**ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**Friday, April 16, 2021**

**3:30 pm**

**Virtual via Google Meet**

**Minutes**

**Committee Members in Attendance:**

Laura Bayless, Cathay Canney, Alberto Cardelle, Joe Cautela, Sara Levine, Kerry McManus, Christa Marr, Michael Nosek, Charles Roberts, Amy Wehe

**Committee Members Absent:** Rala Diakite, Daniel Sarefield

**Guests:** Mary Baker, Soumitra Basu, Rachelle Dermer, Laurie Link, Heather Thomas

*AUC Co-chair Michael Nosek called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.*

**PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION**

**AUC 81: Temporary Academic Recovery Readmission Option**

Motion: Amy Wehe Second: Joe Cautela

Sponsor: Alberto Cardelle

We had a high group of freshmen from fall 2020 who were not successful and suspended at the end of the fall semester. It was twice the amount of the usual number of students and the vast majority received 0.0 grades. The numbers this time around indicated that factors outside with the pandemic and different modalities, contributed to these grades.

What we’d like to do is offer these students a way to return to the university this coming year, fall 2021. The academic department chairs took this issue up briefly at the beginning of the spring 2021 semester and it ended up being difficult with coming up with something across the board. So we came up with this approach which is to focus on the freshmen (who started fall 2020) and give them a shorter time in which they could request readmission to the university and eliminate the credits they took in the fall of 2020. We eliminate the credits from the transcript but we do not eliminate them from their financial aid records. That is why they would have to come in under a contract in which they understand that they have to maintain satisfactory academic progress in order to maintain their financial aid. They have to maintain at least 67% of their credits and will have to be under contract for at least two semesters or until they pass that 67% threshold.

**Friendly Amendments:**

1) Friendly amendment at curriculum committee meeting: ***“Students being readmitted to majors with first-year students caps will be readmitted to the university, and their re-admission to the major will be referred to the department for admission to the major”*.**

2) Friendly amendment at student affairs meeting: ***Added spring 2021.***

3) Add: ***Name will be sent to the major for consideration of readmission into the major/program.***

4) Item 7: Change to **“accumulative of 29 attempted credit hours”.** This way they know it’s for Freshman only .

We have a form that will be going out to students next week. This will change their catalog year for the new year they are readmitted into. It will be clear also, that there is not a guarantee that they will get back into their majors. It will also have contacts for their academic coaches to talk with them if they have any questions or help with the form.

Committee member asked if they had data for transfer first time students. Sponsor answered they can go in and look at the numbers to see how many of those were transfer students.

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

**AUC 136: 2021 LA&S General Education Block Transfer Pathways**

Motion: Amy Wehe Second: Joe Cautela

Sponsor: Alberto Cardelle

Proposal is the result of trying to prepare for how to address some of the issues our transfer students may face with new LAS/General Education program.

The spirit of this is to balance or allow the student to go through our LAS core curriculum and also make sure we continue to be transfer friendly. We received results from a transfer survey and the second most important factor that transfer students look at is how many credits are accepted into the program. That’s our balance is we want to make sure we are transfer friendly, but also want to make sure they graduate with our core curriculum.

We want to grandfather in our transfer students for one more year, for those who transfer in fall of 2021 or spring of 2022. They will follow the previous LAS and they will be assigned to the previous catalog year. If any need to use major changes that is used under the new catalog then those we will do on a case by case basis; but in terms of the General Ed, they will follow the old LAS.

The second bigger part of the proposal is the creation of the transfer blocks, depending on how many transfer credits they come in with. Completion requirement for students who transfer in with the following:

*1-29 credits:* Student still considered a first-year student and will take all LA&S General Education courses. Any courses taken previously will continue to transfer to FSU. Students with a First-Year Experience (FYE) course (of any number credits) will satisfy the requirement and receive credits matching the FYE course transferred in. Students who transfer in FYE will be required to complete the 0-credit, self-paced “The Transfer Student Experience” course.

*30-59 credits:* Students will be required to enroll in a 0-credit, self-paced course title “The Transfer Student Experience.” Students will be required to complete it during their first semester at the university, and they will receive a S/U grade (students will be enrolled in the course by academic advisors, and the registrar will receive notification when students have completed the course). Students must complete all other foundation courses, although the registrar will determine what courses the student may transfer to satisfy foundation courses in during the admission process.Students must complete 18 credits of the critical and creative thinking requirements.Students must complete 9 credits of the integrating and applying requirements. Up to 9 credits of MAJ courses may be used to satisfy both of these requirements.

*60 or more credits:* Students will not be required to enroll in “The Transfer Student Experience.” Students must complete all other foundation courses, although the registrar will determine what courses the student may transfer to satisfy foundation courses in during the admission process. Students must complete 9 credits of the critical and creative thinking requirements. Those who’ve completed bachelor level to complete a second bachelor, or seal that they’ve completed all schools gen ed. They will fulfill our general ed requirements.

Committee member had question about if Registrar office is still consulting with determining with math is considered college level math? Sponsor stated yes we will be continuing with that practice, we’ve already got a large list of courses that we’ve got permission to use from and if it’s not from those, then yes.

