English Department Meeting

Friday, March 14th, 2:00 PM – 4:00 PM

Zoom: <https://fsw.zoom.us/j/84699070938>

**Attendance**: Shawn Moore, Leonard Owens, Hannah Johnson, Victor Triay, Lynn Embick, Thomas Wayne, Sara Dustin, Laura Henning, Mark Massaro, Jill Hummel, Michael Barach, Brandi George, Eric Ivy, Eddie Krzeminski, Cara Minardi-Power, Amy Trogan, Jeremy Pilarski, Scott Ortolano, Ihasha Horn, Tim Bishop, Rebecca Harris

**Absent:** Suzanne Biedenbach, Jason Calabrese

Agenda

**Meeting Starts**: 2:01

1. Reading and Approval of Minutes from February
   1. **Notes Approved**
2. Updates for the Department
   1. Advising
   2. DE
   3. Curriculum
   4. GEAC
   5. WAC
   6. Assessment
   7. Professional Development
   8. Continuing Contract
   9. Clubs/Illuminations/Creative Writing
3. Dr. Rebecca Harris: AI Policies and Detection Software
   1. Dr. Harris will talk to the department regarding AI policy making and the use of detection software as it pertains to college operating procedures.
   2. As chair, I have suggested that as a department we create usage guidelines that faculty can use in syllabi and for detection, which focus on pedagogical solutions and not technical ones (we can draft wording for faculty who don’t want AI usage, those who do, and those who want a mix). The idea would be not for one set policy, but a range of usage ideas and ways to assess that do not rely on detection software.
   3. Rebecca: I’m here today to have a conversation about AI and detection. It’s great to be back with all of you. To get started, using free AI detectors violates FSW’s technology policies. This could result in a FERPA violation.
   4. Mark: If it’s AI generated, isn’t it technically not the student’s work?
   5. Rebecca: You would have to know for sure it isn’t the student’s work. So for best bet, do not do this. We don’t want to have any legal trouble.
   6. Lenny: Has there been any discussion about TurnItIn doing the same thing with student work?
   7. Rebecca: I’m not sure and I am against the use of TurnItIn for that very reason.
   8. Eddie: Does this also apply to revision trackers on Google Docs?
   9. Rebecca: Not that I’m aware of. Those can be helpful and Grammarly has one. I’ll put a link to Grammarly Authorship in the chat.
   10. Amy: Dr. Harrington is suggesting for us to have a list of best practices for AI. Do you think this would be a good endeavor?
   11. Rebecca: I do agree that as a department you should agree on some policies. I’m sure you don’t want a one-size-fits-all policy, but a list of best practices could work.
   12. Rebecca: The AI tools are also outpacing the detectors. Even if we spent money on them as an institution, the detectors may be obsolete. The only “foolproof” solution is to watch the student write the paper, and that’s not practical.
   13. Shawn: That’s what I will propose: a three-tiered solution. Have best practices for those who don’t want any AI, a bit of AI, or quite a bit of AI (such as a tech writing class).
   14. Rebecca: I have four principles that make it difficult for students to use AI in an unethical way.
       1. 1. Specify the required use of specific FSW library resources.
          1. It also ensures that they will keep those library resources if they are used a lot.
       2. 2. Apply knowledge from one context to another.
          1. In my LIT class, I have them make a mixtape based on a story. Chat GPT cannot replicate this kind of thinking.
       3. 3. Requiring the production of original content.
          1. For example, a local project where they go do field research. That cannot be replicated with AI.
       4. 4.Focus on applying the macro to the micro.
   15. Rebecca: I will share this Doc with Dr. Moore and I’m available to talk about these ideas further.
   16. Shawn: I’ll share that right now.
   17. Eric: Do you think that AI can ever get to the level of Aristolean synthesis of character?
   18. Rebecca: I think it will, and at that point we will all have to rethink our approach. One other thing you can do is make your assignments really current. These AI tools are not up to date.
   19. Cara: What AI program are you using for the HLC podcasts?
   20. Rebecca: Wonder Craft. It will produce a podcast from a PDF. Notebook LM is similar.
   21. Jill: I’ve noticed the detectors are problematic, so I’ve been implementing other detection steps. Having them annotate the literature is a “speedbump” that can curb AI use. Also, including “lived experience” in your assignments can help as well since AI cannot do that. I have been using an authenticator as well and I got approval from IT. With all of these steps, I’ve been relying less and less on detectors. My hope is that using AI will be more work for them.
   22. Rebecca: That’s my goal as well. It will be more work to use AI. There are ethical uses of AI that we can implement, but not writing an entire paper.
   23. Brandi: I’ve been close-minded about AI so far but it is definitely not going away. At some point, do we have to evaluate the work, AI or not?
