THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE Graduate School

Graduate Board
Thursday, February 29, 2024
57 Stodder Hall

12:30-2:00 pm

AGENDA

1. Review/approval of the January 25, 2024 Graduate Board minutes

2. Review/approval of the February 6, 2024 Curriculum Committee report

3. Announcements/updates
   - Staff leaves
   - Graduate School financial awards
   - Commencement update
   - Graduate assistantship budget
   - Graduate student workers union collective bargaining update

4. TA Orientation discussion – Karen Pelletreau

5. DRAFT AI guidelines and discussion - Sheridan Kelley

6. Continued discussion of English language requirement for applicants seeking funding

7. Graduate Faculty appointments (held over from the January 25 meeting)

8. Items arising

THE UNIVERSITY OF MAINE Graduate School

Graduate Board
Thursday, January 25, 2023
57 Stodder Hall

12:30-2:00 pm

AGENDA
Meeting called to order: 12:30PM

Attendance:
P. Agrrawal, C. Beitl, T. Bowden, M.Camire, G. Cox, J.Chiarell, S. Delcourt, D. Dryer, K. Evans, A. Foster, M. Gardner, A. Goupee, D. Granke, A. Gray, E. Landis, A. Knowles, C. Marzilli, S. Nittel, P. Rahimzadeh-Bajgiran, L.Rickard, F. Rondeau, D. Sandweiss, T Schwartz, N. Micinski, T. Crisp, R. Wheeler, S. Wright, T. Yoo

Zoom Attendance:
K. Varahramyan, E. Allan, M. Brichacek, G. Schwieterman, N. Emanetoglu, S. Butler, R. Roberts, A. Gardner, R. MacAulay, J. Riccardi, J. Artesani, N. O'Reilly, J. Gill, P.Libby

Guests:
Katy Blackmer, Graduate Recruiter
Fiona Libby, Director of Graduate Recruitment

1. Review and approval of the November 30, 2023 Graduate Board minutes
    - Dan Sandweiss – added to attendance list
    - Motion to accept – Mary Ellen
    - 2nd – Dan Sandweiss
    - Unanimous approval – with Meghan Gardner & Greg Cox abstaining
2. Welcome new members
    - Greg Cox -GSBSE
    - Frederic Rondeau –Modern Languages and Classics
    - Tyrone Crisp - Mathematics

3. Recognition of Sandy Butler – Distinguished Maine Professor 2024

4. Review and approval of the December 5, 2023 and January 16, 2024 Graduate Curriculum Committee reports

    S. Delcourt mentioned that the December Curriculum committee report had inadvertently been sent to the Office of Student Records prior to Graduate Board approval, so retroactive approval is requested.

January 16, 2024 Curriculum Committee Report

New Courses:

- KPE 533 Therapeutic Interventions III
- MAT 559 Advanced Ordinary Differential Equations
- SFR 510 Forest Operations Finance
- SVT 513 Advanced Studies in Boundary Law

Modifications:

- EDT 520 Digital Age Teaching and Learning Methods
- ENG 545 American Literature at the *Fin de Siecle*
- IMD 561 Research Studio II: Projects in Collaborative Production
- LMS 515 Dynamic PK-12 Library Management

December 5, 2023 Curriculum Committee Report

New Courses:

- ELL 576 Curriculum and Assessment in ESL
- ERL 531 Linguistic Diversity, Multilingualism, and the Classroom
- ERL 572 Language and Linguistics
- NUR 562 Quality and Safety in Healthcare

Modifications:

- ERL 601 Seminar in Reading

Motion to approve- Dan Sandweiss
2nd – Colleen Marzilli
No abstentions – unanimous approval of the January 25 minutes

5. Announcements/updates
    - Graduate School - Round 2 nominations due 2/2/24
        i. Round 1 (fellowships and assistantships) – generally for later stage doctoral students, although shared TAs are open to master's level students. The Chase and Waldron award nominees have been ranked and will be finalized soon.
        ii. Round 2 (Trustee, Thurgood & Atlantic Provinces scholarships) - open to both current and new students.

