Spring Chairs Workshop

18 March 2024
Agenda

- Introduction - Matt Kinservik, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
- UD ADVANCE: Peer Review as a Mentoring Opportunity - UD ADVANCE Institute
- Provost’s Working Group on AI for Teaching and Learning: Campus conversation, guidance, and experimentation with AI - AI for Teaching and Learning Working Group
Peer Review as a Mentoring Opportunity: A Workshop for Department Chairs
UD ADVANCE Institute

- Founded by an NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation
- Currently supported by the provost’s office
- Core work involves research-based initiatives surrounding faculty development, diversity, and positive departmental climates
- Programs and initiatives are for all faculty
ADVANCE Team

**Leadership Team**

- Co-Director: Robin Andreasen, Professor and Interim Chair, Linguistics & Cognitive Science
- Co-Director: Heather Doty, Associate Professor, Mechanical Engineering
- Research Director: Shawna Vican, Assistant Professor, Sociology & Criminal Justice

**ADVANCE Faculty Fellows, Spring 2024**

- Peter Benson, Professor and Chair, Anthropology
- Jennifer Biddle, Professor, Marine Science & Policy
- Kaila Draper, Professor, Philosophy
- Andrea Everard, Professor, Management Information Systems, Associate Dean
- Carly Pacanowski, Associate Professor, Health Behavior & Nutrition Sciences
Today’s Goal & Agenda

**Goal:** Discuss how chairs can support improvement in the 2- and 4-year peer review processes as a means of clarifying P&T procedures and expectations.

**Agenda:**

1. Highlight research findings on UD faculty’s experiences of P&T
2. Discussions: how chairs can help
3. Wrap-up and recommendations
Background: 2020 COACHE Survey

UD faculty express low levels of satisfaction with P&T policies and clarity of expectations
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UD | Peers
In-depth interviews w/ recently promoted UD T/TT associate professors:
Research questions:
  • To what extent do UD faculty experience clarity in P&T processes and expectations?
  • How do faculty learn norms surrounding P&T processes & expectations?
  • To what extent do 2-/4-year reviews help to clarify P&T processes & expectations?
Key findings related to P&T:
• Consistent with the COACHE results, respondents report lack of clarity on P&T processes and expectations
• Faculty outside the norm in their departments were especially affected
  Interdisciplinarity, atypical workload or methodology, split lines
• Respondents expressed concerns about subjectivity and potential for bias
2-/4-Year Peer Review and P&T

The FHB suggests that peer review should be a mechanism for helping to clarify P&T, and that chairs can play a role

“Since promotion and tenure recommendations are heavily dependent on peer evaluations, it is essential that candidates have early indications from their colleagues regarding their progress in the areas of teaching, research, and creative activity, and service. The chair's role in these latter activities is to facilitate and coordinate the processes and to provide leadership wherever appropriate.”

--UD Faculty Handbook 4.3.5
UD ADVANCE Research Findings, Peer Review

- Lack of clarity in procedures and expectations for peer review (and P&T)
- Inconsistency within and across units in processes and depth of peer review
- Significant reliance on institutional memory
- More clarity experienced by faculty in departments with more robust peer review processes
- Written peer review feedback is often mild and not useful
- Key information is often communicated through informal mechanisms
Formalizing 2-/4-Year Review Procedures

• Our research suggests that peer review can help faculty understand the procedures and expectations surrounding P&T if it is conducted intentionally.

• We want to get you thinking about how to create more clarity and to encourage you to create standardized processes for 2-/4-year review.

• Written protocols are important for equity. They reduce reliance on institutional memory and ensure that all faculty have access to the same information.

How many departments have these already?
Resource for Chairs

Designed to help departments create/update written guidelines for peer review by posing questions for consideration on topics such as:

- peer review evaluation criteria
- metrics for measuring success
- materials to be reviewed
- departmental communication with candidates
- feedback given to candidates
Table Discussion 1

P&T documents are often circumscribed in terms of what is required to meet the standards for tenure and promotion.