   24. Shawn: That’s what I kind of do now. Before I look at anything, it goes through a process to check for things like synthesis. If it doesn’t have that, that’s the issue. Anna asked me about how much of a detective to be about this. Grading is hard, but it’s part of our job. Thinking of a pedagogical solution seems like a better option.
   25. Rebecca: There are bigger questions this is opening up, such as “what is identity?” Things like Grammarly can level the socioeconomic playing field.
   26. Cara: There’s a lot of pressure in industry for graduates to use AI. In my classes, I talk about the importance of voice so they understand what they are personally supposed to be getting out of this. I’m doing a lot more in-class writing so I can track their progress and compare it to their online submissions.
   27. Lenny: Online classes are going to be the real frontier for us to think about with AI. In ground classes, I’m taking a more workshop approach. I find that it’s less likely they’ll use AI with this approach.
   28. Shawn: I’ve been using it in my 1102 and the students have learned the limitations of AI. I created a whole logical fallacy game with it. A lot of students are tired of it. I want them to see it just as a tool they can use in very specific ways.
   29. Mark: I reiterate to my students that you have to have critical thinking to even use AI. I share horror stories of past papers with students to deter them as well.
   30. Rebecca: I give this speech a lot to students. I’m a big Star Trek fan. In the Star Trek universe you can be illiterate. You could not know anything. In that universe, many of the major characters read and consume art. Why is that? AI can’t have the next great idea, it can’t move us forward as a species, it can only tell us about what already exists.
   31. Cara: A generation that suffered through online education needs connection, and you don’t get that with Chat GPT. I’m trying to focus on the human aspects of why they should want to learn to genuinely write.
4. Regular and Substantive Interaction Discussion
   1. The department will review College Operating Procedure 03-0805 and the section on “Regular and Substantive Interaction.” This language was added to the COP on January 10th of 2025.
   2. Department will review material sent by Dr. Roz Jester regarding RSI and the language changes (materials are available for download in Calendar invite for our meeting).
   3. Shawn: There’s been some changes to the language as of January 10th. Here’s the thing: over the past couple weeks, I’ve dealt with over 12 student concerns. Almost all of them were related to “my professor does not email me back.” It needs to be said in general: there is no world where you cannot respond to a student email. It doesn’t matter what the student email is, you have to respond. Now, if a student is genuinely harassing you, that’s different. I talked to Brian about a “3 before me policy.” If you have three interactions with a student that aren’t fruitful, you are free to forward it to me and I will take it from there.
   4. Shawn: This is related mostly to online asynchronous classes. At times, there is no real interaction between professors/students in mini online classes. How you determine that interaction is up to you, but it needs to be clear what that interaction is going to be, what it looks like, and that it’s consistent. Do not turn on a class and wait for students to email you. You have to reach out to students. Some professors do a weekly email chain with videos and updates. For most of us, it is not really a problem, but do keep it in mind.
   5. Ihasha: My policy says 72 hours in my syllabus for responding to student emails. Do I have to update that?
   6. Shawn: I think they’re going to accept that if it is for a ground class. For Mini classes, it definitely shouldn’t be longer than 24 hours.
   7. Lenny: I think there was something in there about not being able to use AI to respond. How does admin feel about that? There was a whole panel about that.
   8. Shawn: They probably wish that panel never happened. None of those people ever used AI. There’s no resource that we give to students that doesn’t have AI integration. As far as I know, there’s no rule against it currently. They do think it’s been happening.
   9. Lenny: How are they going to police that?
   10. Shawn: They use it for administrative feedback. We have to come up with things that work for us as a Department and not worry about what they do.
   11. Jill: Packback offers AI feedback, but how can we expect students to not use it if we are? The question is, where do we incorporate the moral use of this?
   12. Shawn: We should be asking those questions and that’s the point of the “best use” policy.
   13. Cara: Not to be a Debbie-downer, but the reality is that it’s only the Humanities that care about this. Many other departments don’t care as much about this.
