**ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE**

**Tuesday, February 4, 2021**

**3:30 PM**

**Google Meet**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Laura Bayless, Cathy Canney, Alberto Cardelle, Joseph Cautela, Rala Diakite, Sara Levine, Christa Marr, Kerry McManus, Michael Nosek, Steven Olson, Charles Roberts, Daniel Sarefield, Kisha Tracy, Amy Wehe

**Guests:**

Keith Chenot, Will Cortezia, Rachelle Dermier, Laura Garofoli, Ben Lieberman, Nadimpalli Mahadev, Zachary Miner, Kelly Norris, Hong Yu

***Co-Chair Michael Nosek called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm***

**Acceptance of Sub-Committee Minutes**

Motion: Laura Bayless Second: Charles Roberts

* Academic Policies: December 8, 2020
* Curriculum Committee: December 15, 2020
* LAS Sub-Committee: December 8, 2020
* Student Affairs: December 15, 2020

Curriculum Minutes for AUC 10 has wrong info on the name of the course.

Vote: 14/0/0

**Approval of AUC Minutes**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

AUC: December 3, 2020

Vote: 14/0/0

**Referral of New Proposals**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

All of proposals AUC #25 – AUC #37 should be going to curriculum committee.

Vote: 14/0/0

**REVIEW OF PROPOSALS**

**(Un-Table) AUC #6: Changes to Prerequisites for Some CSC Courses**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Nadimpalli Mahadev

It’s got two parts to it. We got a bunch of courses that we wanted to modify the prerequisites for. I have listed the old prerequisites and new prerequisites. Because of those changes, we need to change one of the courses which is to change CSC 3011 to CSC 3050 for the CSC majors. And CSC 3011 is no longer the capstone course for those majors it is now CSC 3050.

The second part is the Game Programming concentrations. Previously they had to take 5 CSC electives because all CSC majors have to. One of the courses in the Game Programming that counts as an elective is listed as a Game Programming course but it’s also listed as a Computer Science elective; so we are trying to drop the number of CSC electives.

AUC Chair wanted to make correction we are un-tabling this proposal cause we originally brought this up at the December 2020 meeting but had to table it. Altered motion is to un-table this proposal by Rala Diakite and seconded by Kerry McManus

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #7: Change Prerequisite for CSC 4100 Ethics and Impacts in Computing Solutions**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Nadimpalli Mahadev

This proposal is asking to change the prerequisite for CSC 4100. The prerequisite is Junior/Senior status in CS/CIS majors. We want to drop the requirement that it has to be for CS/CIS majors so now should say “Junior/Senior status in any major”.

Committee member asked about students who do not have a background in Computer Science, what will they get out of this course?

Sponsor stated they initially thought to only include CIS/CS majors because of the topics that are being discussed. But in reality it may be interest to everybody. It discusses about computer ethics, social media, hacking issues, software vulnerability issues; all of these topics have an interest to everybody so we wanted to open it up to all majors. And if there is anything technical we need to discuss, it will be at a very low level that a general audience can understand it. We needed some maturity level so we thought Junior and Senior level will still fit as a prerequisite for this course. There is no programming in this course.

Committee Member asked if the department will have the enough support for the potential of extra students taking this course? Is there worry there will be too many students taking this course; concern that your majors would still want to take this course but will be inaccessible to majors?

Sponsor stated they don’t know what demand of this course is. This is a non-technical course so we may be able to find adjuncts to teach it. We may offer two sections and may be able to offer it every semester. We can also reserve some seats for the Computer Science majors. We believe we can manage if we have other majors outside of the Computer Science majors.

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #8: LAS Designation Request: CSC 4100-Ethics and Impacts in Computing Solutions**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Nadimpalli Mahadev

This is for the same course we just had discussion about. This proposal is seeking an LAS designation of Ethical Reasoning (ER). I discussed with the department about a friendly amendment and they approved it; which was for section 3 ethical and creative thinking skills. We originally had it listed as reading and writing and was told the critical thinking was more appropriate for the way we are conducting this course.