    - Fall 2024 admissions offers with financial support – Senior administration is dealing with a large FY 25 structural deficit which may involve reducing the overall number of assistantships. Financial commitments to current graduate students will be honored. Graduate School is trying to reduce impact to current students as well as to the overall funding available to graduate students.
        i. Anne Knowles asked - When will the decision be made? Scott replied the final decision is long overdue given the stage of the admission cycle. Departments should consult with their college deans. The Graduate school recommends that any new financial commitments be made to qualified doctoral degree applicants first.
        ii. Keith Evans asked for clarity around those departments who only have master's students. Scott replied that the University recognizes that some programs are master's only programs and that assistantships are also

required for the functioning of these programs The University seeks to rebalance the distribution of doctoral and master's assistantships, but not eliminate all master's assistantships. Again, the college deans are the best source for any potential changes in TAs within ach college.

iii. Rob Wheeler asked for clarification regarding TA, RA, GA – Scott explained that there are 302 positions held in the Graduate School, which are TAs and MAFES RAs. However, all university-funded assistantships are being reviewed with a focus on administrative assistantship as opposed to TAs or RAs.

iv. Terry Yoo asked about Thurgood Marshall & other scholarships – and Scott noted they are likely safe from budget cuts, so the nomination process for AY 24-5 awards is continuing.

v. Keith Evans asked how many assistantship lines are we talking about. Scott suggested that the total number will depend on what can be afforded within the FY 25 budget reduction, so there is no specific number.

vi. Mary Ellen Camire – asked about Flagship fellowships – Scott stated that these would likely not be subject to cuts as these are funded through the UM System.

vii. Jacquelyn Gill asked about the cuts – and how units carrying TA's for critical courses – i.e. Biology 101

1. PhD students are more expensive to support than Masters
2. How to meet commitments to students & start up packages

VPR Varahramyan responded that growth in PhD enrollment is very important to the University's R1 ranking. S. Delcourt added that the college deans are looking at existing commitments, so that these funding commitments should not be in jeopardy.

Bangor Savings Bank Faculty Development Fund – Terry Yoo stated that he was told that the fund was depleted, and funds are not available this year. Scott Delcourt will check with Associate Provost for Faculty Development Gabe Paquette to see if he has heard anything.

- Graduate student workers union collective bargaining update –the bargaining teams met on December 20 and January 18, with additional meeting scheduled for February 7-8 and February 29. A link to the Graduate Workers Union website is included in the agenda for those who are interested in what items have been discussed to date.

- English proficiency requirements for graduate applicants – Fiona Libby

i. Fiona Libby – influx of International applications – especially students who took their instruction in English, but do not meet the score requirements. The Graduate School is proposing to require any applicant looking for funding to submit a passing English proficiency test in order to apply for any graduate assistantship. (Exceptions would be students who studied in: UK, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Ireland).

ii. Nearly 60% of our applications for fall 2024 are international, so the number of applications that are being processed with requiring official English scores is substantial which places a burden on the program and the Graduate School with regard to responding to questions about funding. It is anticipated that this change would cut down on those inquiries.

iii. Change in protocol would be announced widely 1 month before rolling out & Graduate School would share recommended language to respond to applicants.
iv. There would be some opportunity to assist financially with DuoLingo testing if needed for high priority recruits.
v. Laura Rickard – concerned about offering discounts or free DuoLingo when we cannot waive the application fee. Scott replied that both represent costs to the applicant. However, waiving one or both would likely increase the volume of applications, especially those who are seeking funding.
vi. Pank asked about whether we could video interview as a supplement.
vii. Meghan Gardner – concerned about the volume of applications and whether that would be feasible.