   14. Shawn: AI might be good at doing what admins do, but in our classes students have to think critically and AI can’t do that.
5. 1102 Discussion
   1. Department will review all material submitted to the GoogleDoc (<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1inMw_P88iNohFBqMm8q8_sOESAXD9cR0Rs0eoLXnFkg/edit?usp=sharing>) and will begin structuring a framework for course design.
   2. Please bring all reading material and anything you’d like to see added to the OER to this meeting as well.
   3. The goal for this meeting is to end with a conceptual framework for how we want the modules ordered (by theme / by assessment / etc.,)
   4. Shawn: We need to give an outline of what the asynchronous modules will look like next meeting. What’s the logical order of this 1102 master shell?
   5. Lenny: We’ve been thinking about the idea of thematically versus assignment based. What’s everyone’s thoughts?
   6. Shawn: I include a Rogerian Argument section and a Conspiracy Theory paper about misinformation.
   7. Shawn: So far, I’ve been organizing it by discipline. Gus gave me a module on Science Report writing, so we can include that. Another Module is Business Report Writing, etc. For my 1102, I like focusing on very specific ways of constructing arguments and that’s how I section mine out.
   8. Lenny: I’m the same way in my Ground classes. I used to use more theme-based assignments, but now I give students a lot more freedom to pick a topic.
   9. Cara: We could use the purposes of writing for the themes.
   10. Shawn: I like the ideas of argumentation forms and the purposes of writing as well.
   11. Jeremy: Within these sections could we possibly have student examples if we change the names?
   12. Shawn: Sure, as long as you have permission.
   13. Shawn: I think we’ll go with the Types of Argumentation as our Module breakdown. From there, we can structure it from there. We’ll have a “classical” section first. What should come next?
   14. Lenny: How long will that last?
   15. Shawn: I’d say for at least two assignments. We can modify it for online.
   16. Ihasha: Does that include types of arguments?
   17. Shawn: No, that might be more modern.
   18. Jill: I have a love/hate relationship with the rhetorical analysis in terms of where to put it.
   19. Shawn: I put mine at the beginning because it’s something they should have learned in 1101. Ihasha, what else did you want to put in there?
   20. Ihasha: The various types of arguments like policy, value, or even a LIT argument. And of course, a synthesis.
   21. Jill: I’ve been having a lot of success at ethical arguments. My thematic focus is Civic/Civil discourse.
   22. Shawn: What about the third? I was thinking maybe discipline specific arguments for this section.
   23. Ihasha: Those multimodal projects are pretty popular.
   24. Jill: Like a visual argument? Ellie had one in there in the early online course.
   25. Shawn: Wendie has students research in the style of a painter.
   26. Lenny: Maybe there’s a way to pull those two together. The multimedia project they make could be a piece of civic discourse. Like a campaign poster for if they run for SGA president. As long as we limit it to what kind of posters.
   27. Jill: I’ve had them analyze campaign posters before and even make a campaign poster.
   28. Mark: My students really love a deductive argument and we look at billboards, bumper stickers, etc. My main goal is how culture can influence us.
   29. Shawn: My students love doing that with social media posts.
   30. Amy: I remember a multimodal composition where they found a piece of fake news where they would outline their own investigation of it.
   31. Shawn: Here’s what I’m hearing: A classical section, an ethical/cultural section, and a civil discourse section. That’s a solid module structure.
   32. Shawn: For next meeting, we’ll discuss assignments. Use the same Google Doc. Think big assignments.
   33. Lenny: How many big assessments are you thinking about?
   34. Shawn: Two per module so we can have choices. For the online course, we can condense and move things around.
   35. Shawn: Also, welcome Tim! He will be joining us full-time and is already excited to be at the meeting.
6. Other Updates:
   1. Amy: I’m going to put something in the chat that might be helpful. At our last LAC meeting, we discussed this. If you are asked questions about the HLC process, this document might be ,.
   2. Scott: If you have not used the ancillary fund, please consider it!
   3. Brandi: Julie Marie Wade reading on April 3, 1:30-2:30 P.M. There will be food!
   4. Scott: Do you know anything about the philosophy math course? Apparently it just launched.
   5. Shawn: No idea. Who’s teaching it?
   6. Scott: Not sure, I’ll get the name.
   7. Shawn: FGCU is trying to enter into an agreement with Clewiston. I do hope that the positive is that admin has to treat Hendry better. Thank you to all my H/G faculty.
   8. Shawn: Have a great break everyone.

**Meeting Ends**: 3:34 P.M