WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
May 6, 2021

To: The WPI Faculty
From: Tanja Dominko, Secretary of the Faculty

The eighth Faculty meeting of the 2020-2021 academic year will be held on **Thursday, May 6th, 2021 at 3:15 pm via ZOOM**.

1. Call to Order
    *   Approval of the Agenda
    *   Approval of the Consent Agenda and the Minutes from 4-8-21
2. Committee Business
    CAP
    *   Motion to Revise Language on Overloads in Undergraduate Catalog
    COG
    *   Motion to update Part Two - Section 7 of the Faculty Handbook to: include Assistant, Associate, and (full) Professors of Teaching; revise categories of nontenure-track faculty, and document terms of appointments, reappointments, and performance reviews for both *secured* and short-term nontenure-track teaching faculty members.
    *   Motion to add a fourth type of faculty grievance within the purview of the Faculty Review Committee.
    *   Motion to expand the formal definition of the WPI faculty, extend the responsibility for the governance of the faculty, and explicitly extend the full range of academic freedom to all members of the WPI faculty.
3. Other Reports – Recognition of recipients of Trustees' awards for this academic year
4. President's Report
5. Provost's Report
6. Secretary of the Faculty Remarks
7. New Business
8. Closing Announcements
9. Adjournment

TABLE OF CONTENTS Faculty Meeting Materials, May 6, 2021

   • Motion to update Part Two - Section 7 of the Faculty Handbook to: include Assistant, Associate, and (full) Professors of Teaching; revise categories of nontenure-track faculty, and document terms of appointments, reappointments, and performance reviews for both *secured* and short-term nontenure-track teaching faculty members.
   • Motion to add a fourth type of faculty grievance within the purview of the Faculty Review Committee.
   • Motion to expand the formal definition of the WPI faculty, extend the responsibility for the governance of the faculty, and explicitly extend the full range of academic freedom to all members of the WPI faculty.

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
Faculty Meeting Minutes
April 8, 2021

Summary:
1. Call to Order
   - Approval of Agenda
   - Approval of the Consent Agenda and Minutes from March 11, 2021
2. SoF Report
3. Committee Business:
- **CTAF/COG**
  Motion to extend the notification deadline for tenure-track faculty who opt out of the COVID-related extension
  Motion to extend the probationary periods for new tenure-track faculty members
- **COG**
  Motion to allow elected faculty governance committee members to vote on critical issues if a meeting of the entire faculty cannot be called
  Motion to extend remote voting in emergency settings only
- **COG – for discussion**
  Motion to update Part Two - Section 7 of the Faculty Handbook
  Motion to add a fourth type of faculty grievance within the purview of the Faculty Review Committee
  Motion to expand the formal definition of the WPI faculty
4. President's Closing Remarks
5. Provost's Closing Remarks
6. Closing Announcements
7. Adjournment

Detail:
1.Call to Order

The seventh Faculty meeting of the 2020-2021 academic year was called to order at 3:15pm via ZOOM by **Prof. Dominko** (BBT). **Secretary of the Faculty Dominko** welcomed everyone and reminded them that the meeting was being recorded. The consent agenda including the minutes from the last faculty meeting were approved.

3. Committee Business
CTAF/COG
Prof. Mathews (BBT) presented on behalf of the Committee on Tenure and Faculty (CTAF). CTAF and COG recommend that the deadline for opting out of a COVID related extension to the pre-10-year probationary period be extended not later than May 1st, 25 months before the date that tenure materials are currently scheduled to be submitted for all probationary faculty except those whose tenure review was originally scheduled for this academic year.

The original motion had an opt-out deadline for all probationary faculty, which falls about a month from now. We are concerned that most faculty may not be in a position to gauge just how severely the COVID-19 adaptions have impacted their professional progress by that date, so this motion then extends the opt out deadline to 5 months before the candidate's tenure materials would otherwise be due. Candidates who choose to opt out would submit their materials 13 months after the opt out deadline. This would provide extended time for decision making on the candidate's part before they reach their opt out deadline, but it also provides the departments or programs with an extended period of certainty during which they can plan the candidates application process and approach. The rationale for this motion includes the table shown. This lists relevant dates. This motion only changes things for individuals who have been here for 2-3 years at WPI. It does not affect those who have been here for longer than that since they will have either already gone through the tenure process or will be submitting this year, provided they did not opt out already. Candidates who are in their first year are falling under the following motion.

This motion passed with 76 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

Prof. Matthews moved on behalf of CTAF and COG that the probationary period for tenure track faculty members who started at WPI in the academic year 20/21 be extended by one year due to hardships associates with the COVID-19 pandemic and that each faculty member in this group be given the choice to opt out of the extension by providing written notice no later than May 1st, 25 months before the date that the tenure materials would be scheduled to be submitted.

