of which would be enrollment numbers. She asked that the council members reach out to their departments and then let her know their interest.
iii. There was also discussion on the approval process for the class if implemented. Jennifer Ball suggested the course outline be presented to Graduate Council for review and any recommendations before submitting approval through the usual process.
iv. Jim Schnoebelen reminded the council members that if they have any concerns, topics of discussion, or reminders for the Graduate Council to send those items to him, Jennifer Ball, or Beth Mathews to be added to the next agenda.

V. Announcements
a. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 4, 2024.

VI. Adjournment – there being no further business to discuss, Jim Schnoebelen concluded the meeting at 12:25pm.

Gen Ed Committee Minutes
Monday, February 12, 2024, at 12:00pm
In-Person – Crane Room

Members In-attendance: Jennifer Ball, Beth O'Neill, elly McClendon, Justin Moss, Gary Hu, Roy Wohl, Linzi Gibson, Amy Memmer, Dmitri Nizovtsev, Stephen Woody

Not present: Joey DeSota, Belinda Eckert

Meeting called to order at 12:02pm by Jennifer Ball

I. Approval of Minutes – Motion made by Dmitri Nizovtsev to approve the minutes for the meeting on November 13, 2023. Seconded by Roy Wohl. Motion carried.
II. Revisions Discussion and Review
    a. EN200 – Jennifer Ball shared she had a conversation with Melanie Burdick advising this committee would need to review ob ectives, assessment and rubric. With no further discussion, Dmitri Ni ovtsev made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Stephen Woody. Motion carried.
    b. RG101 – Jennifer Ball shared that the Religious studies classes were previously reviewed by Dr. Jones but not submitted to en Ed Committee for review and approval. Dmitri Ni ovtsev noted that there were two rubrics attached. The committee preferred the rubric attached to the application. Jennifer Ball will share this with Dr. Jones and report back to the committee. The rubric preference also applied to RG102 and RG103. With that condition, Roy Wohl made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Stephen Woody. Motion carried.
    c. RG102 – Dmitri Ni ovtsev made a motion to approve this revision conditional to the rubric preference being addressed. Roy Wohl seconded the motion. Motion carried.
    d. RG103 – Roy Wohl made a motion to approve this revision conditional to the rubric preference being address. Stephen Woody seconded the motion. Motion carried.
III. Student Petition – Kaito Kashiyama
    a. This petition is for acceptance of a transfer course for 2 hours of en Ed credit. Dmitri Ni ovtsev initially met with the student and performed the audit review. Jennifer Ball shared that she reviewed the petition and believes it should be accepted. Further discussion was had concerning the difference between the two hours transferred and the possibility of the student requiring three. Jennifer Ball advised that the student could apply for a waiver of one credit hour if necessary. Dmitri Nizovtsev shared he believed the student would have adequate credit hours based on the transcript review. There being no further discussion, Stephen Woody moved to accept the transfer credit as Gen Ed for this student. Justin Moss seconded the motion. Motion carried.
IV. Discussion Items –

a. Jennifer Ball shared there was a conflict with the next en Ed meeting on March with the CAS faulty meeting. It will be discussed further a er reviewing what, if any, items the committee would have to consider a er their next meeting on February 22, 2024.

V. Ad ournment. There being no further business Jennifer Ball ad ourned the meeting at 12:21pm

Meeting notes taken by Beth Mathews

Approved: 3.5.24

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 04/01/2024

Submitted by: Kelly Erby, x. 2018

SUBJECT: New Program - Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) – CIP Code 24.0102

Rationale: We all know students who began a major program of study and then stopped out due to finances, complicated life circumstances, or because they could not pass a particular course or series of courses required for their major. In Shawnee County alone there are 38,000 individuals who have earned some college credit but not a completed degree. These students are likely to have accumulated debt without having secured the nancial and developmental bene ts afforded to college graduates.

The proposed Bachelor of General Studies is designed to encourage such students to complete a four-year degree at Washburn. It offers a straightforward path to timely graduation by 1) optimizing the number of electives to accommodate earned college credits that may not easily apply to another degree program and 2) providing a flexible curriculum that may be completed in person, online, or through a combination of in-person and online classes.

This is a non-traditional degree that allows greater freedom of course selection than is available in traditional major programs. However, students will need to complete core university graduation requirements common to all baccalaureate degrees, including 120 total credit hours; general education requirements; 60 credit hours earned from a four-year institution; 45 credit hours of upper-division credit; residency requirements; and a minimum GPA of 2.0. Students pursuing this degree will also be required to complete an upper-division English composition course in addition to the two composition courses included as part of general education.

Admission to the General Studies program requires a minimum of 45 credit hours of college coursework earned after high school graduation and acceptance by the program coordinator. The program coordinator will ensure students pursue a more traditional degree when appropriate and will consult annually with advisors in other academic units to stay abreast of requirements other academic degree programs.

The proposed program learning objectives for the degree encourage the development of a wide range of competencies, including problem solving, critical thinking and analysis, and communication. These learning objectives prepare students for the challenges they may face in various professional, civic, and personal contexts. They are skills taught across different disciplines and throughout many parts of the existing Washburn curriculum, particularly in the arts and sciences. This helps to ensure that the program learning objectives will be met even with the flexibility of course selection the degree facilitates.

The program learning objectives will be regularly assessed using artifacts students create in an upper-division composition course, similar to how the critical/creative thinking and written communication university student learning outcomes are currently assessed. This approach to assessment supports the flexible design of the degree and the population of students this degree is intended to serve. Assessing through a portfolio, for example, would not be equitable for students with large gaps in their educational career who might not have access to previous academic work. Likewise, requiring a capstone for every student may not accommodate specific needs and circumstances.

The Bachelor of General Studies degree will enable Washburn to more effectively recruit a distinct subset of returning and transfer students because it offers a straightforward roadmap to degree completion, supporting Washburn's mission to create educational pathways to success for everyone. It will also allow Washburn to compete with other universities who offer a similar non-traditional degree option. The addition of this degree will benefit our community by increasing the number of residents who have college degrees and thereby supporting workforce development, increased income and employment opportunities, civic engagement, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

The Bachelor of General Studies is similar to the Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) in that it does not require a major. However, the Bachelor of General Studies degree will provide greater flexibility than the BIS because it does not require an individualized study plan, pre-approved multi-department study program, or capstone. These requirements of the BIS have necessitated additional coursework for students who already have significant college credits and no degree and can present barriers to recruiting students because they can be complicated to navigate. In recent years, the BIS has been utilized as a degree completion program because such a program is needed at Washburn. But that was not what the BIS was originally designed to be. With a Bachelor of General Studies degree available at Washburn, the BIS could return to its original purpose for students who desire to design their own unique, integrated program of study.

Proposed Catalog Description: The Bachelor of General Studies program is a flexible, four-year degree program that provides a broad educational experience. This is a degree completion option for students who have completed significant coursework but not the requirements of a specific major. College credits that are not easily applicable to a particular major or minor can often be applied to this degree, facilitating time to graduation. Students may seek college credit for non-traditional prior learning experiences by contacting the Center for Prior Learning: https://www.washburn.edu/academics/prior-learning-assessment/index.html.

Admission to the General Studies program requires a minimum of 45 credit hours of college coursework earned a er high school graduation and acceptance by the program coordinator. The program coordinator will discuss with students whether a more traditional degree would better advance their personal and professional goals.

Program Learning Objectives:

1. Develop a broad understanding of various disciplines, fostering an interdisciplinary approach to problem solving and decision making.
2. Develop and apply critical thinking skills to evaluate and synthesize information, assess arguments, and make informed decisions across diverse subject areas and perspectives.
3. Develop and apply communication skills.

Study Plan: Candidates for the Bachelor of General Studies degree must complete the following requirements:

- A minimum of 120 credit hours, 84 of which must be graded and 45 of which must be at the 300 or 400 level
- All general education requirements
- 300-level English composition course
- Minimum 2.0 GPA
- Minimum of 30 credit hours of the last 45 must be earned from Washburn University
- Minimum of 60 credit hours must be earned from a four-year institution
- There is no minimum requirement for credit hours within the College of Arts and Sciences

List any financial implications: Market research indicates demand for this program in our community and region, and so implementation is likely to result in new revenue. Other public institutions in the region are already offering completion programs with similar flexibility. This addition to Washburn's catalog will enable us to be more competitive in recruiting and graduating adult learners. The degree will be coordinated by the College of Arts and Sciences Deans Office. If the program grows considerably, an additional CAS academic advisor might be necessary, and would be justified by the increased revenue generated.

Are any other departments affected by this new program: Yes, the program is highly flexible and students may take undergraduate courses from all units of the university and apply them toward this degree. The impacts should be largely positive, as the program's flexibility and diversity will preclude a major burden on any one department.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/.FAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments: Yes **X** No _

Program Change Request

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/15/24 1:44 pm

Viewing: **: Bachelor of General Studies**

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:23 am

Changes proposed by: Kelly Erby (kelly.erby)

Catalog Pages Using this Program	General Studies

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **Library**
3. **Governance Check**
4. **AA Committee**
5. **Faculty Senate**
6. General Faculty
7. WUBOR
8. Final Acad Ops
9. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 03/15/24 1:51 pm Beth ONeill (beth.oneill): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/15/24 1:57 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
3. 03/21/24 10:28 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Governance Check
4. 04/02/24 8:23 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	College of Arts and Sciences
College	College of Arts and Sciences
Division	
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Bachelor of General Studies
Degree to be Offered	Bachelor of General Studies (BGS)
Is this program offered completely online?	No
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
CIP Code	240102 - General Studies.
Modality	

New Program Header

Statement of Justification/Rationale for Offering the Program

We all know students who began a major program of study and then stopped out due to finances, complicated life circumstances, or because they could not pass a particular course or series of courses required for their major. In Shawnee County alone there are 38,000 individuals who have earned some college credit but not a completed degree. These students are likely to have accumulated debt without having secured the financial and developmental benefits afforded to college graduates.

The proposed Bachelor of General Studies is designed to encourage such students to complete a four-year degree at Washburn. It offers a straightforward path to timely graduation by 1) optimizing the number of electives to accommodate earned college credits that may not easily apply to another degree program and 2) providing a flexible curriculum that may be completed in person, online, or through a combination of in-person and online classes.

This is a non-traditional degree that allows greater freedom of course selection than is available in traditional major programs. However, students will need to complete core university graduation requirements common to all baccalaureate degrees, including 120 total credit hours; general education requirements; 60 credit hours earned from a four-year institution; 45 credit hours of upper-division credit; residency requirements; and a minimum GPA of 2.0. Students pursuing this degree will also be required to complete an upper-division English composition course in addition to the two composition courses included as part of general education.

The proposed program learning objectives for the degree encourage the development of a wide range of competencies, including problem solving, critical thinking and analysis, and communication. These learning objectives prepare students for the challenges they may face in various professional, civic, and personal contexts. They are skills taught across different disciplines and throughout many parts of the existing Washburn curriculum, particularly in the arts and sciences. This helps to ensure that the program learning objectives will be met even with the flexibility of course selection the degree facilitates.
The program learning objectives will be regularly assessed using artifacts students create in an upper-division composition course, similar to how the critical/creative thinking and written communication university student learning outcomes are currently assessed. This approach to assessment supports the flexible design of the degree and the population of students this degree is intended to serve. Assessing through a portfolio, for example, would not be equitable for students with large gaps in their educational career who might not have access to previous academic work. Likewise, requiring a capstone for every student may not accommodate specific needs and circumstances.

The Bachelor of General Studies degree will enable Washburn to more effectively recruit a distinct subset of returning and transfer students because it offers a straightforward roadmap to degree completion, supporting Washburn's mission to create educational pathways to success for everyone. It will also allow Washburn to compete with other universities who offer a similar non-traditional degree option. The addition of this degree will benefit our community by increasing the number of residents who have college degrees and thereby supporting workforce development, increased income and employment opportunities, civic engagement, innovation, and entrepreneurship.

The Bachelor of General Studies is similar to the Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) in that it does not require a major. However, the Bachelor of General Studies degree will provide greater flexibility than the BIS because it does not require an individualized study plan, pre-approved multi-department study program, or capstone. These requirements of the BIS have necessitated additional coursework for students who already have significant college credits and no degree and can present barriers to recruiting students because they can be complicated to navigate. In recent years, the BIS has been utilized as a degree completion program because such a program is needed at Washburn. But that was not what the BIS was originally designed to be. With a Bachelor of General Studies degree available at Washburn, the BIS could return to its original purpose for students who desire to design their own unique, integrated program of study.

Program Demand

Market research indicates demand for this program in our community and region (e.g., 38,000 individuals who have earned some college credit but not a completed degree in Shawnee County), and so implementation is likely to result in new revenue. Other public institutions in the region are already offering completion programs with similar flexibility. This addition to Washburn's catalog will enable us to be more competitive in recruiting and graduating adult learners.