- To what extent do your department’s 2-/4-year peer reviews help to clarify standards?

- What materials are submitted for peer review in your department? Are they sufficient to conduct a fair and thorough review? Do they take into consideration the candidate’s workload?
Table Discussion 2

Through our research we learned that many faculty did not find feedback from their 2-/4-year reviews helpful.

- In your department, what type of post-review feedback does the candidate typically receive? Is it sufficient to help them grow and improve?

- What are the pros and cons of putting the feedback in writing? Does/should your department rely on other formal mechanisms for feedback?
Workshops for UD Faculty Review Committees

- Hired
- 2-year peer review
- 4-year peer review
- Candidate initiates the process
- Materials sent to letter writers
- Submits dossier
- Committee Reviews
- Promoted

Workshop 1, Spring 2024
Strategies to foster smooth and transparent evaluation processes

Workshop 2, Fall 2024
Mitigating against evaluation errors or biases
Conclusion: Recommendations

- Formalize departmental processes for peer review (and P&T).
- Write them in an internal document available to all faculty.
- Make sure new faculty are made aware of them, and chairs/review committees should reference them in communications to faculty being reviewed.
- Faculty review committees should meet early in the process to make sure all committee members are up to speed on the procedures and evaluation guidelines.
Workshop Takeaway

Take a minute to write down one thing that you plan to take back to your department to address the goal of leveraging 2-/4-year reviews as a means of clarifying the P&T process.
ADVANCE Resources for Chairs

UD ADVANCE has developed several resources for department chairs. These include:

- Fostering Inclusive Department Climates
- Faculty Retention Manual
- Faculty Recruitment Manual

How can ADVANCE support you in your role as chair?
Thank you!

ud-advance@udel.edu

www.udel.edu/advance
Update from AI Working Group

Spring Chair’s Workshop, March 2024
This AI Moment

This is a moment of imminent, profound change in the human experience—especially regarding our relationship with knowledge.

• We are currently teaching the last cohorts of students with a foot in both worlds.
• There is a worrisome gap between student and faculty experience with AI.
• AI is not a calculator.
• This is not like the pandemic.
Takeaways from the APLU

• Discussion of the impact of AI on the enterprise of undergraduate instruction at a time when public support is weakening.
• Focus on the importance of a coordinated institutional effort to embrace AI for research, teaching, learning, and business practices. Will require top-down, bottom-up, and middle-out effort.
• Concern about the gap between faculty uptake and student use
• A few universities have made eye-popping investments, including Florida ($75M from NVIDIA), SUNY-Albany ($75M from State of NY), and ASU (partnership with OpenAI).
How Can We Respond?

Inaction is irresponsible.

Acquisition of knowledge is no longer just about content—process will become an important focus.

We need experimentation informed by conversation and guidance.
Two conversations

Shaun Tan *The Arrival*

Seminar recordings, reports
Sharing Expertise across campus

**Faculty:**
- Electrical & Computer Engineering
- Philosophy
- Education
- Human Development & Family Sciences
- Business Administration

**Administrators:**
- Provost and Vice Provost

**Staff**
- Community Standards & Conflict Resolution
- Library, Museums & Press
- Center for Teaching & Assessment of Learning
- Career Services
Key insights

1. There is much demystifying to do around these tools and to determine the level of expertise needed to be a truly critical and proficient user.
2. Educators need access to tools and support to help them appropriately judge the tool’s appropriateness for a given use, and to model appropriate use for students.
3. Some uses of AI pose higher risks than others, both to society and to individuals, and educators must exercise critical judgement to ascertain which uses pose minimal risks and maximum benefit.
4. Transparency surrounding expectations regarding generative AI use is critical.
5. AI use in the classroom is deeply contextual and tied to the learning goals of the course as well as the changing reality of these tools within the workforce.
Attendance by College
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“I'm hoping that this becomes a call for the kinds of conversations we need to be having as these tools are developing. What are the pros and cons of using AI in this context or in this context? What are the rules of engagement and how broadly are they shared?” - Provost Carlson
More Conversations: Ithaka S&R Study