The recommendation came from LAS subcommittee, then went back to department curriculum committee who accepted that, and then went to the full curriculum committee who accepted that friendly amendment too. That friendly amendment is not listed on the website but is listed in the minutes. It’s listed in subcommittee minutes but not in the curriculum committee minutes. They voted on it with the friendly amendments. The curriculum committee acted on it with the friendly amendments made from the LAS Subcommittees. They need to amend the minutes to reflect that was done.

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #9: New Course-FYE Seminar in Computer Science**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Nadimpalli Mahadev

We worked with Laura Garofoli on this. This is the FYE for Computer Science. We would like to offer this in two sections by a full-time faculty member. We hope all CS/CIC majors will take this course. There are no other prerequisites for this course. The theme will be computational thinking, so anyone in that area can take this course. So again with regards to enrollment size, we are hoping two sections will be enough. We usually get approximately 16-20 freshmen students each year, so we think there will be enough room for students outside of the major. It is required for CIS majors. There is text at the end of the proposal stating if a Computer Science major is not able to take their department’s FYE, they will not be asked to retake the FYE.

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #4: Proposal to Require MATH 1700 (Applied Statistics) for Sociology Majors**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Zach Miner

We (Faculty) in Sociology realized that with the new course SOC 3002 that the prerequisite math for that course is Applied Statistics MATH 1700. We now have it in our 4-year plan of study and would like to have it applied as a prerequisite for all Sociology majors. This is something we wanted people to know ahead of time, especially those transferring in. We originally wanted it to be a part of the major, then after discussing we realized it would be better as a required LAS course; so this is what the proposal is doing.

This did have a friendly amendment from the curriculum committee to change wording for Math equivalency and to change to Quantitative Learning Environment. This is not going to be a double dipping MAJ course for Sociology. This is going to be listed under the required courses for quantitative reasoning.

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #5: LAS Course Designation for FFL-Quantitative Reasoning for 9 MATH Courses**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Sarah Wright

This is our first big chunk of courses for the Quantitative Reasoning for Foundations of Lifelong Learning requirement for the new LA&S. In the proposal, the section after the chart of courses, we’re considering more courses later. Precalculus and Intro to Functions are currently being discussed in the Math Curriculum committee to see if they meet the QR outcome as they are or if we need ot adjust them. In that process we would like to hear from departments who are planning on having those be their QR courses for their students. We would like to discuss with them on how we can meet those needs and why it is required for their QR. Anyone in the Math Department will be happy to chat with folks about that.

There was no friendly amendment from the LAS subcommittee or Curriculum committee. But the AUC chair made a friendly amendment to the form itself. The forms will have a title line added to them and he will be adding a title line to this proposal with the approval of the sponsor. Will run it by the sponsor before he puts it in.

Vote: 14/0/0 (With friendly amendment)

**AUC #10: Course Designation-FA and HI for Introduction to Graphic Design (COMM 3810)**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

In the curriculum minutes the correct course information on this should be COMM 3810 not CSC 4100. On the website and agenda it’s correct.

Sponsor was not at meeting so will table the discussion. Motion to table by Rala Diakite and Seconded by Kerry McManus

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #11: New Course: Worlds of the Past on the Digital Frontier (HIST 2XXX) and HI Designation**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Ben Lieberman

This is a course that brings together digital methods, digital humanities, history and historical skills. Dr. Wachtel has ran it as a topics course and it ran well. The course reconsiders the purpose of history and it brainstorms when merging digital technologies when presenting history to public audiences. Students engage in historical methods and interpret prime resources. They’re producing digital exhibits for public history sites.

AUC Chair will talk to the Curriculum chair because there was a friendly amendment for the text for the rationales that were added by the LAS Subcommittee who then forwarded to the curriculum committee. When the curriculum committee discussed, those should’ve been added to the minutes, so will reach out to them to have them enter those into the minutes. Adding the rationales for creative thinking and digital literacy.