Projected Enrollment for the Initial Three Years of the Program

Implementation

Year 2

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	NA	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	NA
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	NA	Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	NA

Year 3

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	NA	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	NA
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	NA	Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	NA

Employment

Employment Opportunity Information

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	Admission to the General Studies program requires a minimum of 45 credit hours of college coursework earned after high school graduation and acceptance by the program coordinator. The program coordinator will ensure students pursue a more traditional degree when appropriate.
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	120

Curriculum

Degree Requirements

Admission to the Bachelor of General Studies program requires a minimum of 45 credit hours of college coursework earned after high school graduation and acceptance by the program coordinator. The program coordinator will ensure students pursue a more traditional degree when appropriate. Candidates for the Bachelor of General Studies degree must complete the following requirements:

Required Courses [1, 2]		
General Education Courses [3]		34-35
EN 3XX	Upper-Division English Composition Course	3
Other University Courses Required to Reach 120 Hours		82-83
Total Hours		**120**

1

A minimum of 30 credit hours of the last 45 must be earned from Washburn University, and a minimum of 60 credit hours must be earned from a four-year institution. Additionally, a minimum of 84 hours must be graded, and at least 45 hours must be at the 300 or 400 level.

2

A minimum 2.0 GPA is required for graduation.

3

More information about general education requirements can be found at https://catalogedits.washburn.edu/undergraduate/programs-degrees-graduation-requirements/

Pathway

Core Faculty

Faculty Workload Analysis

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

The degree will be coordinated by the College of Arts and Sciences Deans Office. If the program grows considerably, an additional CAS academic advisor might be necessary, and would be justified by the increased revenue generated.

The program is highly flexible and students may take undergraduate courses from all units of the university and apply them toward this degree. The impacts should be largely positive, as the program's flexibility and diversity will preclude a major burden on any one department.

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments

Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (03/26/24 3:06 pm): Proposal was approved and completed CAS Governance Process prior to entry into CourseLeaf per Kelly Erby.

Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:23 am): Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

Key: 442

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Michelle Shipley, x. 2114

SUBJECT: New Program – Skilled Trades, AAS ((Pending SAS approval))

Description / Rationale: This degree program requires course work at both Washburn Tech and Washburn University. Once completion of an approved certificate is earned at Washburn Tech, students can continue at Washburn University to earn an associate of applied science degree by completing general education requirements. The AAS degree maintains a reasonable number of credit hours, keeping in line with those offered at other institutions. The current AA/AS articulation degrees will be 87-88 credit hours due to the new general education framework.

Current demand exists for these programs and is expected to continue into the future. Associate degrees help graduates advance in their careers and are a step toward a Bachelor degree for many. Students completing eligible certificates at Washburn Tech can begin this AAS degree program within 6 years of graduation. There are currently 52 students enrolled in the WU/ Washburn Tech articulation degree programs.

Financial Implications: None noted.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments **Yes X** No

Program Change Request

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/22/24 8:42 am

Viewing: **: Skilled Trades, AAS**

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:23 am

Changes proposed by: Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley)

Final Catalog	2024-2025
Rationale for	
Change Type	
Summarize Changes and	

In Workflow

1. Acad Ops
2. SAS Chair
3. Library
4. SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. SAS Dean
6. SAS Fac Council Chair
7. Governance Check
8. AA Committee
9. Faculty Senate
10. General Faculty
11. WUBOR
12. Final Acad Ops
13. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 03/22/24 10:29 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/22/24 11:06 am Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Chair
3. 03/22/24 1:52 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 03/26/24 12:30 pm Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. 03/26/24 2:47 pm Zach Frank (zach.frank): Approved for SAS Dean
6. 04/01/24 9:32 am Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Fac Council Chair
7. 04/01/24 9:38 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Governance Check
8. 04/02/24 8:23 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	School of Applied Studies
College	School of Applied Studies
Division	
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Skilled Trades, AAS
Degree to be Offered	Associate of Applied Science (AAS)
Is there a Washburn Articulation	
Related	
Is this program offered completely online?	No
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	
Concentration	
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
Interdisciplinary	
CIP Code	46.9999 - 46.9999
Modality	

New Program Header

Statement of Justification/Rationale for Offering the Program

This associate of applied science degree program requires course work at both Washburn Tech and Washburn University. Once completion of an approved certificate is earned at Washburn Tech, students can continue at Washburn University to earn an associate of applied science degree by completing the required general education courses. The AAS degree in Skilled Trades maintains a reasonable number of credit hours and keeps the degree in line with those offered at other institutions.

The current AA/AS articulation degrees will be 87-88 credit hours due to the KBOR general education changes.

Program Demand

Current demand exists for these programs and is expected to continue into the future. Associate degrees help graduates advance in their careers and are a step toward a Bachelor degree for many. Students completing eligible certificates at Washburn Tech can begin this AAS

degree program within 6 years of graduation. There are currently 52 students enrolled in the WU/ Washburn Tech articulation degree programs.

Projected Enrollment for the Initial Three Years of the Program

Implementation

Full-Time Headcount		Part-Time Headcount	
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per		Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per	

Year 2

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	26	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	26
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	312	Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	150

Year 3

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	26	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	26
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	312	Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	150

Employment

Employment Opportunity Information	By combining an associate degree from Washburn University with technical training from Washburn Tech, students gain knowledge in areas such as math, history, psychology and communication. These skills add value to any career path. An added bonus is the cost. Washburn Tech students, pursuing an eligible associate degree at Washburn, may qualify for reduced tuition rate.

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	This program requires completion of an approved Washburn Tech certificate program in addition to 15 hours of General Education and all requirements for an Associate of Applied Science degree. Students must be concurrently enrolled in 12 credit hours at Washburn Tech or have already completed one of the eligible Washburn Tech certificates. Students must start at WU within 6 years of Washburn Tech certificate completion.
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	69
Curriculum	

Degree Requirements

This program requires completion of an approved Washburn Tech certificate program,15 hours of General Education, and all requirements for an Associate of Applied Science degree.
Eligible Washburn Tech certificate programs are as follows:

- Auto Collision
- Auto Service Technician
- Cabinet/Mill Work
- Climate and Energy Control Technologies
- Culinary Arts
- Diesel Technology
- Engineering Drafting and Design
- Graphics Technology
- Industrial Automation Mechanic
- Information Systems Technology
- Machine/Tool Technology
- Welding

Required Courses		
Approved Washburn Tech Certificate		
WU 101	The Washburn Experience [1]	3
TA 210	Technology Survey	3
or TA 310	Technology & Society	

1

Students transferring in 30 or more credit hours completed at an accredited post-secondary institution (after graduating from high school) with a GPA of 2.0 or higher are exempt from this requirement.

Pathway

Core Faculty

Faculty Workload Analysis

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments	**Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:23 am):** Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

Key: 439

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Michelle Shipley, x. 2114

SUBJECT: New Program, Family & Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AAS

Description / Rationale:

The AA Early Childhood Professional program is being inactivated and replaced with this AAS degree. This is designed specifically for WIT students who have taken the Early Childhood Education Certificate to provide a pathway for completing an Associate degree. This AAS degree better meets the needs of WIT students, as it allows them to complete the degree in 60 hours (whereas the AA pathway would require over 70 hours).

Financial Implications: None noted.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments **Yes X** No

Program Change Request

New Program Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/20/24 12:25 pm

Viewing: **: Family & Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AAS**

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:23 am

Changes proposed by: Deborah Altus (deborah.altus)

In Workflow

1. Acad Ops
2. HS Chair
3. Library
4. SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. SAS Dean
6. SAS Fac Council Chair
7. Governance Check
8. AA Committee
9. Faculty Senate
10. General Faculty
11. WUBOR
12. Final Acad Ops
13. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 03/20/24 12:52 pm Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/20/24 1:11 pm Stacy Conner (stacy.conner): Approved for HS Chair
3. 03/20/24 3:17 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 03/26/24 12:30 pm Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. 03/26/24 2:46 pm Zach Frank (zach.frank): Approved for SAS Dean
6. 04/01/24 9:32 am Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Fac Council Chair
7. 04/01/24 9:38 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Governance Check
8. 04/02/24 8:23 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Family and Human Services
College	School of Applied Studies
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Family & Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AAS
Degree to be Offered	Associate of Applied Science (AAS)
Is this program offered completely online?	No
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
CIP Code	131210 - Early Childhood Education and Teaching.
Modality	

New Program Header

Statement of Justification/Rationale for Offering the Program

Inactivating the AA program and offering this new AAS program to replace. The AAS better meets the needs of WIT students who want to obtain an Associate degree, as it allows them to complete the degree in 60 hours (whereas the AA pathway would require over 70 hours to complete).

Program Demand -

Projected Enrollment for the Initial Three Years of the Program

Implementation

Year 2

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	-	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	-
Full-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	-	Part-Time Sem Credit Hrs Per Year	-

Year 3

Full-Time Headcount Per Year	-	Part-Time Headcount Per Year	-
Full-Time Sem	-	Part-Time Sem Credit	-

Credit Hrs Per Year Hrs Per Year

Employment

Employment Opportunity Information

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria

Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree 60

Curriculum

In addition to the requirements stated below, students must complete the Early Childhood Professional Certificate (Cert A - 24 hours), 15 hours of General Education and all requirements for an Associate of Applied Sciences degree. Some of the courses below may also fulfill general education or other degree requirements. Please see your advisor for more information.

Required Courses Inside Department [1]		
HS 100	Family and Human Services	3
HS 131	Human Development	3
HS 250	Skills for Helping Professionals	3
HS XXX	HS Electives	3
Required Courses Outside Department [1]		
WU 101	The Washburn Experience	3

1

Students must receive a C or better in each course.

Pathway

Core Faculty

Faculty Workload Analysis

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments **Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:23 am):** Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

Key: 443

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Michelle Shipley, x. 2114

SUBJECT: Program Inactivation, Family & Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AA

Description / Rationale: Inactivating program and creating new AAS program to replace this.

The AA Early Childhood Professional program is being inactivated and replaced with an AAS degree. This is designed specifically for WIT students who have taken the Early Childhood Education Certificate to provide a pathway for completing an Associate degree. This AAS degree better meets the needs of WIT students, as it allows them to complete the degree in 60 hours (whereas the AA pathway would require over 70 hours).

Financial Implications: None noted.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments **Yes X** No

Program Change Request

A deleted record cannot be edited

Program Inactivation Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/20/24 12:24 pm

Viewing: **HS-WIT-AA : Human Services/Early Childhood**

Last approved: 04/21/22 7:33 am

Last edit: 03/20/24 12:24 pm

Changes proposed by: Deborah Altus (deborah.altus)

Catalog Pages Using this Program	Family and Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AA

Final Catalog	2024-2025
Rationale for Inactivation	Inactivating program and creating new AAS program to replace this.

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **HS Chair**
3. **Library**
4. **SAS Curr Policy Chair**
5. SAS Dean
6. SAS Fac Council Chair
7. Governance Check
8. AA Committee
9. WUBOR
10. Final Acad Ops
11. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 03/20/24 12:52 pm Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/20/24 1:12 pm Stacy Conner (stacy.conner): Approved for HS Chair
3. 03/20/24 3:17 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library

History

1. Apr 21, 2022 by clmig-jwillging

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Family and Human Services
College	School of Applied Studies
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Human Services/Early Childhood
Degree to be Offered	Associate of Arts (AA)
Is this program offered completely online?	
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	
Program Code	HS-WIT-AA
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	
CIP Code	
Modality	

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	
Curriculum	

Degree Requirements

In addition to the courses completed as part of the Early Childhood Professional Certificate, students will take Washburn University Requirements, General Education Requirements, and:

HS 100	Family and Human Services	3
HS 131	Human Development	3
HS 250	Skills for Helping Professionals	3
HS Electives		3
Pathway		

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer
Comments

Key: 101

Program Change Request

A deleted record cannot be edited

Program Inactivation Proposal

Date Submitted: 03/20/24 12:24 pm

Viewing: **HS-WIT-AA : Human Services/Early Childhood**

Last approved: 04/21/22 7:33 am

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:24 am

Changes proposed by: Deborah Altus (deborah.altus)

Catalog Pages Using this Program	Family and Human Services - Early Childhood Professional, AA

Final Catalog	2024-2025
Rationale for Inactivation	Inactivating program and creating new AAS program to replace this.