6. Discussion with Vice President and Dean Varahramyan regarding UMaine's R1 ranking and support for the University's research and graduate missions
    - Where are the needs and opportunities?
    - Questions provided in advance:
        i. What are the values / benefits of being designated as R1?
            1. Some benefits are broader and some are not realized immediately.
            2. Why should UMaine be an R1 vs. an R2?
            3. We want to have the best possible research university for our State. R1 is one way that excellence is measured for universities nationwide.
            4. The Maine government appreciates what UMaine has contributed to the State – and the R1 status helps to remind the State of our contributions.
            5. Faculty benefits – added benefits for faculty seeking research funding. R1 universities are considered differently in the research proposal process.
            6. Better resources and funding for faculty, salaries, etc…
            7. Recruitment & retention of faculty.

        ii. What is the criteria for designation of R1 vs. R2
            1. Simplified after Nov 1 – previously based on 8 parameters. Now based on just 2 parameters.
                a. HERD Survey – Research Expenditures above $50 million (We are at 3.5x this requirement)
                b. Total number of research doctoral graduates required per year is 70. We are borderline on this number. They can use a 3-year average in the 2025 classification – but going forward, we must be at 70 or above. Our current 3-year average is 70.3 for the 2025 ranking. Next classification will be in 2028.
                STEM vs. Social Sciences vs. Humanities – currently all doctoral degrees count toward the goal. We should be a comprehensive university where all disciplines are important.

                Terry Yoo – asked which doctoral degrees are counted. UMaine grants PhD's & EdD's – both are reported to IPEDS in the research doctorate numbers.

Richard Roberts asked about online doctoral programs – D. Eng. doctoral program in surveying engineering. This program would likely not be considered a research doctorate given the research expectations outlined in the program proposal. This is much more of a professional degree.

Anne Knowles – how does the drive for R1 status affect the need for faculty investments, etc…
VP Varahramyan relied with respect to priorities, as an R1 we can attract more resources from the State and can attract more students to enroll.
Where do the revenues go? Great tension between scarce resources and R1 status.
VP Varahramyan replied that resources are being distributed fairly. Many non-STEM programs received doctoral fellowship funding over the past few years.
The Vice President offered to meet with individual departments to discuss University support and barriers to growth.

Allie Gardner – question about the logic of shifting away from master's to PhD students – feels short sighted. There are lots of advantages of having strong master's programs – it is what draws students in – and sometimes they end up staying on for PhD programs. We get many strong, qualified applicants because we are able to offer support to master's students. It is part of the pipeline for how we can attract students.

Jacquelyn Gill – School of Biology & Ecology – robust master's program that services many state agencies, etc… Master's level students are critical to faculty tenure – often a faster process as their programs take 2-3 years vs. 5-6 years for PhD programs. TA allocations will impact long term results and tenure tracks, etc… New faculty are coming in feeling like they are set up to fail. We're barely on par with 4-year colleges for startup packages, and that was true when we were R2. I understand the budget considerations, and I know that these are hard questions. I think a lot of us are trying to understand why some of these decisions are being made and how they align with our vision of being an R1 institution.

VP Varahramyan replied that in order to keep the University's R1 ranking, we must focus on doctoral students first. However, the Graduate School is looking at the number of students who begin in master's programs and remain for doctoral study. Stress that there is no plan to eliminate all master's funding –just to redistribute the

funding between doctoral and master's students to be more in line with peer institutions.

Where should the cuts be made? Faculty would like to see more administrative lines cut. However, UMaine is still underfunded relative to peer research universities.
What is the right balance? Most significant investment in administrative positions is at the UMS-level. The Graduate School and VPR have increased staff but in response to faculty needs to help with graduate student recruitment, admissions, and student support, as well as with pre- and post-processing of research proposals. Relatively small investment benefits a large number of programs and faculty.