Vote: 14/0/0

**LAS Designation for AUC #11**

Historical Inquiry and Analysis (HI) Designation

This course clearly engages in history inquiry. Students ask historical questions. They learn how the story interprets the past it also does so digitally. They’re doing work on research and digital archives. Finished research products can be shown in digital archives and digital exhibits. They practice working for clients as well.

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #17: New Program: Architecture Minor**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Keith Chenot

This minor offers students exposure to graphic design and communication skills and tools used in architecture. Various building systems that form architecture and the knowledge needed in architecture.

It crosses over with some coordination with the humanities department. History in architecture is well attended with students so we think that there is an opportunity with students who would like the minor with these specific 6 courses.

This is shared with construction management, which is our strongest concentration. Lots of people have interest in architecture and gives an opportunity for others on campus to understand some of those skills. This is for students who will go onto to other programs like masters programs, government and regional planning, or city planning. Be able to see and read drawings in a building environment type of situation. So hands on knowledge of a building environment.

It was also in a way to keep our enrollment robust and allowing others to do it by sharing the courses too.

Committee member asked if the engineering courses or CMGT courses have prerequisites and if so what are those prerequisites?

Sponsor stated no. It starts out you have to have the Engineering Graphics course first and then that because the prerequisites for the next and so on following. These can be done with students who dont’ have the other engineering courses that are required in the major.

Committee asked if they will be offering these courses frequently so that students will be able to complete this minor in time or within a reasonable time frame?

Sponsor: Yes these courses are shared with all the engineering technology and applied science students. The building construction systems is shared with at least three of our concentrations so it’s offered on a very regular basis. Building Design I is a fall and Design II is a spring course and both are shared with other concentrations.

**Friendly Amendment:**  **Engineering Graphics is supposed to be listed as ENGT 1020 not ENGT 1040.**

Committee member had a concern that the proposal is premature. The program just went through a program review and there is going to be a meeting with the department to come up with an action plan. Doesn’t remember the architecture minor being a part of that action plan. Doesn’t see how it would meet the needs of the advancement of the department. If you look at the other concentrations there are no enrollments in them. Because of that there are a lot of substitutions and directed studies that are being submitted because of low enrollments in those courses. Feel this is going to happen with this course as well. Think it would be ideal to table this and see what happens after the department discussions about the next steps after the program review. Think it should not be implemented until there’s further discussion within the department.

This would have to go to DHE afterwards as well. So if the department is going to gather and dig into the next steps I feel it would be best to discuss this after the department meeting as well.

AUC chair said there are a couple of more meetings coming up in the semester so if it is tabled now, the committee will still be able to look over at the next meetings.

Sponsor: We could table it and bring it up after the department meeting and discussion. Thinks it is a strong idea.

**Motion to table by Alberto Cardelle and Seconded by Kerry McManus**

Vote: 13/0/0

**AUC #18: Name Change of Electronics Engineering Technology Minor**

Motion: Charles Roberts Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Hong Yu

Curriculum committee mentioned about the program changes. Curriculum suggested that we put this as a minor. Also students mentioned they wanted this as a minor. Chose the 6 required courses shown in the proposal. Some of the students we had say they like taking some of these courses so we chose to put those ones in the minor requirements because from student feedback and curriculum recommendation.

Some committee members shared they were confused because the proposal says name change but it looks it’s more than a name change because it’s changing the requirements. It needs to be explicit that you are changing the minor in the proposal.

Sponsor: The department used to be Industrial Technology now we are Engineering Technology. This was supposed to be listed in the 2019-2020 change but it was not listed.

Committee member asked if the prerequisites are similar in the sequences for the minor?

Sponsor: In those 6 courses. The first is Fundamentals, then second is Electronics I, then next is Electronics II; so if you follow with the sequence the students will be able to complete the minor.

Committee member: Saw in the curriculum minutes it was notated that it was not in the catalog. And when I looked back a few years in catalogs, the curriculum is different than what is in front of us. And I agree with the other committee member that you are redesigning the minor. When I spoke with one of the members of the curriculum committee they stated that they voted on it as a name change and not as a program redesign.