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Family and Human Services
College	School of Applied Studies
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Human Services/Early Childhood
Degree to be Offered	Associate of Arts (AA)
Is this program offered completely online?	
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	
Program Code	HS-WIT-AA
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	
CIP Code	
Modality	

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	
Curriculum	

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **HS Chair**
3. **Library**
4. **SAS Curr Policy Chair**
5. **SAS Dean**
6. **SAS Fac Council Chair**
7. **Governance Check**
8. **AA Committee**
9. **Faculty Senate**
10. General Faculty
11. WUBOR
12. Final Acad Ops
13. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 03/20/24 12:52 pm Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 03/20/24 1:12 pm Stacy Conner (stacy.conner): Approved for HS Chair
3. 03/20/24 3:17 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 03/26/24 12:30 pm Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. 03/26/24 2:48 pm Zach Frank (zach.frank): Approved for SAS Dean
6. 04/01/24 9:32 am Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Fac Council Chair
7. 04/01/24 9:39 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Governance Check
8. 04/02/24 8:24 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

History

1. Apr 21, 2022 by

Degree Requirements

In addition to the courses completed as part of the Early Childhood Professional Certificate, students will take Washburn University Requirements, General Education Requirements, and:

HS 100	Family and Human Services	3
HS 131	Human Development	3
HS 250	Skills for Helping Professionals	3
HS Electives		3

Pathway

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments **Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:24 am):** Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas / Michael O'Brien, x. 1510

SUBJECT: Significant Program Changes – Spanish, BA

Description / Rationale: Description / Rationale: With more elective hours now due to new system of general education, we are adding the requirement of a minor, certificate, or second major to promote student engagement in a complementary field of study that advances personal and career goals. Also, formatted electives into new standard format along with completing other revisions according to new standardization approved by Deans and Provost Office. Relevant program details removed from the degree requirements section were placed in the catalog under the department's overview section.

Financial Implications: None indicated.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments: **Yes X** No __

Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 12/20/23 10:42 am

Viewing: **SP : Spanish**

Last approved: 03/29/23 11:01 am

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:24 am

Changes proposed by: Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas)

Catalog Pages Using this Program	Spanish, BA

Change Type	~~Not~~ Significant
Summarize Changes and Include Rationale	Due to the new general education requirements, students will now be required to complete a minor, certificate, or additional major. This will replace the general education credit hours and the correlated credit hours that are no longer required and allow students to choose a complementary area of study. ((Holly 12/5/23: Completed revisions according to new standardization approved by Deans and Provost Office))

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Modern Languages
College	College of Arts and Sciences
Division	Humanities
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	Spanish
Degree to be Offered	Bachelor of Arts (BA)
Is this program offered completely online?	No
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	SP
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
CIP Code	160908 - Hispanic and Latin American Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics, General.
Modality	Face-to-Face

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	
Curriculum	

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **MFL Chair**
3. **Library**
4. **HUM Chair**
5. **CA Dean**
6. **CFCCC Chair**
7. **Assoc Dean CFC**
8. **CA Assoc Dean**
9. **Governance Check**
10. **AA Committee**
11. **Faculty Senate**
12. General Faculty
13. WUBOR
14. Final Acad Ops
15. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 12/20/23 10:51 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 12/20/23 11:30 am Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas): Approved for MFL Chair
3. 12/20/23 3:41 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 02/19/24 1:23 pm Ian Smith1 (ian.smith1): Approved for HUM Chair
5. 03/13/24 8:44 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for CA Dean
6. 03/21/24 12:08 pm Bruce Mactavish (bruce.mactavish): Approved for CFCCC Chair
7. 03/21/24 12:16 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for Assoc Dean CFC
8. 03/21/24 12:16 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for CA Assoc Dean
9. 03/21/24 12:29 pm Beth ONeill (beth.oneill): Approved for

Governance Check
10. 04/02/24 8:24 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

History

1. Apr 21, 2022 by clmig-jwillging
2. Jul 19, 2022 by Steve Luoma (steven.luoma)
3. Sep 30, 2022 by Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)
4. Mar 29, 2023 by Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas)

~~Degree Requirements In order to major in Spanish students must complete 30 hours of course work beyondSP101.The 30 hours of course work mustinclude:Required for majors planning toteach: Nine hours of correlated course work are required of all modern languagemajors.These courses are selected in consultation with anadvisor.All majors are required to present a portfolio upongraduation.The portfolio will contain three significant papers and a video recorded public presentation in front ofprofessors.Three significantpapers:One of the essays must be the senior thesis, the other from the literature requirement (FR 331 Introduction to French Literature/ SP 331 Introduction to Hispanic Literature) and the third one preferably from a cultural course, either on campus or takenabroad.If that's not possible, discuss with the advisor what essay should beincluded.The student will give an oral presentation of the Senior Thesis, not to exceed 15 minutes, summarizing what's in thethesis.The student may use as much or as little technology as he/she wishes, keeping in mind that the presentation may not be read; it should be delivered in a comfortable, yet professionalmanner.The presentation will berecorded.After the presentation, there will be a question and answer session by faculty memberspresent.~~ Degree Requirements

~~SP 324~~	~~Civilization of Spain~~	~~3~~
~~SP 326~~	~~Civilization of Latin America~~	~~3~~
~~SP 331~~	~~Introduction to Hispanic Literature~~	~~3~~
~~ED 368~~	~~Methods of Teaching Foreign Language~~	~~3~~

In addition to the requirements stated below, ~~Transfer~~ students must complete 34-35 hours ~~and students desiring validation~~ of General Education, all requirements ~~foreign language competencies~~ for ~~teaching certification normally must take~~ a Bachelor of Arts degree, and any additional hours needed to reach the minimum 120 credit hours required for graduation. Some of the courses below may also fulfill general education or other degree requirements. Please see your advisor for more information. ~~of 6 hours in the target language at the 300-level at Washburn.~~ All Spanish (BA) majors must also complete a complementary minor, certificate, or additional major; students must declare this with the department that grants it.

Required Courses Inside Department		
SP 311	Spanish Grammar Review	3
SP 312	Spanish Composition	3
SP 331	Introduction to Hispanic Literature	3
SP 400	Senior Thesis	3-6

~~Upper division course work~~		~~3~~
SP 3XX	Spanish Upper Division Courses	6
SP XXX	Spanish Electives [1]	9-12
Total Hours		**30**

1

Students must complete the appropriate amount of Spanish courses beyond SP 101 to equal 30 total hours of Spanish courses. Selection of courses should be discussed with student's academic advisor.

~~Students whose native language is one of those taught by the department may not enroll in or challenge 100 and 200 level courses byexamination.~~

Pathway

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments	**Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:24 am):** Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

Key: 189

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas / Michael O'Brien, x. 1510

SUBJECT: Significant Program Changes – French, BA

Description / Rationale: With more elective hours now due to new system of general education, we are adding the requirement of a minor, certificate, or second major to promote student engagement in a complementary field of study that advances personal and career goals. Also, formatted electives into new standard format along with completing other revisions according to new standardization approved by Deans and Provost Office. Relevant program details removed from the degree requirements section were placed in the catalog under the department's overview section.

Financial Implications: None indicated.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*

Approved by: *AAC on 4/1/2024*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments: **Yes X** No __

Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 12/20/23 10:42 am

Viewing: **FR : French**

Last approved: 03/29/23 10:46 am

Last edit: 04/02/24 8:24 am

Changes proposed by: Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas)

Catalog Pages Using this Program	French, BA

Change Type	~~Not~~ Significant
Summarize Changes and Include Rationale	Due to the new general education requirements, students will now be required to complete a minor, certificate, or additional major. This will replace the general education credit hours and the correlated credit hours for the major that are no longer required and allow students to choose a complementary area of study. ((Holly 12/5/23: Completed revisions according to new standardization approved by Deans and Provost Office))

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Modern Languages
College	College of Arts and Sciences
Division	Humanities
Degree Level	Undergraduate
Program Title	French
Degree to be Offered	Bachelor of Arts (BA)
Is this program offered completely online?	No
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	FR
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
CIP Code	160901 - French Language and Literature.
Modality	Face-to-Face

New

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	
Curriculum	

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **MFL Chair**
3. **Library**
4. **HUM Chair**
5. **CA Dean**
6. **CFCCC Chair**
7. **Assoc Dean CFC**
8. **CA Assoc Dean**
9. **Governance Check**
10. **AA Committee**
11. **Faculty Senate**
12. General Faculty
13. WUBOR
14. Final Acad Ops
15. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 12/20/23 10:51 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 12/20/23 11:29 am Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas): Approved for MFL Chair
3. 12/20/23 3:41 pm Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 02/19/24 1:23 pm Ian Smith1 (ian.smith1): Approved for HUM Chair
5. 03/13/24 8:44 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for CA Dean
6. 03/21/24 12:08 pm Bruce Mactavish (bruce.mactavish): Approved for CFCCC Chair
7. 03/21/24 12:16 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for Assoc Dean CFC
8. 03/21/24 12:16 pm Kelly Erby (kelly.erby): Approved for CA Assoc Dean
9. 03/21/24 12:29 pm Beth ONeill (beth.oneill): Approved for

Governance Check
10. 04/02/24 8:24 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for AA Committee

History

1. Apr 21, 2022 by clmig-jwillging
2. Sep 30, 2022 by Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)
3. Mar 29, 2023 by Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas (miguel.gonzalez-abellas)

~~Degree Requirements In order to major in French students must complete 30 hours of course work beyondFR101.The 30 hours of course work mustinclude:Required for majors planning toteach: Nine hours of correlated course work are required of all modern languagemajors.These courses are selected in consultation with anadvisor.All majors are required to present a portfolio upongraduation.The portfolio will contain three significant papers and a video recorded public presentation in front ofprofessors.Three significantpapers:One of the essays must be the senior thesis, the other from the literature requirement (FR 331 Introduction to French Literature/ SP 331 Introduction to Hispanic Literature) and the third one preferably from a cultural course, either on campus or takenabroad.If that's not possible, discuss with the advisor what essay should beincluded.The student will give an oral presentation of the senior thesis, not to exceed 15 minutes, summarizing what's in thethesis.The student may use as much or as little technology as he/she wishes, keeping in mind that the presentation may not be read; it should be delivered in a comfortable, yet professionalmanner.The presentation will berecorded.After the presentation, there will be a question and answer session by faculty memberspresent.~~ Degree Requirements

~~FR 324~~	~~French Civilization~~	~~3~~
~~FR 326~~	~~La France Contemporaine~~	~~3~~
~~ED 368~~	~~Methods of Teaching Foreign Language~~	~~3~~

In addition to the requirements stated below, ~~Transfer~~ students must complete 34-35 hours ~~and students desiring validation~~ of General Education, all requirements ~~foreign language competencies~~ for ~~teaching certification normally must take~~ a Bachelor of Arts degree, and any additional hours needed to reach the minimum 120 credit hours required for graduation. Some of the courses below may also fulfill general education or other degree requirements. Please see your advisor for more information. ~~of 6 hours in the target language at the 300-level at Washburn.~~ All French (BA) majors must also complete a complementary minor, certificate, or additional major; students must declare this with the department that grants it.

Required Courses Inside Department		
FR 311	French Grammar Review	3
FR 312	French Composition	3
FR 331	Introduction to French Literature	3
FR 400	Senior Thesis	3-6
~~Upper division course work~~		~~3~~
FR 3XX	French Upper Division Courses	6
FR XXX	French Electives [1]	9-12

Total Hours	**30**

1
=

Students must complete the appropriate amount of French courses beyond FR 101 to equal 30 total hours of French courses. Selection of courses should be discussed with student's academic advisor.

~~Students whose native language is one of those taught by the department may not enroll in or challenge 100 and 200 level courses byexamination.~~

Pathway

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments	**Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/02/24 8:24 am):** Approved by 4/1 Academic Affairs committee.

Key: 85

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM

Date: 4/1/2024

Submitted by: Michelle Shipley, x. 2114

SUBJECT: Significant Program Edits: Family & Human Services – Graduate-Level Trauma and Recovery Certificate

Description / Rationale: FHS department is changing the requirements so that other graduate students or post-Master's students could obtain this certificate.

Financial Implications: None noted.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by Grad Council, FS, Gen Fac, etc.*

Approved by: *Grad Council on 4/1/24*

Faculty Senate on date

Attachments **Yes X** No

Program Change Request

Date Submitted: 02/22/24 1:28 pm

Viewing: **TRC-CT-GR : Family & Human Services - Graduate-Level Trauma and Recovery Certificate**

Last approved: 02/22/24 10:33 am

Last edit: 04/01/24 1:39 pm

Changes proposed by: Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)

Change Type	Significant
Summarize Changes and Include Rationale	FHS department is changing the requirements so that other graduate students or post-Master's students could obtain this certificate.