VPR would like to be invited to a faculty meeting to address the faculty directly with regard to these issues and to hear feedback. As the research enterprise has grown, we are going to continue to become bigger and better by joining forces and working together. Trying to see the glass half-full and appreciate how far we have come in a relatively short time.

iii. What are the ramifications of losing R1 status?
    1. Impact to external funding & support
    2. Ability to recruit students nationally and internationally.

7. Discussion of Graduate Faculty appointments/reappointments
    Pari brought this up – we will table to the next meeting.
    Is there a way of streamlining the appointment process?
    In programs where faculty are limited, can faculty from other UMS universities be appointed as Graduate Faculty.

8. 3MT competition has begun and the participants will be meeting soon. However, if someone is interested, please reach out to Aylah Ireland ASAP.

9. Items arising

Meeting Adjourned – 2:03PM

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE REPORT

The Curriculum Committee met on February 6th, 2024 and is recommending the following courses to the Graduate Board for approval at its February 29th meeting.

New Courses:

ERL 554 Literacy Processing: How Students Learn to Read

FSN 539 Probiotics in food: Formulation and Function

KPE 661 Current Topics in Athletic Training Practice

KPE 681 Leadership and Management in Athletic Training

TO: Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Academic Affairs

FROM: The University Teaching Council

DATE: February 2, 2024

RE: Draft Guidelines for Generative AI Use in Teaching and Learning at UMaine

---

With the support of the UMaine Provost, we submit the linked DRAFT UMaine AI Guidelines for Teaching & Learning for comment and consideration. Our hope is that the UMaine Faculty Senate will consider adopting guidelines for the use of generative AI in teaching and learning at UMaine.

At its first meeting of this academic year the University Teaching Council formed a task force to draft guidelines for the use of AI in instruction. Over the course of the fall 2023 semester the faculty, staff, administrators, and, when possible, student members of this task force met eight times and together drafted UMaine's first guidelines for addressing generative AI for teaching and learning. As part of this effort, and with the help of OIRA, we surveyed all UMaine instructors teaching this semester. In addition, CITL and Library staff met bi-monthly to discuss developments, CITL ran a faculty Community of Practice focused on the use of generative AI in teaching, the Task Force assessed guidelines and practices at other universities in the United States as well as coordinated with UMaine's AI Research group, and, finally, we experimented with a range of generative AI services.

Some of the principal issues the task force sought to accommodate in these guidelines include:

- The rapidity with which generative AI is evolving and expanding
- The central roles and potential roles generative AI will play in scholarship, research, work, communication, media, and education at all levels.
- The varying ways faculty and students will utilize generative AI in high school, college, and graduate courses.
- The role AI may play in supporting neurodiverse students as well as students for whom the language of instruction is not their first language.
- The epistemological shifts generative AI is causing in many if not most fields of study.
- The need for the University to provide all members of the learning community with equitable access to generative AI tools and services as an essential tool in their education.
- The importance of academic honesty.

The results of the faculty survey demonstrate a range of approaches and perspectives relative to AI and teaching. For example, almost the same percentage of faculty include an explicit statement about the use of AI in their syllabus as those who do not discuss AI with their classes at all. Faculty who allow or want students to use and/or assess AI, generally want the students

to describe the ways they used it. A significant percentage indicated that they are in an exploratory stage with regard to AI's role in teaching and learning.

We fully anticipate that the UTC will need to update and revise these guidelines regularly as use of generative AI in education matures.

Task Force Members:

Sheridan Adams (chair) Gabe Paquette Scott Marzilli Sue Sullivan Jon Ippolito	Lindsay Decker David Fiacco Mia Morrison Peter Schilling Riley Mills (student)

Draft Document for UMaine Guidelines: Teaching, Learning, and Artificial Intelligence

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

In this document we discuss **generative artificial intelligence** (generative AI) services and tools. These tools and services can enhance and even automate the creation of content based on a body of existing data and queries. They can be used to create text, code, images, video, sounds, and more. These models use datasets and algorithms to discern patterns and structure to create new content that has a statistically similar structure. As we experiment with these new resources we should also keep in mind associated privacy, security, legal, and ethical issues that may come with them.