Guiding Questions:
How can AI literacy be defined so it's meaningful and accessible for students and faculty in different disciplines with different career goals?
What skills or knowledge are required for everyone? Advanced users? Experts?
What do faculty need to do this well?
Current UD AI-related Guidance
Current UD AI-related Guidance

1. CTAL’s “Considerations for using and addressing advanced automated tools in coursework and assignments”
   a. https://ctal.udel.edu/advanced-automated-tools/

2. AI for Teaching and Learning’s “Considerations for Integrating AI Within Teaching and Learning”
   a. https://www.udel.edu/home/artificial-intelligence/
   b. https://www.udel.edu/content/dam/udellImages/artificial-intelligence/Considerations_for_Integrating_AI_Within_Teaching_and_Learning.pdf
CTAL’s Considerations

Key features include example course policies related to AI and example syllabus language for each different policy.

**Course policies**

In each course, at least four possible approaches seem plausible in terms of student use of these tools:

1. Prohibit all use of these tools
2. Allow their use only with prior permission
3. Allow their use only with explicit acknowledgement
4. Freely allow their use

Each approach is discussed below with some thoughts and considerations; possible syllabus language for each approach is included in a separate section below. Regardless of the approach selected, faculty should explicitly **discuss with students the approach and its underlying rationale.**

If use of these tools is prohibited, limited, or must be documented, faculty should also consider if they should include an explicit reminder about plagiarism and whether use or misuse of these tools would be considered plagiarism.
CTAL’s Considerations (cont.)

Other helpful sections include:

1. Talking with students about AI

2. Examples of assignments

3. Detecting the use of AI tools
   a. ***big idea: instructors should not rely exclusively on these tools because they are not sufficiently reliable (too many false positives).
AI for Teaching and Learning’s “Considerations”

Purposes of this document are to:

1. Provide a rationale for why instructors should embrace AI within T + L
   a. AI can improve education
   b. AI is increasingly become prevalent within society and the workplace
   c. Instruction and engagement will lead to awareness of risks and position the next generation to appropriately use and develop AI tools

2. Offer general key considerations for instructors to guide their integration of AI within instruction

3. Stimulate conversations that result in utilizing or adapting these considerations when creating unit- or discipline-specific AI-in-education policy documents.
AI for TL “Considerations” (cont.)

Key Considerations

1. Human-Centered
   a. AI within teaching and learning should be “human centered”
   b. Educators should be “in the loop,” remaining responsible for teaching and educational decision making

2. Transparent
   a. Educators should make their expectations regarding learners' use/non-use of AI explicit
   b. Educators should make their own use of AI tools transparent
3. Ethical
   a. Educators should consider issues of access, equity, bias, and fairness when using AI within teaching and learning
   b. AI use should be aligned with policies and practices protecting learners’ data and privacy
   c. The greater the consequences, the more educator expertise, knowledge, and involvement is necessary

4. Educationally effective
   a. Use of AI within teaching and learning should be aligned with best practices in instruction and theories of how we learn
   b. Effective use of AI requires some explicit instruction in the use of AI
Discussion (10 min)
Given the considerations outlined for integrating AI within teaching and learning, how can your department or unit specifically adapt and apply these principles to develop discipline-specific guidance?

- Consider the unique needs, opportunities, and challenges within your discipline.
- Discuss potential strategies to ensure AI tools enhance learning outcomes, maintain educational integrity, and address any ethical and equity concerns specific to your field.
- Key elements to bear in mind: human-centered approach, transparency, ethical considerations, and educational effectiveness.
Begin to think about where your area is on this continuum.
This framework is self-reinforcing. Experimentation naturally leads to more discussion. Scalable to the programmatic level.
What if?

