

ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, May 10, 2023
2:30-4:30PM
Hammond 314

Minutes

Present: Elise Takahana, Allison Turner, Juan Pablo Casilla Nicodemus, Patricia Marshall, Kisha Tracy, Franca Barricelli, Laura Garofoli, Steven Fiedler, Rachel Dermer, Paul Weizer, Laura Bayless, Rala Diakite

Guests: [Becky Copper Glenz](#), [Laura Baker](#), J.J. DeSilva, Debra Stone, Jennifer Hanselman, Nirajan Mani, Denise Simion, [James Alicata](#), [Kelly Morgan](#), [Jeff Warmouth](#), Mary Baker, Liz Gordon, Deb Stone, Sarah Lavine, Mary Baker, [Abdel Mustafa](#)

Minutes written by Amy Wehe

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:32pm
2. Minutes:
 - a. Drafts of Minutes from AUC standing committees (informational purposes)
 - Policy: [May 9, 2023](#) (last meeting of semester - acceptance in Fall)
 - Curriculum: [May 8, 2023](#) and May 10, 2023 (forthcoming) (last meeting of semester - acceptance in Fall)
 - b. Approval of Minutes from AUC meeting on May 9, 2023 (forthcoming)
3. Proposals to Consider for Recommendation of Approval
 - [AUC #25 Graduation with Honors Policy Update For Transfer Students](#) (Becky Copper)
 - Policies: friendly amendment
 - Correct mistake in weights used in the example calculation of cumulative GPA for transfer students

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

This proposal came about because students who transfer in more than 45 credits are not eligible for graduating with honors. This was discovered when a transfer student with excellent grades asked why he could not be considered for graduating with honors. They discovered the policy currently requires students to take 45 credits with a numerical grade on campus in order to qualify for graduating with honors. Transfer students are now allowed to transfer up to 90 credits into Fitchburg State, which means they are only required to take 30 credits on our

campus in order to graduate with a degree from Fitchburg State University. The student asked if his grades from his previous institution could be used toward the calculation of honors. At the time, it could not be counted. The purpose of this proposal is to remedy this inequity. If a student has at least a 3.2 GPA at Fitchburg State University at the time of graduation, their grades from their previous institution will contribute to the calculation of honors for graduation.

13-0-0

- [AUC #67 Remote Participation Option for University Events](#) (Rala Diakite, J.J. Sylvia, Laura Baker)
 - Policies: friendly amendment
 - Eliminate language regarding graduation, convocation, and the undergraduate research conference from the proposal
 - Student Affairs: friendly amendment
 - Remove #1 from the proposal, which refers to the events mentioned in the faculty handbook

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

- AUC
 - In point 2 after provide, add “within two years”
 - In point 4 strike “faculty professional development” -
 - In point 6 strike Development Day

The purpose of this proposal is to increase access and inclusivity by providing an interactive remote access to open forums and other deliberative assemblies. The spirit of this proposal is genuinely for good intentions. Laura Baker was surprised how much of the discussion at the subcommittees revolved around potential bad intentions of faculty. She is the sponsor of this proposal because she has severe hearing loss. She didn't realize how much it was affecting her connection with the community of the university until COVID. She realized she hadn't been able to understand/hear what was being said at meetings and in groups, but the closed caption in the remote access had a huge positive impact in her access to the community. The university currently will provide accessibility access as needed right now, but that puts the burden on the person who needs the access. This is about creating a more equitable, just, and inclusive community.

JJ's wife has been impacted by long COVID, and will probably be affected for the rest of her life, unless (hopefully) something is discovered to change that. At the beginning of every semester and every year, he is required to advocate for safe access to committees, which is, frankly, exhausting. He believes that the university governance process is the correct venue to have this

discussion. Currently, the policy is that it is up to each committee decides what mode the committee uses for its meetings. HR is not the right place for the discussion because 1) the US laws are not set up that way and 2) in his situation, there is no possible discussion with HR because the need is because of his wife and not him. HR will only consider accommodations for needs an employee has.

Rala added that what we as professors model to our students by our actions how things should be done. what should be done to students. If we want to model inclusivity and open access, we should do that.

Pat respectfully disagreed that this is the correct platform for this discussion. This needs to be a collective bargaining agreement. The way this system is defined in the contract, she does not believe this falls under the definition of governance. Rala responded that yes, in the past the contract has spoken for health and safety, but wherever the contract is silent, universities are welcome and encouraged to create their own policies. This proposal is only a recommendation. It is a way to send our wishes officially to the president. The president said at the beginning of the year very clearly that how we run our meetings is not of interest to him. He clearly stated that each individual body should determine how they will meet online, hybrid, or in person. Therefore, Rala stated she believes this proposal is appropriate.