General Information

Effective Catalog Edition	2024-2025
Department	Family and Human Services
College	School of Applied Studies
Degree Level	Graduate
Program Title	Family & Human Services - Graduate-Level Trauma and Recovery Certificate
Degree to be Offered	Certificate (CERT)
Is this program offered completely online?	
Does this program lead to a teaching certification?	No
Program Code	TRC-CT-GR
Is this program an interdisciplinary program?	No
CIP Code	
Modality	

Admission and Curriculum

Admission Criteria	
Total Number of Semester Credit Hours for the Degree	
Curriculum	

In Workflow

1. **Acad Ops**
2. **HS Chair**
3. **Library**
4. **SAS Curr Policy Chair**
5. **SAS Dean**
6. **SAS Fac Council Chair**
7. **Governance Check**
8. **Grad Council**
9. **Faculty Senate**
10. Final Acad Ops
11. Registrar

Approval Path

1. 02/22/24 1:33 pm Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Acad Ops
2. 02/26/24 9:37 am Stacy Conner (stacy.conner): Approved for HS Chair
3. 02/26/24 9:53 am Sean Bird (sean.bird): Approved for Library
4. 03/08/24 1:49 pm Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Curr Policy Chair
5. 03/26/24 2:49 pm Zach Frank (zach.frank): Approved for SAS Dean
6. 04/01/24 9:32 am Michelle Shipley (michelle.shipley): Approved for SAS Fac Council Chair
7. 04/01/24 9:39 am Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Governance Check
8. 04/01/24 1:39 pm Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman): Approved for Grad Council

History

1. Feb 22, 2024 by Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman)

Certificate Requirements

Required Courses [1]		
HS 601	Working with Trauma	3
HS 602	Trauma and Recovery Services	3
HS 604	Advanced Methods Individual Counseling	3
HS 605	Advanced Methods Group Counseling	3
HS 610	Professional Ethics/Practice	3
HS 640	Practicum I [2]	3
or HS 641	Practicum II	
Total Hours		18

1 = Awarding of the certificate requires a prior or concurrent Master's degree

2 = Minimum 200 clock hours with requirement of trauma-informed care instruction; student must apply one semester in advance.

~~Trauma and Recovery Certificate The Family and Human Services Department offers a graduate-level Certificate in Trauma and Recovery to students completing the Master's program in Family and Human Services – Addiction Counseling.Students must complete the required coursework and criteria to earn the MA-FHS/AC degree and complete six credit hours of additional coursework:HS 601 Working with Trauma and HS 602 Trauma and Recovery Services (or approved elective).Students must also complete a Trauma-informed Practice assignment during their second Practicum Seminar course (HS 641 Practicum II).There are no extra fieldwork hours required to earn this certificate.~~

Pathway

Faculty Workload Analysis (describe how the course offering schedule and anticipated enrollments correlate to faculty lines)

Supplemental Files

Reviewer Comments **Holly Broxterman (holly.broxterman) (04/01/24 1:39 pm):** Approved in 4/1 Grad Council meeting, per Beth Mathews.

Key: 438

FACULTY AGENDA ITEM-INFORMATIONAL

Date: 4/3/2024

Submitted by: Jason Miller, x1746

SUBJECT: CE 300: Special Topics in Community Studies; Course Change

Description / Rationale: The course currently is currently listed as variable credit, between 1-3 credit hours. The department is seeking to change this to 0-3 credit hours. This change will allow students pursuing the CCE WTE to have the structured reflection offered through the course, but will not require them to pay for academic credit. This allows the WTE to be accessible to any student interested in completing the WTE requirements. Because the special topics course could be offered for academic credit in the future (with a different topic), we want to keep the possibility of having students earn academic credit and therefore not eliminate the variable credit. At this time, all WTE students earning the CCE WTE outside of the Community Studies Minor or Bonner Scholar program will always take it for 0 credit and enroll in this class for 0 credit each semester that they are completing the 300 hours of community engagement.

Financial Implications: None noted.

Proposed Effective Date: Fall 2024

Request for Action: *Approval by AAC/FS/ Gen Fac, etc*
Approved by: *Interdisciplinary Studies Committee on 4/3/2024*
Informational to FS on 4/8/2024

Attachments: Yes **No X**

Pedagogical Use of Generative AI: Issues & Recommendations

Washburn University AI Group

AY 2023-2024 Report

Contributors

Carson S. Kay, Ph.D. (chair), Assistant Professor of Communication Studies
Adebanke L. Adebayo, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Communication Studies
James Barraclough, M.S., Interim Director of Career Engagement
Patricia Dahl, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Criminal Justice
Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas, Ph.D., Professor and Chair of Modern Languages
John Haverty, M.A., Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services
Christopher M. Jones, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Religious Studies
Joseph Kendall-Morwick, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Computer Information Sciences
Homer Manila, M.S.-I.T.M., Director of Information Security, Information Technology Services
David Rubenstein, J.D., Professor and James R. Ahrens Chair in Constitutional Law
Brenda White, M.S., Director of Instructional Services, Information Technology Services

Consultants

Joy Bailes, M.A., Director of Internal Communications & Brand Management
Shelby Grau, J.D., Assistant General Counsel
Lori Hutchinson, B.A., Executive Director of Strategic Communications and Marketing
Heather Popejoy, M.S., Director of Student Accessibility Services

History

The AI Group of Washburn University emerged in Fall 2023 as an ad hoc committee in response to global developments in generative AI technologies and large language models (e.g., ChatGPT). After witnessing campus stakeholder concerns regarding AI use in pedagogical settings, the executive officers of Faculty Senate organized the AI Group to explore possible pathways for institutionally supporting instructors, helping students achieve career-readiness, and responding to the complex, global duality of technological advancement and ethical specificity within disciplines.

Membership

All contributors and consultants joined and participated within this committee voluntarily. Members received no compensation for serving on this committee.

Purpose

The AI Group sought to collaboratively (a) identify core issues regarding students' use of generative AI in Washburn University classrooms and (b) outline informed recommendations for addressing core issues on an institutional level.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Carson Kay

The following report reflects the 5-month collaborative reflection, discussion, and overall conclusions generated by faculty and staff members of the ad hoc AI committee (referenced in this document as the AI Group). The following content is not a definitive solution, as the generative artificial intelligence (AI) landscape is still rapidly developing. Rather, the following conversations reflect the core issues that this body believes warrant prompt action. Paired with perceived issues are the AI Group's recommendations for next steps, practical actions that Washburn University may take to proactively—and reactively— respond to current challenges.

This report focuses explicitly on generative AI because of its strong presence on college campuses and its particular complication of pedagogical praxis. Although AI extends beyond the boundaries of generative, language-based models, our use of AI refers specifically to generative models. Moreover, this report focuses on student and instructor use of generative AI in classroom contexts. There is rich potential to expand this lens to include faculty scholarship, but the AI Group limited their scope to what we perceive to be the most pressing challenge to our campus at this moment: Students using generative AI in pedagogically deleterious ways and instructors navigating an ethical challenge that has not yet been defined on an institutional level.

The following pages are organized into four topical sections. Within each section is (1) a description of AI-related issues for our campus community and (2) a summary of core recommendations that respective campus stakeholders may apply to address said issues. Section 1 summarizes practical challenges that AI poses from the student and faculty perspective and general recommendations to frame our discussion. Section 2 relays training issues related to AI and recommendations for educating instructors through accessible resources, resources that respond to many of the practical concerns. In Section 3, we expand our discussion to technical issues, describing how generative AI works and identifying security risks, confidentiality concerns, and next steps for using the technology and navigating training needs. Finally, in Section 4, we explore the structural and equity concerns of generative AI, focusing on the implications of organizational language regarding this technology and identifying documents and policies that would benefit from revision to address student use of generative AI in classroom contexts.

Section 1: Practical Issues & Recommendations

Patricia Dahl & Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas

Student Perspectives on Generative AI: Uses and Constraints

From the students' perspective, there are positive and negative practical uses of generative AI. A punitive approach to constraining AI use will not work at this point, since our students are using it in high school now (and those are the students we will receive in the next few years). While students who use generative AI to plagiarize should still face sanction, our approach has to consider many other ways in which students now use it.

On the positive side, the main uses of AI could be as a reference tool, as a learning tool, and as a point of comparison:

- **Reference tool:** AI documents (i.e., ChatGPT) can be used to find out information, in a similar way to using Encyclopedia Britannica or any other reference tool, printed or online. Instructors can ask students to incorporate AI into their work but indicate in the assignment prompt that students' work must include how the information was generated.

- **Learning tool:** Students can use AI as a prompt to initiate an essay. It can help with writer's block or the fear of the blank page, or even with organization by helping students create an outline. This is how generative AI is promoted in some high school classes.

- **Comparative tool:** Students can use AI documents to compare/contrast with other documents related to their assignments. In a translation class, students can compare the translation documents generated by ChatGPT with the same translation in other tools, like Google Translation, and with their own. By comparing, students reflect on translation differences and determine what they might modify. Students can then justify where there are differences between computer-assisted translation versions and discuss why the differences exist. This entertaining use of generative AI allows students to gain experience using the technology while also helping students learn about AI's practical limitations.

On the negative side, the use of AI can lead students to claim material that is not their own work:

- **Plagiarism.** AI-generated documents do not provide their sources of information. In fact, there have been legal issues with AI-generated documents because they are perceived as plagiarizing sources available online without giving proper credit to their sources (see Andersen v. Stability AI Ltd., 2023; Appel et al., 2023).

Instructor Perspectives on Generative AI: Uses and Constraints

From an instructor's perspective, AI can be used to design assignments, to assess assignments, and to assist in the instructor's area of research if applicable, legal, and ethical.

For instructors to best incorporate generative AI into their classrooms, however, the instructors must receive institutional support to further their training. Specifically, the institution must provide resources and training opportunities to make sure instructors are educated in how to use generative AI effectively, legally, and ethically. Currently, students are potentially more familiar with this technology than most instructors. Thus, rich training opportunities regarding (a) technological or practical issues with generative AI use, (b) legal and ethical issues, and (c) use of AI in instructional design are necessary to increase instructor confidence in navigating generative AI.

Within instructional design training, in particular, we believe a central need of our faculty is support in designing assignments that integrate AI without being "hackable" through AI. For example, instructors might need support in rewriting assignments that AI cannot accurately answer. While instructors need support in crafting assignments that cannot be answered by generative AI, we also acknowledge that the point of such support would not be to create traps within our assignments. Although instructor-written prompts that generate AI hallucinations or self-referencing (i.e., "As an LLM, I am not certain . . .") could help instructors identify cases of improper AI use, these assignment prompts might, more importantly, identify the students who really need support from their instructors.

Institutionally, we owe it to our students to use AI in a legal and ethical manner, since some jobs are seeking expertise in using AI and some higher learning

institutions are already creating programs in prompt engineering to help young professionals obtain accurate results when using AI (see Arizona State University, n.d.; Purdue University, n.d.; University of Texas at Austin, n.d.). We need to support students so that they can meet industry expectations.

Core Recommendations

1. When considering policy revisions, the decision-making collectives of Washburn University should recognize the duality of preparing students for careers and reaffirming academic integrity.
2. Instructors should acknowledge the beneficial potentials of AI to facilitate learning both in class and in homework assignments.
3. Instructors should craft clear expectations regarding AI use and class assessments.
4. Washburn University should provide and incentivize opportunities for instructors to seek affordable training in using generative AI.
5. Instructors (and revisions to policy) should acknowledge that generative AI is not appropriate in all forms of assessment and reasonable boundary-setting is appropriate.

Section 2: Training Issues & Recommendations

Adebanke Adebayo & Patricia Dahl

As generative AI becomes increasingly available to the public and to industries, higher education is compelled to help faculty, staff, and students understand the principles of this technology (Chan, 2023). Training faculty, staff, and students to effectively use AI will require a combination of educational opportunities, hands-on experiences, a variety of resources, and ongoing educational and technological support to meet the constantly evolving demands of the AI age. By providing these elements, we can empower faculty and staff who want to incorporate AI into their work and help college students be better prepared for an AI world while also preparing students to be ethical users. AI training can take several forms centered around faculty, staff, and students' needs. The structure of AI training can include the following facets.

Understanding AI: Use and Application

Training for understanding how AI works and its many applications can initially involve CTEL seminars and workshops to introduce faculty and staff to the fundamentals of AI (including commonly used AI platforms and tools), its applications in various academic settings (AI-assisted content creation and assessment), and its potential impact on the higher education sector (both positive and negative factors). Essentially, training should range from introductory use of AI to advanced use of AI in teaching. The seminars and workshops can provide reading materials, classroom learning (both on campus and virtual), and guest trainers/lecturers to facilitate the understanding of the AI topics. Similarly, exploring how AI can be applied and not applied in teaching and learning helps answer the question, "What should AI *not* be used for in teaching and learning?" This application idea is discussed in Section 4 of this report.

Identifying how AI is used by faculty and staff will involve collaboration and communication between groups and individuals. These collaborative efforts can involve faculty and staff on campus, industry partners in the community, and AI experts. Some standard uses of AI can include adapting AI to the D2L learning platform, continuously incorporating AI-based training for faculty and staff, using AI for curriculum content (assignments, grading, assessments), and using AI detection tools.

Offering Hands-On Training

Offering hands-on training sessions where faculty and staff can experiment with AI platforms and tools under the guidance of a facilitator could be helpful. The hands-on training opportunities can help foster a culture of experimentation and innovation where faculty and staff feel comfortable exploring AI technologies and incorporating them into their teaching, research, and administrative best practices.