Committee member asked what amount of work do students have to do in the “Transfer Experience” course? And why was it decided to be zero credits?

Sponsor: We estimate it’s about two weeks worth of work that you stretch out in the semester. We did zero credits because one of the things transfer students don’t like is to have to pay for more credits. It’s an exercise to help them be more successful at FSU. Complete it by the end of 1st semester. It will be module based and all virtual. Students can watch and answer some questions, follow a virtual orientation process (same platform). It will be monitored by the Registrar’s Office. We will bring it back to governance for review and feedback.

The reason we are pushing this through is because Admissions started recruiting for fall 2022 and they need to let these students know that this is the plan. FYE made it clear it is not a replication of FYE for freshmen.

Committee member asked is there a way to tie it into the midterm deficiency grade review? Would like to have them take this class before the advising period. We can have this as a topics course and see how it pans out afterwards.

Committee member asked about the Math requirements for these students?

We tried to get students to transfer through the Mass Transfer Pathways but a lot of students start in other majors and want to complete their associates degree and come whenever. This allows them to get a general idea of the general education requirements. It simplifies things and makes it able for us to explain what they can expect and fix our articulation agreements and makes clear what is going to happen. We would love to have them come prepare but some end up changing majors so that changes things.

Should be clear that they may not get into a Math or Chemistry major within the two years if they have not taken a math level course. There’s a difference between general ed and difference between major requirements. They’re shown in the 4 year plan of study. It needs to be clear that the math transfer students need to take. Also meet departmental and/or major specific requirements. Insert as asterisk at top under each requirement

**Friendly Amendment:**

Insert asterisk: **\*Students may be required to take specific courses that are general education if they are a requirement of the major.**

**Vote: 12/0/0 *(With friendly amendment)***

**ITEMS FROM THE FLOOR**

Discussion of how we proceed with amendments at different subcommittees.

We’re going to have the following discussion: 1.) Explain what the amendment process is; 2.) Explain what the general hierarchy is for how they move from one subcommittee to the next, then up to us (AUC), and then from us (AUC) to the president. 3.) See if we need to address a situation that has come up from a bulk proposal.

1. Want to make clear how we go about with making amendments and how we go about referring them to our governance committees. Anytime a proposal comes to a subcommittee, there’s a motion to recommend it for approval and then there’s a motion, discussion, and then vote on whether to recommend for approval. Anytime a change is made to the proposal, it’s done in a form of an amendment. The thing that make them friendly is that sponsors agree to them and that just means we don’t have to vote on it.

Then there are other times when a sponsor is not keen on the amendment, then we can either table it or proposal will get withdrawn.

1. Other thing want to be clear on is when a friendly amendment is put on in a subcommittee, it doesn’t mean that change is automatic at that level. That proposal goes to the next level and that information is still in that proposal, it has been put in for a change, and then we recommend that proposal with that amendment and the amendment is able to be revisited at that next level. If someone at that second or next level committee wants to vote to undo that change it can be done. They make a motion that is seconded and then we discuss it and vote on that. (This is why we don’t change the proposal between subcommittee meetings, because ultimately it comes to the AUC committee.) We then make a revised proposal and post that with the original version and the president can decide which version will get approved and/or he’s free to make his own changes.

We had a situation at the LAS Subcommittee where an amendment was made and it was not agreed upon by sponsor and it was still voted upon and moved up to Curriculum Committee and this is what led to this misconception about how the amendment process works.

In that situation with the LAS Subcommittee, there was a proposal with a number of courses. The subcommittee felt that two of the courses did not meet the requirements/qualifications to receive a designation and a motion was made to remove those courses from the list. It was voted upon and approved by the committee and the proposal was voted upon and approved as well, which in turn had it moved on to the curriculum committee.

Because of this, the process has been questioned and we need to have a discussion about whether we continue on with the process the way we have been or do we need to make a change. This made me want us to look out how we process the bulk proposals because most of what has come up for us has been bulk proposals because of the new LAS program. We made the decision to work with the bulk proposals how we’ve been doing because this was a way for us to look at a whole bunch of courses at once instead of having to do many proposals individually.

The courses that were removed from the proposal gave the impression that they were not acted upon. It was voted on as a proposal but it was made with those courses pulled out of the proposal. Do we want to isolate those courses, have those proposals voted on and then we vote on those courses separately.

We can vote on the one proposal separately and the rest of the bulk can still be voted together. Someone at a different level can vote on the courses to be put back in.If the sponsor is not comfortable with change then you would vote on individual courses. If they are comfortable, then we vote on the bulk.

Process could be more effectively to capture discussion at department curriculum level. Without that discussion you start at base zero and loose inside the committee can bring to the discussion. If that info can be capture that would be helpful.

We do capture that at dept curriculum vote, that’s why we have that in there to capture that.

Isolating proposals if needed causes less unnecessary votes. Voting on individual courses gives us the record of them. Gives us the option of using one cover sheet, but working on them individually. That is the procedure we will be using as we go forward.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Motion: Amy Wehe Second: Kerry McManus

*Meeting adjourned at 4:46 p.m.*

**Vote: 12/0/0**