Pat agreed that individual governance bodies have the prerogative to decide their own mode for their meetings, but that the campus-wide events, like development day, are organized and run by the administration, and therefore they have the right to decide the mode of delivery.

As a disabilities scholar, Kisha is in favor of accessibility. Her concern is logistics. She doesn't think that logistics should come after in a lot of ways. Before she goes on, though, she would like clarity on what committees are included in this policy. The proposers responded that the intention was not to replace the required "in-person" with mandatory "remote access." The intent is to "increase access." They were reluctant to specify specific functions, but are interested in making access a priority and are asking the university to move toward remote accessibility of events.

Question: Do you have any idea where the funding for the technology for this proposal would come from? Rala says, "included in the proposal is 'work towards facilitating that'" We have spent millions and millions of dollars on materials for online classes, etc. We need to see where the focus is. We would be behind the curve if we do not"

Allison says that it is not just training that needs to be increased, but all the technology needs to be upgraded. She does not want to take away from anyone's lived experience and doesn't want to think that someone doesn't have good intentions.

Comment: what would have been said if during the pandemic, a professor had said, "Well, technology is kind of hard, I'm just not going to teach any of my classes." No. We made it work.

There were concerns that the chat is not always monitored appropriately. If we are going to be hybrid, the chat must be monitored.

Also, in the proposal, faculty development is specifically mentioned. In the training for FYE, it is very difficult for the faculty who are remote to be a part of the community. It was harder when faculty were online to practice the routines that were necessary. When we were hybrid, the faculty who were remote were not equally prepared for the routines they were expected to teach. Ideally, this training would take place in person.

In Laura's first iteration as an historian, she was an historian of film. When films were first introduced, it was a feeling of the end of the world, and now we can't imagine living without it. This committee seems to be seeing remote access as a loss. Whether we are seeing this as a loss or an opportunity, the change is going to happen— in the same way that when email and the internet came about, some historians were reluctant to let go of the card catalog and physically going to the library to do research.

Would the proposers be amenable to a friendly amendment to the proposal that this is a "priority moving forward" rather than a "requirement at this moment?" Even the proposers recognize the university is not ready.

Paul: a proposal that says this is a "priority moving forward" does not accomplish anything. Department meetings this semester have worked really well, but he was also at another hybrid meeting (AUC CC) that was like two different meetings, because there was so much happening in the chat that was not spoken out to the rest of the committee. He had no idea what was going on in the other part of the meeting until someone else let him know. There are good and bad hybrid meetings, just like there is good and bad teaching. I see no reason to say this cannot happen. It just means we need to use best practices. Maybe a way to change this is to create a timeline for this change— perhaps "in two years" or "in five years."

One more question/concern– recognize that there are mixed considerations of this proposal. If this gets voted for and President Lapidus signs it and the funding does not come through what is the recourse?

Question (again) on whether this proposal includes Faculty Development– the occasions that are left after removing #1 under section 6. Franca: I am struggling with the benefit of the faculty coming together at Development Day vs this proposal. The urgency of access is real, and I understand that, vs the need for community and the coming together as a group, which is also very important.

The proposers are willing to accept a friendly amendment of “within two years” to #2. Laura Baker is also willing to strike “Faculty Professional Development.” Strike “Development Day.” The remaining items in the proposal asking for remote access are just “shared governance” and “deliberative processes,” such as the campus-wide forums. The proposers are willing to accept this as a friendly amendment, because they would like to make progress toward remote access, without making an undue hardship.

8-1-4

- [AUC #75 History and Social Science Minors Online Social Justice and Identity Rights \(SJIR\) Pathways](#) (Laura Baker)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

Requests to revise the catalog SJ and/or IR cluster thematic focus online. Students can complete the history and social science minor online currently, but they would like that to be reflected in the catalog, so it can be made known that this is possible.

The proposal says that the history department will be offering at least two sections of these courses online each semester. Concerns that this will require professors to use a particular modality, which seems to go against academic freedom. As the chair, we already offer these courses in that modality now, and we will continue to do that. The question is, “is it appropriate that this be a piece of the proposal– that at least two courses will be offered online each semester– since that is in the purview of the chair.” Answer: If the history department is looking to offer this pathway online, they need to demonstrate their plan for making this happen, just like when we include 4-year plans along with new programs.

There are other majors and pathways on campus where it is possible for undergraduate students to complete the entire program online, but those programs do not promote it. The

history department would like to promote it in the catalog, so students who want to do it know they can do it. With that information, they hope to attract more students to the major.