Students across campus can also be provided training and resources about AI and its ethical use. Similar to the faculty technology training across campus, there could be training dedicated to student AI awareness. Student-targeted training can be done in collaboration with Washburn's Information Technology Services (ITS).

Educating Others about Ethical Implications

AI training of faculty, staff, and students will also need to include the ethical and social implications of AI, including issues related to bias, privacy, security, employment (job preparedness), and plagiarism. Since there are currently no programs that accurately identify AI-generated work, this begs the question of whose work would most likely be identified—perhaps incorrectly—as "plagiarized." Brief elaboration of such biases is noted in Section 4. Citation resources for MLA, APA, and Chicago style are presented later in this section (see "Some Resources for Training").

Developing Curriculum Content

One of the most important aspects of AI training involves assisting faculty with integrating AI-related content and policies into their curriculum and classrooms. This assistance could begin with technological and educational staff designing new courses focused on AI learning and AI "how to" information for various skill levels. Further, it will be necessary to assist faculty with incorporating AI content into existing courses through their course content, assignments, projects involving AI technologies, changes to course-level assessment practices, accommodations relative to AI, guidance on what to do when the uncertainties of students' possible use of AI for schoolwork surfaces, and other policy-related elements.

Integrating AI into teaching also requires designing meaningful and practical assignments. These trainings can be designed as workshops to encourage faculty members to create assignments that challenge students to demonstrate their own

knowledge and skills without relying heavily on AI-generated content, irrespective of their discipline.

Providing Guidance on Assessment and Evaluation

Training involving faculty will need to include guidance on how to assess university, department, course, and student learning outcomes related to the integration of AI into faculty coursework. Assessment training could include developing rubrics for AI-related assignments and projects, incorporating AI-generated content into courses, using AI-generated questions for quizzes, tests, and exams, and maintaining transparency and fairness in grading procedures.

AI can support potentially reintroducing oral examinations into the classroom. The increased use of oral exams can give students more practice in the "soft skills," which could benefit them professionally. The drawbacks, however, could include exacerbating communication in the classroom and increasing apprehension and anxiety among neurodivergent student populations. Further, oral examinations could increase faculty time investment in assessment since oral exams may take longer to proctor than written exams.

One recommendation for reintroducing oral examinations is to provide faculty with opportunities to explore new assessment practices. These could include a variety of CTEL programs on creating scalable oral assignments, developing in-class writing assignments, utilizing voice assignments, designing for intrinsic motivation (such as universal design, scaffolding, applied or active learning tools), and engaging in pedagogical programs on navigating student accommodations as they pertain to oral assignments. Another recommendation for use of oral exams involves initiating conversations with local high schools to identify and assess their common AI practices and to better understand student expectations when they begin college.

Faculty can also consider the use of localized or contextualized examples when designing assessments. For instance, they can incorporate student-led discussions and collaborations where applicable. These assignment will enhance student soft skills which are top-tier employability skills (Business-Higher Education Forum, 2019; Hart Research Associates, 2018; National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2016). Using reflection questions and process-driven questions can steer students to be more accountable and harness their critical thinking skills.

Finally, considering the use of blended or flipped classroom formats might limit the use of AI. In the flipped classroom model, students would learn content outside of class time and then use class time for the application of what they learned.

Creating a Community of Continuous Support

It could be useful to establish a campus community where faculty and staff can share their experiences, resources, and best practices related to AI on an ongoing basis. The community could take the form of regular meetings (on campus or via Zoom), online forums or discussion boards, or any other place where collaborative ideas and projects can be shared to help everyone continuously network and learn from each other about AI.

Faculty and staff will need to be encouraged to stay up to date on the latest developments in the rapidly changing world of AI. Ongoing professional development learning could involve local, regional, and national technology, educational, and security-related conferences, workshops, and online resources. A feedback process will be needed for faculty and staff to share the information, techniques, and skills they acquire from the ongoing learning opportunities. Feedback from faculty and staff who are staying current with AI information can continuously help identify areas in need of improvement and refinement for both training and outcome efforts.

Some Resources for Training

Given the instructional need for AI-informed training, we offer the following resource categories that Washburn University can draw upon to support its faculty.

Center for Teaching Excellence and Learning (CTEL)

CTEL has many AI-related links and tutorials provided on CTEL's D2L site under the "Generative AI (ChatGPT) Resources" module. CTEL also distributes articles through Teaching Tuesday emails and through the resource modules. There are also ongoing CTEL workshops related to AI. Some examples of resources shared include content from the following entities:

- **The Chronicle of Higher Education** has a lot of sources for students and faculty. For example, Cassuto (2023) offers the resource, "Artificial Intelligence: A Graduate-Student User's Guide," to guide master's and doctoral students in navigating their coursework.

- **EdX and Coursera** offer online certificate programs ranging in difficulty that are free and take 3-4 weeks to complete. Notable examples include the following: "AI for Anyone" (Google, n.d.); "AI for Everyone: Master the Basics" (IBM, n.d.a.) and "Introduction to Generative AI" (IBM, n.d.b.).

- **Alchemy** has videos and other information for various audiences. The webpage, "AI and ChatGPT Resources for Higher Education," provides access to these resources (see Alchemy, n.d.).

Social Annotations

Activities through programs like Hypothes.is can help students and educators explore content meaningfully. For example, Hypothes.is hosted a webinar about "Leveraging Social Annotations in the Age of AI" (see Hypothes.is, 2023).

Writing Guidelines

Standards for incorporating and citing AI-generated content are now available through major style-guide organizations (see The Chicago Manual of Style, n.d.; McAdoo, 2024; MLA, 2023;). The following links relay guidance on referencing AI-generated texts.

APA
https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt

MLA
https://style.mla.org/citing-generative-ai/

Chicago Style
https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/qanda/data/faq/topics/Documentation/faq0422.html

Core Recommendations

1. Washburn University (perhaps through CTEL) should organize AI forums for faculty to share their questions, thoughts, and concerns. The responses can then be used to create need-specific training sessions across disciplines.
2. Generative AI training should be incorporated into core and general education courses to enhance awareness and ethical use.

3. CTEL should continue to offer workshops directed towards faculty use of AI to reinforce inclusive teaching and learning practices across disciplines.
4. Washburn University should create an institutionalized AI advisory committee to assist in navigating the implications of the constantly evolving AI age for teaching, learning, and service.
5. CTEL and ITS should offer collaborative and targeted (staff and faculty) training sessions to acknowledge, embrace, and enhance ethical use of AI in teaching, learning, and service.

Section 3: Technological, Security, and Related Issues & Recommendations

John Haverty, Joseph Kendall-Morwick, Homer Manila, Brenda White, & David Rubenstein

What is Generative AI?

Machine Learning Algorithms and Models

Artificial Intelligence is an extremely broad area of academic research and technological development within which the subfield of machine learning has gained prominence through the last decade (some calling it the AI Spring; see Bommasani, 2023). Stripped to its essentials, machine learning is a statistical technique that learns from data to make classifications or predictions for new data inputs. Machine learning is characterized by algorithms that read large data sets as input (called training data) and develop models of that data as output. Training data sets are often composed of query/answer pairs (such as an image of an animal matched with the text species of that animal) and are developed to train an ML (Machine Learning) model on a more general concept (such as predicting species of an animal based on appearance). Unlike traditional computer algorithms that require extensive manual coding, machine learning algorithms learn and improve by being exposed to large amounts of data. The models, the products of these algorithms, are used to perform tasks.

Neural Networks

Neural networks are one specific type of machine learning model that is not new. Neural networks were theorized as early as the 1940s but have recently become the cornerstone of popular generative AI applications. Neural networks are inspired from the brains of animals—collections of biological neurons networked together to perform cognitive functions. Similarly neural network models are specifications of networks of software neurons linked together to compute the output of a numeric function through a simulation of their biological counterparts (see Hardesty, 2017).

Deep Learning

Deep learning is the deployment of large neural networks with many layers of artificial neurons capable of much more complex tasks than those developed before the 2010s. These advances were made possible by the increase in computational

power of modern computers, the availability of large datasets for training through the internet, and the development of more sophisticated architectures of networks. Fully connected layers of neural networks (layers in which every artificial neuron is connected to every other neuron) are too dense and complex to train efficiently when the networks are large. Advances in network architectures (such as convolutional neural networks) limit how dense the networks need to be while still retaining the depth to complete complex tasks (such as image recognition), making training possible with the computing resources available (see Lau, 2017). Deep neural networks are a subset of sophisticated machine learning algorithms that have been trained to classify images, recognize faces, translate languages, predict human emotions, personalize online experiences, and much more.

Generative AI

Generative AI is a specialized form of machine learning. Like other machine learning, it uses algorithms that learn from data. It refers to modern neural network models that make predictions of the likelihood of small parts of a complex output, randomly select options based on those probabilities, and replicate or repeat the process over a large, complex output such as an image or a collection of text. Like other neural networks, these models develop outputs based on the data they were trained over and the specific queries provided to the model. More uniquely, the different components of the output from these models will also be dependent on the random selections made for other components of the output such that the overall output will have cohesion and structure (for example, in text generation, if the word "eat" is selected, the next word generated will likely be some kind of food). In other words, the key difference is that generative AI creates new data that *resembles* its training data, while non-generative AI machine learning makes predictions and classifications *about* data. For example, generative AI could create a realistic fake photo, while regular machine learning could predict whether a photo is real or fake.

Capabilities of Generative AI Models

These models will generate output quickly and can be used to generate substantial amounts of content that humans would struggle to generate in the same amount of time. Because they are trained on extremely broad datasets (crawls over much of the internet and all of Wikipedia) they can produce output with substantial depth and breadth of knowledge. Training data is often carefully filtered such that common errors (misspellings, grammatical errors) are unlikely to be generated in the output. The randomness incorporated into their use means that there will be

significant distinction in outputs from the models even for the exact same query.

Limitations of Generative AI Models

These models may be able to quickly produce cohesive and structured output, but the relationships between components of the output are only based on common patterns in the training data for the model. The models cannot generate novel patterns and their outputs will necessarily be derivative of their training data. Because a model's outputs are stochastic and only constrained by the probabilities generated by the model, it is certainly possible for models to generate nonsensical outputs that often manifest as incorrect assertions in text generation or violated natural constraints in image generation (such as additional fingers). These are commonly referred to as "hallucinations" (see Lakhani, n.d.; MIT, n.d.).

Although their outputs are stochastic, the patterns they were trained with can lead to recognizable or predictable features of their output. For similar queries, related results are likely to be generated and the space of likely outputs may not be extremely broad or incorporate the same diversity we might expect from different humans answering the same query.

While these models have been trained on a large set of data, they can only generate output based on the information they were provided through training or through the query, and even with powerful computers, training can take an extraordinarily long time (months in the case of ChatGPT4). Thus, models will not always be equipped with the most recent data and may not adapt to current events and recent phenomena.

Ensuring Data Privacy and Security: Core Issues

Privacy and Confidentiality

There is currently a lack of accountability in the use of AI tools. Their prevalence makes use accessible, but misuse is inevitable. These tools are typically cloud–based, meaning that data must be shared with a third-party to use the service. These tools are oftentimes free, or inexpensive, but also just as often unregulated by the companies whose staff find them valuable. It is even possible that some tools may be developed by bad actors for the express purpose of luring users in to sharing proprietary information. Users may also be unaware of the implications of sharing copyrighted material or the proprietary material of others outside of the

institution with a third party that may not be trusted by the owners of those materials (see Luqman et al., 2024).

Institutions that do not have effective controls on their AI usage should not be surprised to find their enterprise data eagerly shared with these tools, being stored, or parsed on cloud services that (as well as its users) now have access to proprietary information. DLP (Data Loss Prevention) is only one tool that can help curb this abuse, if tuned appropriately, but it will not win the fight alone. Policies and staff training need to be aligned, and staff need to be made aware of not only the legal requirements in this space, but also of contractual ones that may be established with existing customers. Currently, there is no legal AI exemption on the books, but as the U.S. Federal Trade Commission (2024) reports, "Like all firms, model-as-a-service companies that deceive customers or users about how their data is collected—whether explicitly or implicitly, by inclusion or by omission—may be violating the law" (para. 7). Additionally, ensuring that those in possession of proprietary materials (especially students) are aware of their rights to sharing those materials and making copyright notices explicit and clear within these materials may help mitigate accidental breeches of confidentiality.