Many industries use generative AI. In addition, software developers and online service providers are embedding AI in more and more products. A growing number of educators from middle school through doctoral programs now perceive roles for generative AI in teaching and learning, particularly, in developing instructional materials as well as in students' completion of assignments and assessments.

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This document establishes guidelines for the ethical, secure, and responsible use of generative artificial intelligence technologies in the context of teaching and learning at the University of Maine. It provides a framework for all members of the UMaine teaching and learning community, which includes UMaine leadership, instructors, administrative staff, and students.

II. GUIDELINES STATEMENT

The University of Maine is committed to using AI technologies in an ethical, transparent, and responsible manner. We acknowledge that AI technologies have the potential to significantly enhance student learning and engagement, but we also recognize the importance of protecting student privacy and ensuring that the use of these technologies is consistent with ethical considerations. We are equally committed to preparing students to identify and critically evaluate biases or stereotypes that AI may propagate.

The use of AI technologies in our school aligns with our mission to provide a high-quality education that prepares our students for success in the 21st century. AI technologies have the potential to support personalized learning and help teachers identify areas where students need extra support. They can also support research and writing activities and provide opportunities for students to develop skills related to critical thinking, problem-solving, and digital literacy. The University recognizes that an education in the 21st century includes generative AI literacy as well as proficiency in the use of a range of generative AI systems.

III. RESPONSIBILITIES

The following individuals and groups are responsible for the implementation and maintenance of these guidelines:

- UMaine leadership: responsible for providing resources, guidance, and support for the implementation of these guidelines
- Instructors: responsible for implementing these guidelines in their courses, including providing clear instruction on the ethical and responsible use of AI technologies by their students and teaching assistants.
- Administrative staff: responsible for ensuring that AI technologies are used in compliance with these guidelines, including data privacy and security policies.
- Students: responsible for using AI technologies in an ethical and responsible manner, as outlined in these guidelines and communicated to them by their instructors.

IV. ACCESS AND EQUITY

Equal access to reliable and credible generative AI tools and services will be instrumental in creating an inclusive learning environment for all UMaine students. These tools empower instructors and students, and can enrich educational opportunities, but it is also important to note that these tools may also contain biased and erroneous information. Additionally, they have the potential to retain and reuse private information. (See Data Privacy and Security, below.)

Generative AI services for use in instruction may, with requisite evaluation and approval, be licensed by the University, college, department, or be assigned at the course level as an instructional resource via the UMaine Bookstore.

It is also important to note that Generative AI can function as an accessibility resource, both for instructors and students.

V. DATA PRIVACY AND SECURITY

Existing University and University System data privacy and security policies also pertain to AI services when those services store or transmit information and data which may or should be protected. Consult Student Records for responsibilities relating to official educational records of students. The UMS has a specific policy and guidelines with regard to: Safeguarding FERPA Information when Using Cloud-based Resources in a Course Environment that governs the use of free and fee-based AI services as part of instruction. As vendors embed AI into their services, instructors must coordinate with UMS Information Technology (IT) to confirm that data protection protocols continue to be followed.

VI. THE USE OF AI IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

Academic departments, programs, and faculty committees, such as the General Education Committee, should determine the ways in which to incorporate generative AI in the curriculum in accordance with their targeted course, major, and/or minor outcomes.

Instructors should make clear statements in syllabi and/or relevant areas of online course shells in their learning management system about the ways students will use AI in the course as well as the ways the instructor will use AI. For example, instructor expectations and curricula relative to AI could fall into one of these categories:

- Require students to use AI
- Expect students to use AI to develop content and material to complete assignments
- Expect students to use AI to help them generate ideas or approaches for assignments

- Expect students to use AI as a means of studying AI in order to understand its capacities, identify the datasets it uses, evaluate its algorithms, etc.
- Use minimally to proofread or copy edit assignments to check grammar, syntax, clarity, and consistency
- Forbid use of AI

Students must acknowledge the use of generative AI any time they use it in the context of their process. (See Citation and Referencing, below.) As always, all student work should adhere to UMaine's established academic honesty policy. (See Academic Integrity, below)

If an instructor will require or expect students to use generative AI services in a class, the syllabus should indicate the type of tools or mediums they will use. Instructors should be clear about the costs of the use of the tool (if any) as well as any data privacy concerns that may be associated with the use of the tool.