Need to amend the proposal to reflect that this is updating a change in curriculum that was updated previously.

Also there are prerequisites that are not listed here. Example: Control Theory requires Engineering 3900. So in order to complete this minor, it’s really 7 courses the student would need to take. And that’s not including the math. You would have to take Math 1300 to take Electronics I.

There’s a procedural issue here as well. We need to go back to the original proposal where things were changed in order to update this proposal. It may be when that proposal went through, there were some courses that were not questioned and mistakes that need to be corrected; and can be corrected in this proposal.

We should table this, revisit it, and bring it back in a corrected version. This also would need to go back to curriculum because they did not look at the curriculum changes. We have to make sure this program is clear and error free; and if there are corrections that need to be made.

Sponsor: Looking at the proposal summary (#5), it’s explicit of what we’re trying to do here. That language might be clearer on what we’re trying to do here.

We’re just following what we did a few years ago, with the name change in the program; we’re changing/updating this minor to reflect the program changes that happened.

**Table this discussion: Motion to table by Charles Roberts and seconded by Kerry McManus**

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #23: Recognition of Fitchburg State University's Institutional Learning Priorities**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsors: Alberto Cardelle and Laura Bayless

We’re asking for recognition of these Institutional Learning Priorities. These emerged from the January 2018 Development Day where we had discussion on learning outcomes on the LA&S proposal. Groups came together and developed these learning priorities. It’s a stategics set of priorities to think about what we want our graduates to be able to do and know once they graduate. It’s not a curricular proposal, it goes across Academic Affairs and includes the work that our colleagues in Student Affairs do as well as other divisions. It’s showing how students can learn in many different settings and roles on campus. (Example: Leadership in clubs, civic engagement, work study). We’re using this as a guide post for our Strategic Plan. We wanted to bring it to governance and have a discussion across different AUC committees about this. We’ve had good discussions and we’re asking AUC to vote to recognize these Learning Priorities.

This is not to approve because this is not curricular. There is no assessment. It is how the students will obtain and be exposed to these priorities. They are within the new LA&S, within the majors, and engagement in campus and community life.

A committee member asked if there will be a point where they will be assessed? Cause there are some that they would really be interested in finding out how the university is doing.

Sponsor: Every department in student affairs does an assessment process that has annual goals and objectives from the measurable pieces. We measure effectiveness and learning outcome goals. As we assess LA&S we would be assessing these as well.

Student Committee Member: Wondering what ways students can expect to see these things? Because it’s hard to advocate; want to make sure before we advertise this that we understand and acknowledging what’s changing. Just want to know what these are supposed to do.

Sponsor: These are things we already have been doing in alot of our majors and our current LA&S. This was a purposeful attempt to organize these, catalog them, and say these are the components that we hope the students get throughout their education here at Fitchburg State.

I would hope that the students will get these across all their experiences that exposes them to these both inside and outside of the classroom.

One of the things that is going to happen in Student Affairs within the next years are we are going to be moving towards a more curricular approach. It’s going to be a new emphasis in Student Affairs. We’re going to be more intentional about what we want our students to learn and how we know that student learned it. It provides the framework that you build that curricular approach on. The pilot is going to start in 2021-2022 in Student Affairs. We’re going to start to implement it division wide.

Student Committee Member: We have a diverse campus and want to make sure we’re doing our diligence to represent every member of our campus community. How is this curriculum going to effect a student who may not be able to participate in co-curricular activities? Is there accountability on the academic side of this for those who may not be able to participate for whatever reason?

AUC Co-Chair stated they want to get the SGA involved in the LA&S program and alot of things that are happening in the new program area. What is changin on the academic side is there is it’s going to be a lot more visible. You’re going to see these show up in your courses, in your emails, in your co-curricular, and they are going to be showing up in things that are across the campus and frequently. General Education outcomes, then that goes to the major outcomes, and then those effect the courses in outcomes which will be in the syllabus etc. These map out well and match perfectly with the LAS and general education really well.