Deepfake Phishing/Scams

AI has been utilized to create more realistic videos, audio, and pictures, easily mistaken as legitimate representations. Attackers are now using these techniques to create more sophisticated and convincing phishing and scam attacks. Milmo and Hern (2024) explain that

> Generative AI tools already helped make approaches to potential victims more convincing by creating fake "lure documents" that did not contain the translation, spelling or grammatical errors that tended to give away phishing attacks – their contents having been crafted or corrected by chatbots. (para. 9)

Similarly, Hulme (2023) underscores that

> Because of the effectiveness of…large language models (LLMs), attackers can better impersonate influential (or at least the right) people within organizations, such as the CEO or someone from the IT or finance departments. This is helpful for scams that typically start with an email, such as Business Email Compromise (BEC) attacks. A BEC attack is where the attacker impersonates the CEO, some other executive, or even a business partner to trick employees into making a wire transfer. These attacks have

> historically taken place as email phishing attacks. Increasingly, you should expect AI-driven social media and text messaging, deep fake videos, and deep fake voice mails. Attackers are even using virtual meeting platforms. (para. 4)

Humans are always the weakest link in any security program, and as such, need to be prescribed training that will be absorbed, and effect change in their behavior. Hulme (2023) concurs,

> In the age of GenAI and AI-enhanced phishing threats, the human factor plays a critical last line of defense. Should maliciously crafted phishing emails slip past the set layers of protection — and some small percentage will undoubtedly do so — a well-trained staff will be better prepared to not click on the malware-laced attachments or malicious URLs. (para. 12)

A typical training method is simulating phishing attacks, but the need for phishing tests that closely emulate current types of phishing attacks will only increase with the prevalence of AI-generated phishing attacks. Attacks will be more convincing due to language and grammar-correcting AI algorithms when combined with deepfake videos, audio, and pictures. Training the populace to discern fraudulent representations from reality will be of utmost importance. Mandatory security awareness training is also often required by cybersecurity insurance but is another method by which employees can be trained to recognize deepfakes and scams.

There are many projects currently underway to recognize and help detect the use of AI, but their accuracy rates are not high enough to warrant confidence in these tools for important decisions. Furthermore, AI models are frequently updated and adapt to changes in queries making detection a moving target and thus even more difficult to consistently make reliable predictions.

Copyright

Beyond the copyright concerns mentioned in the privacy section, another concern is the copyright conditions of the materials used to train ML models and the possibility of derivative work appearing in some form in generated content. As of the time of this writing, lawsuits are being considered over whether content generated by AI models can be copyrighted (with some current results indicating it cannot be; see Brittain, 2023) and whether content generated by AI models trained over copyrighted material is violating those copyrights (with some current results

indicating it may not be; see Brittain, 2024). Users of AI should be aware of the dynamic nature of the law around copyright and use of AI and consider the risks this ambiguity poses.

Existing Technologies

Support Chatbots

AI-powered chatbots for information retrieval are currently available. These chatbots can be deployed on university websites or communication platforms to provide instant responses to frequently asked questions. They can help students and staff find information about admissions, course schedules, campus facilities, and more. Currently, the following AI-powered chatbots are being used at Washburn and at comparable institutions.

- Brightspace Desire2Learn End User Support Virtual Assistant (as of January 2024)
- Slate AI Chatbot
- Tier I IT Support (University of Kansas)
- Zoom Virtual Agents
- Zoom AI Companion
- LibGuides-Mabee Library

Video and Visual AI-Generated Tools

Additional AI-powered tools are currently available. Examples include the following.

- DeepDream
- RunwayML
- Vid2Vid
- Open Pose
- Rekall
- Deep Art.io
- Clarifai
- Pix2PixHD
- Womba Dream
- SambaNova
- Sora-text to video

Technologies in Development

MS Copilot

Microsoft Copilot is part of Office Suite currently based on a subscription for Copilot. Copilot replaced what was previously known as Cortana which was a tool to help search for information. Copilot is a large language model that will help cite sources, author poems, or write a song.

Review Engines/AI Content Detection Tools

There are many projects currently underway to recognize and help detect the use of AI, but their accuracy rates need to improve as AI development continues. The following AI content detection engines are not perfect, but attempt to reflect instances of AI at work:

- Content at Scale
- ContentDetector.ai
- Copyleaks
- Crossf
- CrossPlag
- GPT Radar
- GPTZero
- Grammica
- IvyPanda
- OpenAI
- Originality.ai
- Sapling
- Scribbr
- SEO.ai
- TurnItIn
- Writer
- ZeroGPTi

Studies are ongoing, but initial studies show less efficacy (more false positives) when attempting to detect student ChatGPT 4 usage vs ChatGPT 3.5 (see Elkhatat et al., 2023; Walters, 2023). Using markers besides AI detection tool results is recommended.

Supporting AI Technology

Integration with Existing Systems

Educational institutions often use a variety of software systems for administration, learning management, and communication. Integrating new AI tools with existing systems seamlessly can be technically challenging and requires interoperability standards.

Scalability

As the number of students and courses increases, the scalability of AI solutions becomes crucial. Designing systems that can handle a growing user base without compromising performance is a technical challenge.

Infrastructure and Resource Requirements

Implementing AI solutions often requires robust computational infrastructure and significant resources. Many educational institutions may face challenges in providing the necessary hardware, software, and cloud services for AI training.

Training

Faculty, staff, and students may lack the necessary skills to effectively use and integrate AI technologies into their daily work or educational environment. There may also be resistance to change and embrace AI in the educational environment and/or workplace. There may also be a lack of AI experts to deliver the training needed. Consistent communication regarding the benefits and genuine constraints of AI, as well as concerns about job displacement, ethical considerations, and changes in teaching paradigms, is essential as this technology progresses.

Training programs are needed to bridge these skill gaps and ensure that educators are proficient in leveraging AI tools for teaching and administrative tasks. ITS (Information Technology Services) staff and Computer Information Sciences faculty can provide a collaborative training session through CTEL to help bridge the gap for faculty and staff.

We also recognize there is a gap in mandatory training for students. Currently, ITS Security has not purchased training for students that would include AI use. We recommend purchasing and deploying the student security training for Washburn

students. We also recommend that this student training be a curriculum requirement in WU 101 courses. Security training and/or training on AI in general could be addressed in the online student resource center.

Core Recommendations

- Washburn University should prioritize DLP (Data Loss Prevention). Appropriately tuned DLP is a tool that can help curb the abuse that AI has of data privacy and confidentiality.
- Washburn University's decision-making collectives should ensure that policies and staff training are aligned, and staff need to be made aware of not only the legal requirements in this space, but also of contractual ones that may be established with existing customers.
- Washburn University should require mandatory security awareness training that reflects current AI attack methods. This includes phishing simulation training.
- Instructors and administrators should exercise caution in using AI recognition engines to assess possible cases of academic impropriety.
- Washburn University should invest in training programs to bridge skill gaps and ensure that instructors are proficient in leveraging AI tools for teaching and administrative tasks.
- ITS and faculty should collaborate with CTEL to create training sessions to help bridge the gap for faculty and staff.
- ITS should purchase and deploy student security training for Washburn students.
- Washburn University's Center for Student Success and Retention (CSSR) should consider making student security training a curriculum requirement in WU 101 courses.
- Washburn University should address security training and/or training on AI in general in the online student resource center.

Section 4: Structural and Equity Issues & Recommendations

Carson Kay, Chris Jones, Adebanke Adebayo, James Barraclough, & Miguel Gonzalez-Abellas

When reflecting upon the overarching issues of generative AI (LLM) use in pedagogical spaces, a common thread emerges: structural concerns. Namely, Washburn University's response to the pedagogical use of AI has the potential to either reaffirm its formal commitment to equitable teaching or further exacerbate inequity among our student body by maladapting its existing policies. Although Escotet (2023) underscores the benefits of infusing AI-learning into the classroom, he also acknowledges that the traditional structures of higher education institutions are experiencing considerable turbulence as the global society becomes increasingly computer-mediated and remotely oriented. As universities begin to adjust to these new advances, they must balance equitable dualities amid disciplinary norms, professional ethics, academic freedom, and the positioning of accountability when crafting official responses and restructuring existing policy. In this section, we (1) summarize the core complexity regarding our potential organizational response to students using AI in pedagogical contexts and (2) present recommendations for Washburn's next steps.

Crafting an organizational response to AI use in the classroom is complicated because academic disciplines and related employers can have vastly different needs. Indeed, it might be tempting to simply forbid students from using ChatGPT and comparable AI technologies. Yet, a university-wide ban on students' use of AI would both prevent educators from teaching skillsets that employers desire and prevent educators from using AI technologies to facilitate learning. Moreover, given that certificate programs in prompt engineering have already started training individuals in using ChatGPT effectively (see Vanderbilt University, 2023), we risk holding our students back from employment opportunities if we refuse to permit AI use in any classroom spaces. Still, if we restructure our existing integrity expectations to account for AI, we must be acutely aware of the ways in which we could inadvertently create systemic inconsistency in how we categorize AI use amid our academic impropriety standards. Additionally, as preliminary analyses suggest that AI detection programs disproportionately flag papers written by students who are not native English speakers (Myers, 2023) and can perpetuate racial, cultural, and gender biases in their responses (Ray, 2023), it is necessary that we both cultivate structural expectations that prevent the penalization of marginalized

students and actively teach our students that ChatGPT is not bias-free and not above reproach.

Is the answer, then, to simply not make any structural adjustments to our current process for maintaining academic integrity? We argue that while this would be the easiest path forward, having a blanket permittance of AI technologies would also be too extreme, as the absence of organizational response disregards disciplinary specificity regarding the use of AI. What is appropriate use in one discipline's courses might be profoundly unethical in another's courses. For example, a modern languages instructor might use ChatGPT to help students learn how to translate languages. In contrast, a qualitative methodology instructor might forbid the use of AI in analyzing data because doing so would require feeding sensitive information into the program which would violate confidentiality expectations. Although it could be argued that no organizational response grants strategic ambiguity so instructors can make individual calls on ethics in their courses, no response could also grant the illusion that the institution has no opinion on whether students use this technology in lieu of completing their assignments as instructed. This duality complicates organizational response and procedure, yet it does bring with it a learning opportunity. Namely, this duality offers students a chance to transition away from the familiar, highly structured K-12 educative norms and to navigate and adapt to ethical ambiguity across contexts. This navigation requires critical thinking and personal accountability alike, as instructor-specific policies would vary, so students would practice adjusting to different class cultures and norms, just as they have and/or will adjust to different expectations in workplace environments.

Still, this variation is a new experience for many students, which is why we support Washburn University offering simple, official language that students and educators alike can draw upon when making pedagogical choices. While we defer to the respective decision-making collectives on campus to craft exact language, we will offer our rationale for this general recommendation. Overall, we recommend that Washburn University modifies the language within its academic impropriety policy to provide some reasonable boundaries regarding AI use in classroom contexts, but to also underscore that decisions to prohibit or include AI are at the instructor's discretion. We recognize that this approach will not be without its challenges. Indeed, the presence of vastly different instructor-specific policies could result in inconsistent responses to AI violations. The same use of AI in an assignment could be reported to Student Life as problematic by one instructor and be deemed

acceptable by another instructor. However, we concur that if there was language clearly noting that AI use is at the instructor's discretion, and if instructors explained to students why they could or could not use generative AI like ChatGPT to complete assignments in their courses, students would have the information they need to both experience discipline-specific ethics and make constructive decisions.

The final reason that we recommend that Washburn formally support instructor discretion through policy revision relates to academic freedom, institutional support of educators, and organizational accountability. By revising existing policy to underscore instructor discretion, Washburn University would reaffirm academic freedom while simultaneously signaling to its instructors that the institution will support them in making difficult decisions regarding course-specific boundary maintenance and academic impropriety reporting. Now, it could be argued that a more universal policy could result in more consistency in how academic impropriety is managed across courses. It could also be argued that a university-wide policy outlining exactly how AI can and cannot be used would allow the institution to grant instructors an explicit set of guidelines to follow. Such language might also semantically function as an organizational commitment to maintaining this overarching policy and, when necessary, protecting instructors from undue public criticism. Indeed, if university-wide language exists, educators can empathize with student frustrations while pointing out that their actions violated university-level expectations. However, as mentioned previously, a one-size-fits-all approach to incorporating AI in the classroom could unintentionally prevent instructors and disciplines from using AI technologies constructively and/or preparing students to use generative AI as they will be asked to do in future jobs. Because of the disciplinary specificity, we *do not* recommend that Washburn University cultivates a *universal rule* regarding how AI can and cannot be used in pedagogical spaces *regardless* of discipline.