In so much as this is a promotion, one commenter is for it. If it is in the catalog, it is a commitment. There are no programs in the catalog currently that commit to make that program online.

Paul has found that there is significant student interest in the online offerings. It is the online courses in the history department that fill up first. In 5-10 years, if staffing changes, there would be another AUC proposal to change it again.

Allison has taken 4 or 5 history courses online and will be taking another one next semester and pays attention in them. She enjoys taking them and is in favor of advertising this program.

This proposal is seeking to institute within the catalog a modality, which has not been done before in a day program. There has been a big pushback on dictating modality of course offerings– it is a part of academic freedom. The commenter is concerned that in the future, faculty will not be willing to teach those classes. What happens then? Answer: If the department is no longer willing to teach these courses fully online, there would be another AUC proposal to change the catalog again.

Comment: GCED has courses that are set in advance to be online courses, so the academic freedom is not such a big deal there. Professors know that the modality will be online before agreeing to teach the course. That can be the case for these classes, also. These particular sections will be decided in advance to be online, and professors will know that in advance and can agree to teach them or not. Students in practice will probably mix and match between online, in-person, and online courses. There will still be plenty of classes offered that are in-person and hybrid. There is no prescription for how students should complete the minor; it will still be possible to take it fully in person. The department only wants to advertise that this is an option for students.

Rala– online day courses exist and are spoken about in the contract. In particular, there are online evaluation forms, which implies online courses. The chair organizes schedules. Rala would be concerned if the history department said they were only going to teach 100% online courses. Also, if anyone were forced to teach online, there would be a grievance. Paul said the entire department was unanimously in favor of the way course assignments were made this past year.

10-1-2

- [AUC #33 New Course Issues in Digital Media Innovation](#) (J.J. Sylvia)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #89 New Course Digital Media Innovation Capstone](#) (J.J. Sylvia)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #90 Revisions to COMM 4800 Digital Media Innovation Capstone](#) (J.J. Sylvia)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #91 Revisions to DMI Major for Intro course and Capstone](#) (J.J. Sylvia)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #78 New Course System Life Cycle and Project Management](#) (Denise Simion)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

- AUC: friendly amendments
 - Change the Course Name to: Business System Life Cycle and Project Management
 - Change the Banner Abbreviation to: Bus Sys Life Cycle and Proj Mgmt

This course has a business focus. It is about when and how you organize changes to business systems. The computer science people are the ones that actually make the change, and they have a course about that.

12-0-0

- [AUC #79 New Course Introduction to Business Analytics](#) (Denise Simion)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #80 Information Systems Management Concentration: New Business Administration Major Concentration](#) (Denise Simion)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

- AUC: friendly amendment
 - Change course title from AUC 78 in the curriculum list.

12-0-0

- [AUC #81 Vocational Technical Teacher Approval Program Revisions](#) (James Alicata)
 - Friendly amendment:
 - In #7, committee vote: Change Dr. Soumitra Basu to Abstain

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

- AUC: friendly amendment
 - In #7, committee vote: Change Dr. Soumitra Basu to Abstain

Vocational technical education program has been here for quite some time. Two years ago, the department made a decision to make changes to the program. The licensure program does not require the course, so they want to take it out as a required course for the program and also to add the words in parentheses (undergraduate) to distinguish it from the graduate program.

12-0-0

- [AUC #118 New Course ENGT 4XXX Internship](#) (Nirajan Mani)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendments
 - Change title: Internship in Engineering Technology
 - Edit second sentence of course description for clarity
 - Change in 12 Hours per week to 9 (per week) from 135 (for semester)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #82 Curriculum update for ENGT program with new General Education](#) (Nirajan Mani)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendment

- Change #7 - MATH 1300 or passing AAF score

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

The change to the curriculum is shown in the proposal.

There is some overlap between Physics II and one of their other courses, so the external evaluator suggested that they remove Physics II. The three courses mentioned in the next proposal are required by their accreditor. They say they are trying to meet the General Education requirements by the university and also fulfill the requirements of their accreditation.

Are you saying that that ABET requires you to have these 75 credits of courses in your major?
Yes.

Jen: ABET does not prescribe a set number of courses; it has a list of objectives that need to be met. The department has been doing a lot of curriculum mapping to map to the requirements of ABET and also the General Education courses and also the necessary scaffolding students need to succeed in their program. They are in the process of trying to arrange their courses so that students can have more choices, but they are not there yet. They need a change right now, so they can get their program requirements under 120 credits.

This major is very prescriptive, and it does not look like transfer students will be able to complete this major in 120 credits at this point. If a student takes anything that is not in the program, they will not be able to transfer into the program and still finish in 120 credits, because there is no leeway in the program.

