**AUC Curriculum Committee Draft Minutes**

**Thursday, December 17, 2020**

**Google Meet Member Attendees:** Franca Barricelli, Linda Dupell, Margaret Hoey, Soumitra Basu (co-chair), Lisa Gim, Cheryl Goldman, Elizabeth Gordon, Jonathan Harvey, Natasha Kurtonina, Laurie Link (co-chair), Tara Mariolis, Zach Miner, Aisling O’Connor (co-secretary), Sherry Packard, Audrey Pereira, Britton Snyder, Danielle Wigmore (co-secretary), Sara Wright

**Absent:** Samantha Bright (SGA Senator), Adem Elveren, Jerry Johnson (SGA Senator),

**Guests:** Laura Bayless, Catherine Buell, Alberto Cardelle, Keith Chenot, Laura Garofoli, Nadimpalli Mahadev, Nirijan Mani, Michael Nosek, Donald Tarallo, Kisha Tracey, Joseph Watchel, Hong Yu

**1. Call to Order**

Soumitra Basu called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm

**2. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting**

**Mention to approve the minutes from the Curriculum Committee meeting of November 19, 2020:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Vote:** 15/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

**3. Current Business**

***3.1 AUC 23: Recognition of Fitchburg State University’s Institutional Learning Priorities***

**Motion to consider AUC 23:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Alberto Cardelle

**Discussion:** This proposal originated from work started at the January 2018 Development Day. At this event an outside speaker, Dr. Paul Gaston spoke about “essential education” and there was cross divisional participation in round table breakout groups. Notes were taken from these discussions and a second group of faculty, staff and administrators used these to develop nine learning priorities. These are general and cover the ways in which we expect students to be learning from both curricular and co-curricular experiences at Fitchburg State. Academic and Student Affairs are requesting recognition of these learning priorities by AUC. These are the skills, values and knowledge our students will leave us with as a result of everything they do at FSU. Even though there is no internal regulatory expectation this is going through governance because it came out of the strategic plan.

**Vote:** 16/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

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

**Motion to consider AUC 24:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Alberto Cardelle

**Discussion:** A major obstacle encountered with the current S/U policy is that the deadline to request S/U for a particular course is too early. It currently aligns with the add/drop date which is approximately 10 days into the semester. This proposal requests that the date for requesting an S/U grade be changed to the deadline when students may withdraw from a class. This proposal also requests the elimination of the language “only one course in each liberal arts cluster may be taken S/U” for new students starting in Fall 2021. These are permanent changes to the S/U policy, not just for Spring 2021.

Sarah asked for clarification on the S/U policy for math courses that are part of LA&S. Linda indicated that foundational math courses are always S/U. Math course taken to fulfill math proficiency requirements cannot be taken S/U. This is confusing for students and clarity may be brought by changing the term “math proficiency requirement” to “quantitative reasoning requirement”. Alberto agreed to this as a friendly amendment to the proposal.

Kisha asked if the FYE course should also be excluded from S/U. It was suggested that, perhaps all foundations of lifelong learning courses should be excluded from S/U. Alberto will investigate this suggestion and bring this up at AUC. Many members felt that FYE should be excluded from S/U.

**Friendly amendment:** change references to “math proficiency requirement” to “quantitative reasoning requirement”.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

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

**Motion to take off the table AUC 4:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Zachary Minor

**Discussion:** Sociology sought to require MATH 1700 for their major. Given the changes made to the LA&S they request that the course be placed in the “required LA&S course” for major category. Kisha and Linda indicated that this is the required language. Franca added some clarification for what is being done: expanding the major by requiring certain LA&S courses be taken in order to have necessary skills.

Meg suggested a friendly amendment to strike the language in the proposal specifying when MATH 1700 should be taken in the 4-year plan of study. This was accepted by the sponsor.

**Friendly amendment:** remove the last paragraph from section VIII of the proposal which refers to the “Four-Year Plan”

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.4 AUC 5: LA&S Course Designation for 9 MATH Courses***

**Motion to consider AUC 5:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Catherine Buell

**Discussion:** This is the first round of 9 courses for which the Math Department are requesting the QR designation. A committee member asked if the LA&S curriculum committee subcommittee voted on this. Liz indicated that they did and approved this proposal.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.5 AUC 8: LA&S Course Designation for CSC 4100***

**Motion to consider AUC 8:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Nadimpalli Mahadev

**Discussion:** After reading the minutes of the LA&S curriculum committee subcommittee, Meg was concerned about some of the procedures in the subcommittee, in particular the discussion and modification of secondary skills. Meg suggested that friendly amendments should go back to curriculum committee of the department and make sure that this is this still what they want and verify that they are okay with suggested changes. In order to close the loop back with the department the sponsor should go back to department, provide documentation that they discussed any changes within the department and confirm friendly amendments before proposal goes from LA&S subcommittee back to the curriculum committee.