We do, however, recommend university-wide language that reaffirms instructor discretion, but for the sake of transparency, we will acknowledge the complexities associated with instructor-specific policies. Incorporating language that underscores instructor discretion in our academic impropriety policies grants strategic ambiguity that better aligns with the complex realities of our represented disciplines. Permitting instructors to make informed decisions about the appropriateness of AI technologies in their courses illustrates an institutional commitment to academic freedom and pedagogical flexibility. Such allowances

would grant instructors the capacity to craft laboratories in which students can practice using AI effectively and ethically. Yet, leaving these decisions solely to instructors without providing explicit organizational support could, from a critical perspective, allow the institution to rhetorically absolve itself from responsibility should instructors be publicly challenged over their policies. Without university-level language that notes (a) the potential for academic impropriety and (b) that instructors make the decisions regarding AI use in their classrooms, instructors could feel unsupported or even pressured to modify their policies amid appeal processes. Alternatively stated, the complete absence of any organizational language reaffirming instructor discretion could further exacerbate power inequities within the organizational structure itself. University rhetoric and its implications for accountability placement must be cautiously considered to ensure that instructors are formally supported in crafting course-specific AI policies. Thus, we concur that clearly stating within our academic impropriety policies that instructors determine AI's appropriateness in their classrooms would both maintain academic freedom and pedagogical flexibility while simultaneously displaying an institutional commitment to protecting faculty as they make these complex decisions. To respect committee boundaries regarding policy and protocol revisions, and recognize our decision-making limitations as an ad hoc committee, we are not providing exact language in this report. However, we are underscoring the need for language in the Washburn University Faculty Handbook, Student Conduct Code, and University Syllabus that underscores that AI-generated work may be academically improper and that AI policies for classroom learning are at the discretion of the instructor (see Drexel University, 2023 for an example approach).

Such language would clarify the process for navigating AI-related cases of academic impropriety. When students use AI in ways that do not comport with the policies established by their instructors, instructors need to be able to treat it in the same way that they would treat other forms of academic impropriety. Thus, we advise that mention of AI-generated work be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook (perhaps in Section 7.C.). Similarly, we recommend language underscoring that faculty must be trained in university policy and kept accountable to follow it. In that way, we can maintain the academic integrity of a Washburn degree and respect students' rights to equitable treatment.

We also recommend that the University Syllabus include model language about AI and academic impropriety. Right now, it just includes a link to the policies. We recommend that 1) academic impropriety language be spelled out explicitly in the

University Syllabus itself, 2) the university offer training (via documents as well as interactive sessions) on any updated language within our academic impropriety policy, and 3) instructors include model language in their own syllabi that both reflect the academic impropriety policy and accommodate it to meet their particular class's needs.

Regarding the latter two recommendations above, we advise that faculty continue to receive training in the formal process for navigating academic impropriety. Faculty can unilaterally require students to revise and resubmit their work, but any further sanctions (including grade adjustment and automatic failure) require the faculty member to report the matter and permit students the right to appeal the decision. Faculty and students need to know and follow these policies, as they provide mechanisms to both enforce academic integrity and to ensure that such enforcement is equitable to students.

Lastly, we acknowledge as a committee that expert stakeholders on our campus must be actively involved in decision-making and that our community needs continued review of the generative AI landscape to best adapt policy and procedure. For example, we recognize that generative AI may have a place within certain student accommodations. However, we underscore that decision-making power regarding generative AI and reasonable accommodations must remain with our campus experts, in this example, Student Accessibility Services. Similarly, because the AI landscape will rapidly change, we cannot underscore enough the importance of a standing committee on campus that reviews AI advancements annually. Continued conversation is needed to determine the best committee home for this responsibility, or whether a new committee is needed.

Core Recommendations

1. Washburn University should craft institutional-level language that (a) notes the potential of generative AI use to constitute academic impropriety (e.g., plagiarism) and (b) affirms that the appropriateness of generative AI use in the classroom is determined by the instructor.
2. Washburn University's decision-making collectives should revise the institutional academic impropriety language in the Faculty Handbook, Student Conduct Code, and University Syllabus to explicitly mention the potential of generative AI use to constitute academic impropriety.

3. Washburn should continue to promote its official policies and reporting mechanisms for academic impropriety to faculty to ensure greater consistency in their application.
4. Washburn University should continue to support expert units on campus (i.e., Student Accessibility Services, ITS, CSSR, etc.) as they assess opportunities for and boundaries regarding student use of generative AI in classroom contexts.
5. Washburn University should conduct a review of AI updates at least once per academic year. We suggest this review take place during the fall semester and that necessary changes be implemented in the spring. This responsibility could be held by a pre-existing committee or be assigned to a new campus AI collective.

This report reflects the information available when the document was written. As generative AI advances and more information becomes available, claims crafted in this document should be updated in subsequent reports.

References

Alchemy. (n.d.). *AI and ChatGPT resources for higher education.* https://alchemy.works/ai-chatgpt-resources/

Andersen v. Stability AI Ltd. 23-cv-00201-WHO (N.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2023). https://casetext.com/case/andersen-v-stability-ai-ltd

Appel, G., Neelbauer, J., & Schweidel, D. A. (2023, April 7). *Generative AI has an intellectual property problem.* Harvard Business Review. https://hbr.org/2023/04/generative-ai-has-an-intellectual-property-problem

Arizona State University. (n.d.). *AI foundations: Prompt engineering.* https://careercatalyst.asu.edu/programs/ai-prompt-engineering/

Bommasani, R. (2023, March 17). *AI spring? Four takeaways from major releases in foundation models.* Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-spring-four-takeaways-major-releases-foundation-models

Brittain, B. (2023, August 21). *AI-generated art cannot receive copyrights, US court says.* Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/legal/ai-generated-art-cannot-receive-copyrights-us-court-says-2023-08-21/

Brittain, B. (2024, February 13). *OpenAI gets partial win in authors' US copyright lawsuit.* Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/legal/litigation/openai-gets-partial-win-authors-us-copyright-lawsuit-2024-02-13/

Business-Higher Education Forum. (2019). *The new foundational skills of the digital economy: Developing the professionals of the future.* http://www.bhef.com/publications/new-foundational-skillsdigital-economy-developing-professionals-future

Cassuto, L. (2023, July 25). *Artificial intelligence: A graduate-student user's guide.* Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/artificial-intelligence-a-graduate-student-users-guide

Chan, C. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Education Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(38), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

The Chicago Manual of Style. (n.d.). *Citation, documentation of sources.* https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/qanda/data/faq/topics/Documentation/faq0422.html

Drexel University. (2023, November 20). *Academic integrity pertaining to artificial intelligence.* Drexel University Office of the Provost. https://drexel.edu/provost/policies-calendars/policies/academic_integrity_artificial_intelligence/

Elkhatat, A. M., Elsaid, K., & Almeer, S. (2023). Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19*, Article 17. Online publication. https://edintegrity.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5

Escotet, M. A. (2023, September 13). *The bright side of AI in teaching and learning.* The Academic. https://theacademic.com/ai-in-teaching-and-learning/

Google. (n.d.). *Google AI for anyone.* EdX. https://www.edx.org/learn/artificial-intelligence/google-google-ai-for-anyone

Hardesty, L. (2017, April 14). *Explained: Neural networks.* Massachusetts Institute of Technology News. https://news.mit.edu/2017/explained-neural-networks-deep-learning-0414

Hart Research Associates. (2018). *Fulfilling the American dream: Liberal education and the future of work.* https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2018EmployerResearchReport.pdf

Hulme, G. V. (2023, November 20). *How to combat AI-produced phishing attacks.* SC Media. https://www.scmagazine.com/resource/how-to-combat-ai-produced-phishing-attacks

Hypothes.is. (2023, March 2). *Webinar: Leveraging social annotation in the age of AI* [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f5fqPirbb64

IBM. (n.d.a.). *AI for everyone: Master the basics.* EdX. https://www.edx.org/learn/artificial-intelligence/ibm-ai-for-everyone-master-the-basics

IBM. (n.d.b.). *Introduction to generative AI.* EdX. https://www.edx.org/learn/computer-science/ibm-introduction-to-generative-ai

Lakhani, K. (n.d.). *How can we counteract generative AI's hallucinations?* Digital Data Design Institute at Harvard. https://d3.harvard.edu/how-can-we-counteract-generative-ais-hallucinations/

Lau, S. (2017, July 10). *A walkthrough of convolutional neural network — Hyperparameter tuning.* Medium. https://towardsdatascience.com/a-walkthrough-of-convolutional-neural-network-7f474f91d7bd

Luqman, A., Mahesh, R., & Chattopadhyay, A. (2024). Privacy and security implications of cloud-based AI services: A survey. *ArXiv.* Preprint. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2402.00896

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). (n.d.). *When AI gets it wrong: Addressing AI hallucinations and bias.* https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/basics/addressing-ai-hallucinations-and-bias/

McAdoo, T. (2024, February 23). *How to cite ChatGPT.* APA Style Blog. https://apastyle.apa.org/blog/how-to-cite-chatgpt

Milmo, D., & Hern, A. (2024, January 23). *AI will make scam emails look genuine, UK cybersecurity agency warns.* The Guardian.

https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2024/jan/24/ai-scam-emails-uk-cybersecurity-agency-phishing

MLA. (2023, March 17). *How do I cite generative AI in MLA style?* https://style.mla.org/citing-generative-ai/

Myers, A. (2023, May 15). *AI-detectors biased against non-native English writers.* Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-detectors-biased-against-non-native-english-writers

National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, 2016). *Job outlook 2016.* http://www.naceweb.org/career-development/trends-and-predictions/job-outlook-2016-attributesemployers-want-to-see-on-new-college-graduates-resumes/

Purdue University. (n.d.). *Post graduate program in AI & ML.* https://bootcamp-sl.discover.online.purdue.edu/ai-machine-learning-certification-course?utm_source=google&utm_medium=cpc&utm_term=prompt%20engineering%20program&utm_content=20711255484-151872201541-678611494695&utm_device=c&utm_campaign=Purduedomain+-+Search-US-25_64-en+-+NB+-+DataCluster-AIML-PG-CAIML-Purdue+-+Strategy:Consideration-adgroup-Prompt+Engineering+Program+-+Subcategory:Prompt+Engineering-PT:Program-MT:Exact&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjw8J6wBhDXARIsAPo7QA8Mv5v0ygbRt2BULqFQLiocvqwg3OpdJ_4AN_txwz0kUDXPmkRNeeMaAgxMEALw_wcB

Ray, P. P. (2023). ChatGPT: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope. *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems, 3*(2023), 121-154. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2023.04.003

University of Texas at Austin. (n.d.). *Master AI & ML, neural networks, computer vision, NLP & more.* https://onlineexeced.mccombs.utexas.edu/uta-artificial-intelligence-machine-learning?&utm_source=google&utm_medium=search&utm_campaign=AIM

L_Int_Search_PromptEng_Broad_US_Certification&campaign_id=20568061426&adgroup_id=162191025348&ad_id=674332845246&utm_target=kwd-1983545563834&Keyword=prompt%20engineering%20degree&placement=&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQjw8J6wBhDXARIsAPo7QA9HZsWHpCsy3tqRnJUPSjA97UKli-r6X_SUoSzsUlHNoV_lnGrAPP0aAn3nEALw_wcB

United States Federal Trade Commission. (2024, January 9). *AI companies: Uphold your privacy and confidentiality commitments* [Blog]. https://www.ftc.gov/policy/advocacy-research/tech-at-ftc/2024/01/ai-companies-uphold-your-privacy-confidentiality-commitments

Vanderbilt University. (2023, May 26). *Vanderbilt launches free online ChatGPT course, shaping the future of AI education.* Vanderbilt School of Engineering. https://engineering.vanderbilt.edu/2023/05/26/vanderbilt-launches-free-online-chatgpt-course-shaping-the-future-of-ai-education/

Walters, W. H. (2023). The effectiveness of software designed to detect AI-generated writing: A comparison of 16 AI text detectors. *Open Information Science, 7*(1). Online publication. https://doi.org/10.1515/opis-2022-0158

Washburn University. (n.d.). *Student accessibility services.* https://www.washburn.edu/studentaccessibility/index.html

Washburn University. (2018). *Faculty handbook: Section 7.* https://www.washburn.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-resources/faculty-handbook/faculty-handbook-section-7.html#undefined

Washburn University. (2023, August 3). *Student conduct code.* https://www.washburn.edu/student-life/services/files/Student_Conduct_Code.pdf

Additional Resources

Artz, M. (n.d.). *How can anthropologists prepare for careers in AI?* [Blog]. Anthropology Career Readiness Network. https://anthrocareerready.net/how-can-anthropologists-prepare-for-careers-in-ai/

Association for Writing Across the Curriculum (AWAC) Executive Committee. (2023, January 30). *Statement on artificial intelligence writing tools in writing across the curriculum settings.* Association for Writing Across the Curriculum. https://wacassociation.org/statement-on-ai-writing-tools-in-wac/

Boise State University. (n.d.). *Generative artificial intelligence (AI) - Guidance on use and applicable policies.* Office of Institutional Compliance and Ethics. https://www.boisestate.edu/policy/generative-artificial-intelligence-ai-use-and-policies/

Bojorquez, H., & Martínez Vega, M. (2023, May 31). The importance of artificial intelligence in education for all students. *Language Magazine.* https://www.languagemagazine.com/2023/05/31/the-importance-of-artificial-intelligence-in-education-for-all-students/

Burrow, L. E. (2023, November 13). *Guide, don't hide: Maximizing course assignments with ChatGPT integration.* Faculty Focus. https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-with-technology-articles/guide-dont-hide-maximizing-course-assignments-with-chatgpt-integration/