This is being done because the original motion that was passed last April excludes this group, but they have been pretty severely impacted by the COVID restrictions. This motion only expands to one more cohort of new faculty, so those hired after the academic year 20/21 are not currently included.

Prof. Billiar (BME) asked if this meant those hired in the academic year 20/21 or those that started working in this year. Prof. Matthews clarified that this refers to the start date. Prof. Billiar mentioned that someone starting in January doesn't start their clock until the following fall, so this would add another year on top of that.

This motion passed with 82 votes in favor, 0 opposed.

COG

Prof. Boudreau (HUA) introduced motions on behalf of the Committee on Governance (COG). She explained that this first motion extends emergency faculty decision making to the quorum of elected faculty members to all committees through the end of the term.

This motion was approved last spring and hasn't been used, but could if a decision had to be made quickly and there wasn't time to assemble the faculty. If this was to happen, the decision would be made by all elected members of faculty governance committees. They would have the power to vote on these issues on an interim basis. Any such vote would be

4

revisited by the faculty at the earliest possible convenience. This was approved last spring, but this motion is to extend it to the end of the term.

The Committee on Governance recommends she move that if a faculty meeting cannot be convened in a timely manner for any reason, all the elected members of faculty governance committees will have the power to vote on critical issues on an interim basis through the end of D term 2021 with a required quorum of at least 25%. Any such vote would be revised by the faculty at the earliest possible convenience. COG felt that as we are still uncertain about what the variants do, it was wise to extend the motion until the end of the year.

Prof. Billiar asked if this has ever been used. Prof. Boudreau said it has not been used, but having it in place empowers us, with decisions about the calendar and other decisions to change academic policies because of COVID. If faculty input were important, this is a mechanism for us to give it without being able to be present as a full faculty body.

Prof. Sanbonmatsu (HUA) asked how many people would need to be present to meet the 25% quorum. His concern is that he would like to see quorum lifted to a higher percentage because this is a handful of people deciding matters for the entire faculty. He would like to see it be more representative if we are going to extend this extraordinary power. **Prof. Hanlan** (HUA) clarified that by definition in the Constitution, quorum is 25%. Prof. Dominko estimated that the quorum for this vote would be 20 faculty based on the approximate count of faculty serving elected committees. Prof. Boudreau reminded everyone that we haven't used this because it hasn't been that difficult to assemble. The fact that this hasn't been used shows that the faculty wouldn't take it lightly. Prof. Richman added that we do need to be careful, but these actions would be made on an interim basis, which brings some comfort. Other than the summer, we would be, at most, a month away from a full faculty meeting anyway.

This motion passed with 68 votes in favor.

COG

Prof. Boudreau explained that we are meeting and voting remotely out of compliance, but the Committee on Governance recommends that she move that they faculty meetings may, if necessary, continue to be conducted remotely, including synchronous remote voting until the start of A term.

President Leshin asked if we need to do anything about all of the stuff we voted on when the policy was expired. Prof. Hanlan clarified that we need to have an addendum to this motion or an amendment to make sure that we don't invalidate all the things we have done in the meantime. Prof. Boudreau proposed the acceptance of the friendly amendment that includes an addendum saying that this motion applies to all faculty meeting votes that were taken in January and March 2021.

The amended motion passed with 69 votes in favor.

COG

Prof. Boudreau explained that last year we developed a slate of proposals to include all of our full-time non-tenure-track faculty in faculty definitions and faculty governance. The first part of this was the teaching track tenure, which we approved in January 2021. The other two parts extend security of employment for the remaining non-tenure track faculty and define terms of their participation in governance.

Together, Prof. Boudreau and Prof. Richman highlighted areas in the Faculty Handbook where changes would need to be made. COG wants to hear from faculty about the big idea regarding the way these two things are coupled and how COG is proposing it. They want to hear about the details that need fixing because nothing is set in stone. The goal is to come up with a document that represents what everyone wants, and they hope that when it is complete, everyone will see in it a good faith effort to do the right thing by all of us.

Right now, the focus is on the handbook itself and what they need to fix. The other two pieces are both the security of the faculty who will be included in governance and then their inclusion. This is the preliminary discussion, and we will work on the details.

The first thing is to establish security for a large group of non-tenure track faculty. We are hoping that 15 of them will be put on the tenure track starting in the fall, but the remaining full-time non-tenure track faculty will have employment security. We are calling them secured teaching faculty and this security will be defined by the status and condition of their appointments, not by their titles.