Nadimpalli indicated that his department thought they should check skills secondary skills that would be reinforced in the course and they were not sure which secondary skills to check. Liz indicated that guidance documents regarding secondary skills will be available by next week, before next AUC meeting.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.6 AUC 9: New Course Request, FYE Seminar in Computer Science***

**Motion to consider AUC 9:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Nadimpalli Mahadev

**Discussion:** Liz confirmed that this proposal was discussed in LA&S subcommittee of the curriculum committee and recommend for approval.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.7 AUC 10: LA&S Course Designations for CSC 4100***

**Motion to consider AUC 10:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Donald Tarallo

**Discussion:** This proposal requests FA and PL LA&S designations for Introduction to Graphic Design. This was voted on by the LA&S subcommittee of the curriculum committee. At that meeting, there were some questions on the secondary skills and critical thinking was removed.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.8 Acceptance of Minutes of LA&S Subcommittee***

Meg asked if we should have accepted the minutes of LA&S subcommittee before commencing business. Michael agreed, and indicated that it is common practice to do this as you are working from proposal amended by a subcommittee.

**Motion to accept in draft form the minutes from the LA&S subcommittee of the curriculum committee:** Meg Hoey, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.9 AUC 11: New Course Request, Worlds of the Past on the Digital Frontier***

**Motion to consider AUC 11:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Joseph Wachtel

**Discussion:** Kisha brought up a note of procedure, that the course should be considered separately from the LA&S designation and there should be 2 votes. The LA&S subcommittee only discussed the HI course designation. The new course was described as a digital history course which is an emerging field, within the digital humanities. It is suitable for both majors and non-majors.

**Vote on new course request:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

**Motion to consider AUC 11 for LA&S Designation:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

Historical inquiry (HI) LA&S designation is being requested. A friendly amendment from the LA&S subcommittee was accepted which added language for the rationale of secondary skills.

**Vote on LA&S designation for AUC 11:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

***3.10 AUC 17***

**Motion to consider AUC 17:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Keith Chenot

**Discussion:** The Engineering Technology Department are proposing a new Architecture Minor. This includes 4 courses from their department and two from the Humanities Department (History of Architecture and History of Modern Architecture). This minor could attract students from many different fields e.g. history, facilities, sustainability. It would give students an understanding of the language of architecture and a good knowledge of architecture from the past.

Meg voiced some concern that 4 of the courses for the minor need to be taken in sequence and wondered how often are they offered. This could cause issues as students often decide on minors in their sophomore or junior years and thus they may not reasonably be able to finish the sequence. Keith confirmed that the courses are frequently offered and the minor could be done in the junior and senior years.

A member posed a question on student demand and how will students would be recruited into the minor. Keith responded that it would be done by word of mouth, the catalog and trying to attract freshman from majors such as environment science.

The abstention in voting by a member of departmental curriculum committee was also questioned. Soumi indicated that he was the member who had abstained from the vote as he was concerned about the lack of evaluation of what is proposed to be taught in the minor. Danielle also questioned assessment of the minor. The Engineering Technology program, ENGT and CMTG courses are all new and they are looking at how courses meet accreditation standards. There is no specific minor evaluation process at the university. Soumi suggested a university wide process for evaluating minors.

Another member asked if the humanities curriculum committee had also voted on this proposal. Keith said the proposal had been sent to Petri Flint and the instructors of the two history of architecture courses. They have an email of support from Petri which Nirajan shared with committee.

Jonathan asked if Engineering Technology majors with the Architecture Concentration could do this new minor. Keith had not thought of that, but thinks it would be redundant. Perhaps other Engineering Technology concentration majors could do the minor. Linda indicated that the Registrar would question Architecture Concentration taking an Architecture Minor. Keith said we could add this exclusion as a friendly amendment. Linda indicated that this was probably not necessary. Department chairs have to approve the addition of minors and it would be flagged at that time.

**Vote:** 17/0/1 (For / Against / Abstain)

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

**Motion to consider AUC 18:** Linda Dupell, **Second:** Sarah Wright

**Sponsor:** Hong Yu

**Discussion:** This proposal requests a name change from “Electronics Engineering Technology Minor of the Industrial Technology Program” to “Electronics Engineering Technology Minor of the Engineering Technology Program”. This reflects the change in department name.

Liz asked if this is an active minor as it does not appear in the current catalog. The page from the catalog in the proposal is from 2013 catalog. Keith indicated that the department did not drop the minor or take action to remove it, so don’t know why it was dropped from catalog. Linda indicated that is still active in Banner and DegreeWorks.

**Vote:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

**4. Motion to Adjourn**

**Motion to adjourn at 5:09 pm**: Linda Dupell, **Second:** Aisling O’Connor

**VOTE:** 18/0/0 (For / Against / Abstain)

**Minutes respectfully submitted by:** Aisling O’Connor