AI-generated self-portrait of Jevonia Harris, Educational Software Engineering Team Lead in UDIT Academic Technology Services.
UD Study AiDE

The Origins

A team assembles

powered by AWS
Our progress to date

UD Study AiDE

Development
UD StudyAiDE: Developing an AI-Powered Study Companion for Student Success

UD StudyAiDE, the University of Delaware’s emerging pilot project, uses OpenAI technology for the benefit of student success. We are training a private, internal large language model with our faculty intellectual property so our students can generate personalized learning experiences. This project leverages two decades of videos from our proprietary lecture capture system, Canvas content, and course materials. The generated output includes individualized study guides, practice exercises, worked examples, and more.
The word spreads

Speaking engagements
The word spreads

Conversations

across higher ed
UD Study AiDE
Potential & Growth
Experimentation

How can we foster experimentation at the program level?

Example: Lerner Graduate Certificate
Generative AI in Business

Introduction to Generative AI

Every day, GenAI is transforming business in ways we’ve never imagined. From Stable Diffusion for image generation and ChatGPT for conversational text generation, this groundbreaking technology has rapidly evolved, expanded and significantly revolutionized the way business is conducted worldwide.

GenAI is an essential foundational technology for business. Professionals from every sector will need to embrace GenAI to improve efficiency and effectiveness of operations and understand the ethical implications to stay ahead of the curve.

This course will help you navigate GenAI to create an innovative strategy for your organization. You’ll understand the intersection of the technology, platforms and large language models of GenAI and how this can help you be more effective and strategic in your business.

No prior background in analytics, computer science or machine learning is required.

ABOUT THE GRADUATE COURSE
This three credit course is designed to equip you with a robust understanding and practical skills in applying GenAI technologies. Upon successful completion of the course, you’ll earn credits toward a UD graduate business degree. It includes demonstrations and case studies across various business domains, including marketing, finance, information technology, and operation management.

What You'll Learn
- Understanding of the key areas in GenAI
- Basic knowledge on industry best practices on GenAI applications and implementations
- Practical skills on prompt engineering, text2image and image2image
- Awareness of current GenAI challenges and issues

COURSE SCHEDULE
7 weeks, April 1 – May 17, 2024
Tuesdays and Thursdays, 5:30 – 8 pm
On-campus (Newark, Section 050) or
Online-synchronous (Zoom, Section 052)

COURSE REGISTRATION
This course is open to anyone interested in generative AI. Non-University of Delaware students should speak to a member of our MBA and Graduate Business Programs Admissions team to be enrolled or with additional questions.

QUESTIONS?
Patrick Cahill  Bishakha Choudhuri
Director, Admission and  Admissions
Recruitment  Specialist
pcahill@udel.edu  bchoudhuri@udel.edu
Goal: Foster experimentation among faculty while improving AI literacy

Audience: “AI Curious faculty”

Purpose:
- Increase comfort level
- Provide suggestions and structuring (scaffolding) resources
- Informal discussion group and sandbox sessions
- Low stakes
- Safe space
Reimagining PedAlgogy: AI Literacy for Educators

Our comprehensive professional development series aims to equip teaching faculty with AI knowledge and skills relevant for higher education. Through hands-on prompting challenges, facilitated experiments with AI models, and guidance from experts, participants will gain strategic insights and practical toolkits to responsibly leverage AI in their classrooms and research.

The learning journey includes:

- Interactive literacy workshops covering AI fundamentals and implications for equitable, ethical teaching and learning
- Creating AI-powered educational resources with guided prompting of leading language models
- Hands-on learning labs for experimenting with diverse AI capabilities in writing, graphics, audio and video
- Watch parties to learn from experts advancing innovative AI solutions for higher-ed

Participant learning journey outcomes:

- Create AI-enabled educational resources like quizzes, assignments, chatbots using leading language models as virtual assistants.
- Analyze capabilities and limitations of prevalent AI writing assistants, art generators, voice/video synthers by actively investigating differences in accuracy, nuance, and responsible creation in learning labs.
- Remember emerging applications and evaluate implications of AI innovations in higher education with participation through a calendar of webinar events and applying critical thinking skills in guided discussions.
Discussion

Where is your department today?
Where could you be a year from now?
What do you need to get there?