Similarly, if the instructor uses generative AI services to prepare or teach any part of a course and/or to assess students' assignments, the syllabus and/or the catalog description of the course should indicate the type of tools or mediums the instructor uses.

Students should be informed if an instructor is using an AI tool to assess their work, and they should have the ability to opt-out to get direct feedback from the instructor. Any third party tools that use AI to assess student work should be properly vetted.

VII. CITATION AND REFERENCING

As mentioned in section VI. The Use of AI in Teaching and Learning, when AI tools are used by a student or an instructor in the context of their teaching and learning, they should acknowledge that use and it should be appropriately cited. Additionally:

- AI-generated material, whether it be quoted or paraphrased, should be cited according to the style assigned by the instructor.
- The most frequently used citation styles (MLA, APA, etc.) now include guidance on how to create citations for AI-generated materials. Fogler Library links to them on their How to Cite Your Sources Guide. Students and instructors citing AI-generated material can contact Fogler Library for further guidance.
- Failure to properly cite and acknowledge the use of AI-generated material will be considered plagiarism and subject to the disciplinary actions outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy.
- As an addendum to any assignment, instructors may require students to submit a document that explains how the student used generative AI in their work. At the discretion of the instructor, this document may contain a description of the tools

used, how each tool was used, specific prompts that were entered into the tool, how the tool and its resources were evaluated, how the work of the tool was incorporated into the final product submitted by the student, and any other relevant information.

VIII. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The UMS Academic Integrity Policy is the established and defensible process to manage accountability for academic integrity violations. Coupled with the UMS Student Conduct Code (identifies serious or multiple violations), accountability and imposition of effective educational interventions can be fully satisfied.

We also recognize that we work and study in an ever-changing educational landscape. Technological advances, expectations to fully collaborate with research partners, and the blurred lines between collaboration and cheating are issues that require us to adapt. Teaching and learning must adapt to account for the growing field of artificial intelligence, and we encourage the ethical and transparent use of artificial intelligence tools to support learning.

Educational modules should be developed and deployed to assist students with violations in advancing their understanding of academic integrity related to AI.

IX. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Investing in professional development for UMaine's teaching and learning community is critical to ensure we have an effective integration of generative AI technologies into our teaching and learning practices. It will be important not only to provide equitable access to Generative AI technologies, but to teach our instructors and students how to use them in responsible ways. Issues of bias and fairness, privacy, transparency and social impact should be discussed throughout.

It is expected that professional development opportunities will be provided by the Center of Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) for UMaine's instructors.

Instructional opportunities for students can occur within their existing courses, but there should also be opportunities for students to learn how to work with these tools outside of class. Understanding how AI can be used as a tool for students within the context of their coursework will be important, but learning how AI will be incorporated into their discipline or future jobs will also be necessary.

UMaine will need to provide a variety of resources and support in order to facilitate ongoing learning and development related to AI technologies. These may be best delivered through Fogler Library, IT or other campus resources.

X. REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE GUIDELINES

The University Teaching Council (UTC) is charged with keeping these guidelines current. At least once a year, the UTC, or a task force it forms, will assess these guidelines and, through any approach agreed upon by the UTC membership, determine if changes in services, practices, or some other variable has given cause for recommending to the Faculty Senate and the Provost amendments or updates to this guidelines. Between updates, members of the UMaine community are invited to share observations, concerns, or recommendations with the UTC.

English Proficiency Decision Tree