We need to promote the collaboration. Laura Bayless from Student Affairs and Kisha Tracy who is in charge of the LAS program have already collaborated and are in the works on that. LAS is working on the marketing plan and changing the wording on this to terminology that makes sense.

Making us aware of this is going to make us better at communicating to the campus community as a whole. The proposal brings out this is a beginning of the conversations and integrating them over time. So shows it’s not going to happen immediately but will have more discussions and continue to work on it over time once AUC recognizes it.

**Again, want to make clear the committee is supporting this proposal more than recommending for approval; we’re just voting whether we support the purpose of the proposal. Approving to recognize the Institutional Learning Priorities.**

Vote: 14/0/0

**AUC #24: Change in S/U Policy**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Sponsor: Alberto Cardelle

This is to help students move towards more success. Right now, the student has to choose to go to towards S/U within the first two weeks of the semester. We are proposing to move it to the due date the student has to withdraw by. So students have the option of staying and have the grade go to their GPA, withdrawing, or requesting a S/U grade.

In the curriculum minutes there was a friendly amendment to the quantitative reasoning course; they just wanted to make more clear what those two things were.

Committee member had a clarification question for the proposed wording. The language states “Students must request the S/U option by deadline to withdraw from the course. Once recorded, the designation cannot be changed”. If you are meaning it cannot be changed by the student afterwards, then should have a friendly amendment to change that language to be more clearer.

**Friendly Amendment: Change that portion of the sentence to now say “once recorded, cannot be changed by the student”.**

Committee member stated there is a process that students can change the grade through petition, so that amendment request is really not true.

Committee members discussed and they said can leave the amendment as is, because it can be petitioned.

Committee member asked is there a place for an advisor to sign? Think this is important since we are making this more visible faculty and students. Also students and a lot of faculty don’t even think of this as an option. It would be a much more visible option to them now. And if decision making is when they would be in that advising period it would make sense to have an advisor signature as well; would be nice to have the advisor as part of the process.

Committee member: On the fence of moving the due date forward like that. Feel like a student who knows they are doing badly and since longer to stay in course they may just sail along in the class and just check off to get the S/U grade. And the boundary is so low at 1.0 worry some students will take advantage of it.

Sponsor: This really emerged from the experience of the last few semesters that we had during the pandemic semesters. Those students were identifying or not if they could get a grade they would’ve got under normal circumstances. Yes, this does change the philosophy on this. But there are still requirements on this; students cannot have all their courses S/U. There is no requirement now that an advisor signs the form. The departments could be asked what courses would not be allowed to be under the S/U because they require a letter grade; those could be programmed into a form and they will know which courses they can or cannot use this for and also will let Registrar’s Office know once they try to process. With the limitations/requirements listed in the proposal I think it would be a change in the quality of the student’s education.

Student Committee Member: This is a GPA protector. The first semester in COVID when online courses switched to online my grades were not well. It was a good protection and I said I’m not going to let this semester lower my overall grades and it helped me tremendously. This is also good for a student who may not be doing so well because of an unforeseen circumstance and they need that particular course for the credits and they can’t afford to push it back a semester.

Committee Member: Some folks in the curriculum committee have asked should FYE be a course that is not allowed to have and S/U grade? Wanted thoughts on whether feel the Foundation courses should not be part of the pass/fail option for students.

It was strongly felt at curriculum that FYE and the other foundations should be open for an S/U. There were FYE instructors at that meeting who felt it shouldn’t be on there. There was push back that it should be the Math and Writing requirements.

It would be worth wile after we approved and move this forward that we look back on this a year or two and see how this is effecting different areas; just consider the option of revisiting.

Vote: 12/0/2 (With friendly amendments)

**Adjournment**

Motion: Rala Diakite Second: Kerry McManus

Meeting adjourned at 5:29 pm

Vote: 14/0/0