Proposer: External evaluator said there was a lot of content overlapping, and so they think they can take physics II out.

0-1-11

- [AUC #83 MAJ Designations for Engineering Technology](#) (Nirajan Mani)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

As the gen ed chair, Kisha says, that these courses absolutely do meet the general education objectives. This would be the first major that would include the entire “integration” part of the general education requirements prescribed by the major— from the perspective of the spirit of the general education curriculum. She would rather see them spread the MAJ courses out throughout the curriculum.

The spirit of the general education curriculum is to take classes outside of their major, and by specifying the courses this is not in the spirit of the general education guidelines.

Proposer: What do they need to do to meet the General Education? Kisha said she would like to see the MAJ courses spread out throughout the curriculum, and not just in one part of it – in this case, the integrative courses. This does, however, technically fulfill the general education requirements.

At this time, if this does not pass, the students would have to take more than 120 credits to graduate. Because of the new General Education Curriculum, certain courses are not double-counted in the Gen Ed and also in the major, students need to take 9 credits too many. The QR course is resolved– the Precalculus and the Calculus courses are QR and PL. Kisha said that foundations cannot be included as a MAJ course, but she would rather give them an exception to that, than have all of the MAJ in one category of the Gen Ed curriculum.

Proposers: There is a way that this is being handled until this is worked out. They are currently dealing with this issue of the 9 extra credits through petitions on an individual basis. It is not a good solution– it takes a lot of time.

Proposer: Our department has spent 2 years meeting about the curriculum and general education courses. Question by proposers: What would you like us to do? Ans: Take more courses outside of their department. That is the spirit of the General Education Curriculum

Allison: Some of the classes I have learned the most from have been the courses outside of my major.

Proposer: We want students to do social sciences and humanities. We want our students to have a well-rounded education. The proposers think these three courses are the most appropriate courses to meet the General Education requirements for our students.

Commenter: I would like to point out that in AUC 60 (the proposal that created the current General Education program), if you have a professional major and you take a minor to fulfill the AIA section of the general education requirements, you must take a minor in an LA&S field.

Commenter replied: Yes, but the proposers should not be penalized because there is a loophole in AUC 60, [allowing MAJ courses to fulfill the AIA cluster].

2-9-1

Proposers commented that they always feel like they are outside of the community. Every time they come to the AUC, they experience resistance. They request support, so they can create a program that works within the requirements of the university.

- [AUC #84 Cross List THEA 3002 as a COMM course and drop prerequisites and status](#) (Kelly Morgan)

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #85 Update to Graphic Design Capstone Option B](#) (Mary Baker)

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #86 Update to COMM 4880 Internship](#) (Mary Baker)

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #87 New Course 2D Game Development](#) (Jeff Warmouth)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendment
 - Add cross-listed GAME 3000/CSC 3010

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #88 Game Design curriculum restructure](#) (Jeff Warmouth)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendments
 - Additional electives: add ART 2XXX Drawing the Figure in Action (pending approval) and ART 2004 Ceramics
 - Remove ART 1100 and ART 1300 as options
 - Remove section about option for minor that reads “with permission of advisor...”

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #112 Earth and Geographic Sciences name change](#) (Elizabeth Gordon)

Moved: Paul
Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #113 Revisions to Environmental and Earth Science curriculum](#) (Elizabeth Gordon)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendment
 - Remove ENSC 2000 as an elective

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

- [AUC #114 New Course Global Health in Costa Rica \(Study Abroad\)](#) (Deborah Stone)
 - Curriculum: friendly amendment
 - Add to # 13 Prerequisites “or by permission of instructor”

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

Commenter to proposer: Would you like to strike the location, so you don't have to create a new course if you want to go to a different location? For instance, change the title of the course to “Global Health (Study Abroad).” Change “Costa Rica” in the course description to “with a focus on a health care system outside the United States.”

Commenter: There is a section to check “can the student take this course multiple times?” Perhaps you would like to change this from from no to yes?

Agreed upon language: Change the check from no to yes with the permission of the instructor. The intent is that a student can take the course more than once if they go to different locations, but they cannot go to the same location multiple times and receive credit for it. The repeated course must be different in order to receive credit for it.

12-0-0

- [AUC #115 Revisions to Public Health Sciences curriculum](#) (Elizabeth Gordon)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

Part of their curriculum is to take 6 electives. This proposal restricts them from taking 3 of them in any single discipline.

Add to the list of electives “Psy 3500 – Psychology of learning.”

12-0-0

- [AUC #116 PL, HI, and IHIP designations for GEOG2056](#) (Elizabeth Gordon)

Moved: Paul

Seconded: Laura

12-0-0

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30pm.