

## Appendix A- Faculty Senate endorsements of Task Force recommendations

### I. Task Force on Artificial Intelligence

#### a. **Strategic Planning & Policy**

- i. Establish a Generative AI Advisory Committee (GAIAC) to monitor AI advancements, advise on AI best practices, and provide strategic guidance.
- ii. Ensure the committee includes key stakeholders: senior academic leaders, faculty with AI expertise, and representatives from CTLD, ITS, Student Affairs, as well as other relevant departments.
- iii. Regularly schedule reviews and updates of policies and procedures to guide students, faculty, and staff towards the ethical, legal, and safe use of AI in learning, teaching, and professional activities. o Initially, review *Procedure 2005-Student Academic Honesty, 4200- Acceptable Usage Standards of Computing and Communication Technology, and I-55-Campus Conduct Code*.
- iv. Provide resources and technical support for university-wide and on-request AI tool subscriptions and innovation.
- v. Review program offerings and workflows to determine if and how they can be adapted to the possibilities of AI aligned to Stockton's vision, mission, strategic plan, and leadership priorities.
- vi. Strategically align and allocate resources to enhance collaboration across various divisions and departments.

#### b. **Teaching & Curriculum Development**

- i. Provide resources, funding, and adjusted workloads for faculty to familiarize themselves with GAI tools and consider appropriate use in teaching, service, research, and other professional activities.
- ii. Faculty should offer students clear guidance on expected use or nonuse of AI in each course where AI might potentially be utilized. Faculty may use the syllabus statements on GAI offered by CTLD.
- iii. Faculty are advised to provide students with supportive training on the use of AI that is discipline specific and/or relevant to a specific course.
- iv. It is not recommended to use the results from any currently available AI tool as evidence of academic integrity violations, until accurate and reliable AI tools are made available.
- v. Each program should conduct curricula review to explore opportunities for integrating AI, ensuring that our offerings align with current technological trends and workforce demands.

#### c. **Training and Professional Development**

- i. Provide resources to support training and professional development activities for faculty, staff, and students to increase awareness, safety, ethical use, digital/AI literacy skills, and AI innovation.
- ii. Provide resources to the Center for Teaching & Learning Design (CTLD) to work collaboratively with other relevant departments and programs to create professional development opportunities for faculty and develop resources related to GAI.
- iii. CTLD should regularly update the GAI resource website for teaching and learning to keep pace with advancements in AI technology.

- iv. Allocate resources to the Office of Human Resources or other relevant departments to provide GAI training and support for staff.
- d. **Research & Entrepreneurship**
  - i. Richard E. Bjork Library should develop and regularly update a digital knowledge and resource hub on the website that houses a collection of research support resources designated for faculty, staff, and students to utilize when researching with or about AI.
  - ii. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP) should collaborate with other relevant departments and programs to seek opportunities for AI grants, entrepreneurship, and research and development activities.

*It is important to note that due to the limited timeframe of the task force and the rapid evolution of AI technology, our recommendations may not be comprehensive and could require updates. Therefore, the task force emphasizes the importance of forming the Generative AI Advisory Committee to continuously monitor AI advancements and offer guidance on policies and practices at Stockton.*

- II. Task Force on Stockton's Approach to Precepting
  - a. To address basic workload fairness, we recommend that any preceptor with an unequitable number of preceptees be compensated beyond the normal expected load of full-time faculty. For example, if the number exceeds 40 preceptees then the faculty member should be compensated with an additional 1 tch. Tiers of compensation could be set up based on the additional load. Exact numbers would have to be negotiated between the union and the university. *Workload should consider the type and number of students, as this varies based upon undergraduate or graduate students.*
  - b. We recommend that faculty be given academic freedom in determining the modality and format of their own precepting. Clearly from the data students and faculty prefer flexible modalities. We argue that faculty know their respective students best and should be trusted to choose the modality that they see fit. Precepting is teaching, and making blanket rules about precepting modalities is counteractive and does not reflect student needs.
  - c. Programs should be allowed to choose precepting solutions that fit their program needs. For example, Education program faculty should be allowed to precept in groups or in any other effective way. Again, we argue that faculty should be allowed academic freedom in addressing student needs.
- III. Task Force on Stockton: The Next 50 Years and Beyond
  - a. The Task Force and Stockton at large, should not make any specific denaming or renaming recommendations without having first been guided by a set of clearly articulated principles on renaming that should include well-established guidelines and policies for the renaming procedures and processes. Following on from the previous point, the Stockton University President should consider creating a committee to articulate principles on denaming and renaming. Finally, in its future denaming and renaming projects, Stockton University should adopt a two-tiered approach, with one committee laying out guiding principles on renaming and another making recommendations for renaming.