Carroll College. (2023, Fall). *Generative A.I. in fall 2023—Faculty resource guide.* https://scholars.carroll.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/0e94e64a-9bbc-46d1-ae0e-3ce55e2181fd/content

Chen, C. (2023, March 9). *AI will transform teaching and learning. Let's get it right.* Stanford University Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. https://hai.stanford.edu/news/ai-will-transform-teaching-and-learning-lets-get-it-right

Clune, M. W. (2023, September 12). *AI means professors need to raise their grading standards.* Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/ai-means-professors-need-to-raise-their-grading-standards

Copyleaks. (2024, February 22). Copyleaks research finds nearly 60% of GPT-3.5 outputs contained some form of plagiarized content. https://copyleaks.com/about-us/media/copyleaks-research-finds-nearly-60-of-gpt-3-5-outputs-contained-some-form-of-plagiarized-content

Collins, K. (2023, February 17). How ChatGPT could embed a 'watermark' in the text it generates. *New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2023/02/17/business/ai-text-detection.html

Douma, K. (2023, March 5). *How to keep students writing in the age of AI tools* [Reprint from Edutopia]. National Council of Teachers of English. https://ncte.org/blog/2023/03/keep-students-writing-age-ai-tools/

EDUCAUSE. (n.d.a). *Policies and guidelines.* https://airtable.com/appOfAfWh27rexTJp/shrCrbi4wMgXMyVt0/tblWvgmG1HRibK15g

EDUCAUSE. (n.d.b.). *Presentations, events, and articles.* https://airtable.com/appOfAfWh27rexTJp/shrx8UbfrXROuasFJ/tblWvgmG1HRibK15g

Gartner. (2023, October). *Opening keynote: The next era—We shape AI, AI shapes us* [Video]. LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/video/live/urn:li:ugcPost:7119684233421312001/

Government Technology. (n.d.). *Center for digital government.* https://www.govtech.com/cdg

Gupta, G. (2023, September 18). *The AI advantage: Boosting student engagement in self-paced learning through AI.* Faculty Focus. https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-with-technology-articles/the-

ai-advantage-boosting-student-engagement-in-self-paced-learning-through-ai/

Guzman, A. L., & Lewis, S. C. (2020). Artificial intelligence and communication: A human-machine communication research agenda. *New Media & Society, 22*(1), 70-86. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819858691

Haisler, D. (2023). *Making ChatGPT work for you: A generative AI prompt guide for public servants.* Center for Digital Government. https://media.erepublic.com/document/CDG23_GUIDE_ChatGPT_V.pdf

Haisler, D., & Takai, T. (2023, August 9). *Generative AI guidelines: A resource for public sector leaders.* Government Technology. https://www.govtech.com/sponsored/generative-ai-guidelines-a-resource-for-public-sector-leaders

Hashim, S. (2023, September 25). *Meet Zoom AI Companion, your new AI assistant! Unlock the benefits with a paid Zoom account* [Blog]. Zoom. https://www.zoom.com/en/blog/zoom-ai-companion/

Hellman, R. (2023, August 31). *Author outlines AI in education 'Bill of Rights.'* KU News. https://news.ku.edu/news/article/2023/08/31/author-outlines-ai-education-bill-rights#:~:text=In%20the%20article%2C%20Conrad%20acknowledged,buy%20and%20implement%20AI%20tools

Hodgson, J. (n.d.). *Generative AI, ChatGPT, & syllabi: An ethics of practice.* https://new.express.adobe.com/webpage/PjeaG4XqmiynH?

Hohenstein, J., Kizilcec, R. F., DiFranzo, D., Aghajari, Z., Mieczkowski, H., Levy, K., Naaman, M., Hancock, J., & Jung, M. F. (2023). Artificial intelligence in communication impacts language and social relationships. *Scientific Reports, 13*(1). Online publication. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41598-023-30938-9

Hosseini, M., & Horbach, S. P. J. M. (2023). Fighting reviewer fatigue or amplifying bias? Considerations and recommendations for use of ChatGPT and other

large language models in scholarly peer review. *Review Integrity and Peer Review, 8*, Article 4. Online publication. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-023-00133-5

IAPP. (n.d.). *Artificial intelligence topic page.* Resource Center. https://iapp.org/resources/topics/artificial-intelligence-1/

Johnson, K. (2023, February 16). *Chatbots got big—and their ethical red flags got bigger.* Wired. https://www.wired.com/story/chatbots-got-big-and-their-ethical-red-flags-got-bigger/

Kirschenbaum, M. (2023, March 8). Prepare for the textpocalypse. *The Atlantic.* https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/03/ai-chatgpt-writing-language-models/673318/

Lauer, M., Constant, S., & Wernimont, A. (2023, June 23). *Using AI in peer review is a breach of confidentiality.* National Institutes of Health. https://nexus.od.nih.gov/all/2023/06/23/using-ai-in-peer-review-is-a-breach-of-confidentiality/

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). (n.d.). *AI detectors don't work. Here's what to do instead.* https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/teach/ai-detectors-dont-work/

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). (n.d.). *Generative AI for teaching & learning.* https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai/

McMurtrie, B. (2023, September 1). *Teaching: Want your students to be skeptical of ChatGPT? Try this.* Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/newsletter/teaching/2023-09-21

McMurtrie, B. (2023, September 8). *What will determine AI's impact on college teaching? 5 signs to watch.* Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/what-will-determine-ais-impact-on-college-teaching-5-signs-to-watch

McMurtrie, B., & Supiano, B. (2023, June 13). *Caught off guard by AI.* Chronicle of Higher Education. https://www.chronicle.com/article/caught-off-guard-by-ai

Modern Language Association and Conference on College Composition & Communication. (2023, July). *MLA-CCCC joint task force on writing and AI working paper: Overview of the issues, statement of principles, and recommendations* [Working paper]. https://hcommons.org/app/uploads/sites/1003160/2023/07/MLA-CCCC-Joint-Task-Force-on-Writing-and-AI-Working-Paper-1.pdf

Modern Language Association (MLA) and Conference on College Composition & Communication (CCCC). (2023, August 8). *Quick start guide to AI and writing.* https://aiandwriting.hcommons.org/resources/

Mollick, E., & Mollick, L. (2023, September 25). *Student use cases for AI.* Harvard Business Publishing Education. https://hbsp.harvard.edu/inspiring-minds/student-use-cases-for-ai

Natale, S. (2021). Communicating through or communicating with: Approaching artificial intelligence from a communication and media studies perspective. *Communication Theory, 31*(4), 905-910. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtaa022

National Institutes of Health. (2023, June 23). *The use of generative artificial intelligence technologies is prohibited for the NIH peer review process* [Notice number: NOT-OD-23-149]. https://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/notice-files/NOT-OD-23-149.html

O'Bryan, V. (2023, April 30). *Test driving ChatGPT on a personal narrative and text analysis essay* [Blog]. National Council of Teachers of English. https://ncte.org/blog/2023/04/chatgpt-personal-narrative-text-analysis-essay/

Padlet. (n.d.). *University policies on generative* AI. https://padlet.com/cetl6/university-policies-on-generative-ai-m9n7wf05r7rdc6pe

Pérez-Núñez, A. (2023). Exploring the potential of generative AI (ChatGPT) for foreign language instruction: Applications and challenges. *Hispania, 106*(3), 355-362. https://doi.org/10.1353/hpn.2023.a906568

Ryan. (2023, February 23). *Adventures in ChatGPT: Meet David Wilkie, anthropologist* [Blog]. Anthro{dendum}. https://anthrodendum.org/2023/02/23/adventures-in-chatgpt-meet-david-wilkie-anthropologist/

Salzano, M., & Yang, M. (2022). Going off scripts: Emotional labor and technoliberal managerialism. *Critical Studies in Media Communication, 39*(2), 78-91. https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.2021.2011349

Salzano, M. (2023, June 23). *Bring on the bots? Preparing communication studies for artificial intelligence.* Spectra. https://www.natcom.org/spectra/bring-bots-preparing-communication-studies-artificial-intelligence

Self, M. (2023, September 1). *KU professor proposes 'AI Bill of Rights in Education.'* KSNT News. https://www.ksnt.com/news/local-news/ku-professor-proposes-ai-bill-of-rights-in-education/

Singer, N. (2023, September 1). Ban or embrace? Colleges wrestle with A.I.-generated admissions essays. *New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2023/09/01/business/college-admissions-essay-ai-chatbots.html

Sobo, E. J. (2023). Could ChatGPT prompt a new golden age in higher education? *Teaching and Learning Anthropology Journal, 6*(1), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.5070/T36160114

Sundar, S. S., & Lee, E.-J. (2022). Rethinking communication in the era of artificial intelligence. *Human Communication Research, 48*(3), 379-385. https://doi.org/10.1093/hcr/hqac014

Terry, O. K. (2023, May 12). *I'm a student. You have no idea how much we're using ChatGPT.* Chronicle of Higher Education.

https://www.chronicle.com/article/im-a-student-you-have-no-idea-how-much-were-using-chatgpt

United States Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology. (2023, May). *Artificial intelligence and the future of teaching and learning: Insights and recommendations.* https://tech.ed.gov/ai-future-of-teaching-and-learning/

Verma, P. (2023, May 18). A professor accused his class of using ChatGPT, putting diplomas in jeopardy. *Washington Post.* https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2023/05/18/texas-professor-threatened-fail-class-chatgpt-cheating/

Vogelsinger, B. (2023, June 12). *Inviting artificial intelligence with curiosity* [Blog]. National Council of Teachers of English. https://ncte.org/blog/2023/06/artificial-intelligence-curiosity/

Warner, J. (2023, August 29). *We must still make students write* [Blog]. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/blogs/just-visiting/2023/08/29/chatgpt-challenge-instruction-can-meet-dont-retreat

White House of the United States. (2022, October). *Blueprint for an AI Bill of Rights: Making automated systems work for the American people.* https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2022/10/Blueprint-for-an-AI-Bill-of-Rights.pdf

Yang, M. (2020). Painful conversations: Therapeutic chatbots and public capacities. *Communication and the Public, 5*(1-2), 35-44. https://doi.org/10.1177/2057047320950636

Weizenbaum, J. (1966). Computational linguistics: ELIZA—A computer program for the study of natural language communication between man and machine. *Communications of the ACM, 9*(1), 36-45. https://web.stanford.edu/class/cs124/p36-weizenabaum.pdf

College of Arts and Sciences – Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Description and Criteria. Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer is awarded to those who exhibit a consistent record of exemplary performance in their position. It requires active participation in the academic department of appointment with responsibilities that include: a sustained record of teaching effectiveness, collegiality, and a record of appropriate service. Creative and/or scholarly activity is not a requirement. In addition to the criteria below, Departments may have additional expectations that should be conveyed to lecturers. The appointment to Senior Lecturer is a privilege to be earned according to the criteria described below; it should not be considered automatic. Promotion to Senior Lecturer does not carry any assumption of permanent employment.

1. **Eligibility.** A minimum of 5 years at the rank of Lecturer and completion of at least 60 teaching credit hours while serving in this role at Washburn University.

2. **Teaching.** Effective teachers are essential to the College of Arts and Sciences. The quality of instruction must be judged by its intrinsic purposes: to transmit and preserve knowledge, to encourage critical and creative thought, to foster a lively interest in learning, and to stimulate a continuing commitment to inquiry. Among the criteria of teaching effectiveness are student perceptions and opinions, the performance of students, and the informed judgment of colleagues.

3. **Service**. Service to the department, to the College of Arts and Sciences, to the University, to the profession, and/or to the community is required for the rank of Senior Lecturer. Among service activities are active participation in committees, administrative leadership, sponsorship of student organizations, and serving as a representative of the University where professionally appropriate. Community service draws upon professional expertise.

Appointment to Senior Lecturer Process

The appointment to Senior Lecturer is a shared faculty and administrative responsibility involving recommendations from the Department Chair, in consultation with the department's tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers, and the CAS Dean. The VPAA's Office will develop a list of candidates to consider for Senior Lecturer status on an annual basis. Eligible candidates, after consulting with the Department Chair, will submit a vita and a letter summarizing their accomplishments in support of teaching and service. Deadline for application will be announced annually by the CAS Dean's Office. Faculty members whose applications for Senior Lecturer status are denied may reapply at their discretion.

1. The Chair will review the candidate's vita, letter of application, annual reviews, and student perception forms with the tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers in the Department. If they support the promotion to Senior Lecturer, a letter of recommendation will be forwarded to the CAS Dean along with the application materials. Dissenting letters from tenured faculty members or Senior Lecturers may be submitted to the Dean.

2. After reviewing the materials, the Dean will make a recommendation. The Dean will submit the Department recommendation, the Dean's recommendation, and the supporting documentation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3. In cases where the designation of Senior Lecturer is not recommended, the department chair and/or Dean will communicate to the candidate what is needed to reach the professional level where Senior Lecturer may be obtained.

Approved by College of Arts and Sciences Faculty on 8/30/2017.