b. Further Consideration of the Name and Other Alternative Responses

Once procedures for naming are established, we believe that the University should undertake a serious consideration of its name and the implications of having spent fifty years honoring an enslaver who is also associated with the contentious accusation of being a traitor. To explore the name change effectively, several steps will need to be implemented. These include investigating potential new names and assessing their financial and perceptual implications; engaging stakeholders in discussions and gathering feedback on proposed name changes; developing a comprehensive plan for transitioning to a new name, including rebranding efforts and communication strategies.

Additionally, other responses should be considered regardless of whether or not the institution is renamed. These may include, but are not limited to: issuing a formal statement denouncing slavery and its legacies; acknowledging the error of naming the school after an enslaver; clearly articulating the naming policies and processes that will guide future decisions and ensure alignment with institutional values; integrating programming that educates and raises awareness about the institution's historical context and commitment to diversity and inclusion; and, establishing an academic center dedicated to studying race relations in South Jersey and New Jersey as a whole.

Given that the current task force's deliberations have been inconclusive regarding supporting or opposing a name change, external review will be necessary to assist in future deliberations. This will entail hiring independent external reviewers to conduct a thorough analysis of the issues surrounding the current name and potential implications of a name change, and to lead focus groups and other means of ascertaining community sentiment. The findings of the external review will be utilized to inform future decision-making processes and potential actions regarding the institution's name.

- c. Other Points for Consideration Results from the survey of faculty, staff, and students suggested that opinion is divided over the name of our university. Moving towards a more conclusive result, therefore, would require carrying out focus groups. These groups would allow people to gain a greater appreciation of community members' opinions and facilitate further education on the issues at hand. Many of those who the survey results suggested felt most clearly the need for a change, also feel disaffected in other ways (as shown in the climate survey and "The Other Stockton"). Those who feel this way have come to expect that these issues will not be considered seriously. Consequently, they would not commit to a task force of this nature believing that a lot of work would be undertaken, and the results would be shelved and ignored. This sentiment was shown to be fairly accurate when the former President of the University announced in a local newspaper article that the name would not be changed. From that point on, the belief that this work was an exercise in futility likely affected participation and commitment. In short, if a task force is created in the future, it should receive the support of the administration so that it can do its job unencumbered by external influences.

IV. Task Force on the Stockton Institute of Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET)

- a. The current SIPET model is strong
  - 1. It accomplishes its purpose
  - 2. Participants perceive high value, impact, and confidence in peer evaluation skills
  - 3. Junior faculty members want peer evaluators to be trained
  - 4. The three-day intensive summer session is successful and should be retained
  - 5. The MoA should be updated to reflect the current model
- b. SIPET could reduce the burden on peer evaluators
  - 1. Qualitative comments repeatedly indicated that peer evaluations are overly time consuming, which contributes to the high number of refusals experienced by junior faculty.
- c. SIPET should seek to incorporate methods that streamline reports, making the writing process more efficient and faster while also appreciating and respecting individuality of faculty members
- d. SIPET could seek ways to increase the impact on the following activities/discussions
  - 1. Writing sample observation reports
  - 2. Post-observation practices
  - 3. Evaluating online, studio and laboratory courses
- e. SIPET could reach more faculty members in the following ways:
  - 1. Greater encouragement of faculty participation by Provost, Deans, Chairs (more frequent reminders, direct requests)
  - 2. Implement short, focused sessions throughout the year
  - 3. Increase the SIPET participant stipend to include compensation for the four required evaluations.
- f. SIPET could be expanded to empower junior faculty
  - 1. Training sessions should be offered to junior faculty that give them control over the direction of their peer evaluations and the content, such as including pre-and post-evaluation meetings.
  - 2. Junior faculty can contribute to training peer evaluators who are unable or unwilling to do SIPET