The second part of this is to enhance faculty inclusion. There are three ways we are doing this. The first way is to expand the formal definition of the faculty formally. The faculty is defined in the Faculty Handbook as only tenured and tenure-track faculty. We refer to the non-tenure track faculty as our faculty colleagues, but formally and officially that definition does not include them. The proposal is that all full-time professors and instructors of all ranks, including Professors of Practice, are included explicitly in the definition of the faculty. The second way extends the responsibility for the governance of the faculty. It continues to include our tenured and tenure-track faculty members, but it will also include the teaching-track faculty members and all secured teaching faculty members. These are full time faculty on secure appointments. This also broadens the formal protections of academic freedom to include all members of the faculty. We believe that everyone who teaches should have academic freedom including part time faculty, but without the protection of the handbook. The processes in the handbook will extend these formal protections of academic freedom to all members of the faculty.

Prof. Richman explained the three relevant motions that will be discussed today. We have a section of the Faculty Handbook that is called Categories of Faculty Members of WPI. This includes a lot of provisions beside descriptions of the categories of faculty members and probably should be divided into smaller sections. He explained that changes will reflect the changes that have already been approved, for example, the establishment of the new professors of teaching as tenure-track ranks, but will also include appointment assurances and provisions that will be put in place for the secured non-tenure track teaching faculty. Other parts will include small changes for Professors of Practice and promotion procedures for the non-tenure track faculty. The second part of this is related to the security of employment that

we want to offer the secure non-tenure track faculty, which involves extending the scope and charge of the Faculty Review committee to include renewals and terminations of certain categories of appointments, just as we do for the current tenure-track faculty. We want to also do this for the secured non-tenure track faculty.

Prof. Richman pointed out that the first motion has different parts to it. One of these recategorizes our faculty and puts them into clear categories that are identified with brief descriptions of their roles. This is where a lot of our attention is focused. The secured non-tenure track faculty are defined as those who are hired not only with the expectation that they will have significant and continuing academic responsibilities of WPI focused on their teaching, but we also include provisions in their appointments that assure them that they have a long-term institutional commitment from WPI. This will be an explicit understanding that could be stated in an appointment letter, for example.

There is a second category that we would also consider secure non-tenure track faculty who are Professors of Practice because they bring non-traditional experience in terms of academic background. They would be considered secured non-tenure track faculty by the nature of their contract.

Prof. Richman added that it is important for the institution to also have the ability to hire short term non-tenure track teaching faculty who would be hire with the explicit understanding that their roles would be to fill temporarily. Currently, we don't propose to make any changes to appointments of research professors.

The TRT Council, COG, the Provost and the University Council are working on agreeing on a set of appointment conditions that are going to make the faulty who are appointed with these conditions secure. The first is appointment length. Someone who is hired as a probationary faculty would have a one-year appointment with the understanding that if things went well, the purpose would be to enter into a long-term commitment. This would be followed by two 3-year appointments and then repeating 5-year appointments. This is assuming that the conditions for reappointment are met. Primarily the security in these appointments is that no faculty member in these appointments would be disciplined or terminated without just cause. Just cause would include misconduct that would be defined and adjudicated according to our faculty conduct policy and would also include financial emergencies that would require reduction in teaching staff.

The reappointment decisions would be solely based on performance reviews. It would be important to do these in a transparent and fair way with a focus on teaching. There is a difference between a long-term restructuring plan and temporary cyclical changes in enrollment where a faculty can adjust their teaching responsibilities. If someone is going to be reappointed, this decision would be made by department heads in consultation with other faculty members. This goes up the chain then to the Dean and Provost. For current faculty members, the proposed rule is that their length of appointment that they would receive would be determined by the time they have already spent at WPI, as if this sequence had been in place from the time they were hired. If you started a year ago, you would have just finished the probationary period, so you would receive a 3-year contract. Someone who has been here

for 7 years has served their probationary period and two 3-year periods. They would be starting their first 5-year contract.

Prof. Boudreau explained that the second motion is to expand the scope of the Faculty Review Committee (FRC), which will be co-sponsored by the FRC. FRC has the power to review and require reconsideration of a number of decisions about faculty, including the Provost's decision not to renew a probationary tenure-track appointment. The proposal is to add this line to the list of things that the FRC can review. They can also review decisions to terminate or not renew appointments. Currently, FRC can only look at procedural issues, violations of academic freedom, improper procedure, or discrimination. We do not propose changes to these grounds. Motion three broadens the explicit right to academic freedom and protections. We want everyone to have academic freedom, but we cannot guarantee it except to those who are given these more secured contracts and allowed the process of appealing a decision that might be taken as a retribution for speaking openly. The right to express one's views without reprisal is extended to all faculty included in the formal definition of the faculty. This right is secured by access to all procedures described in the Faculty Handbook and most notably, the revision of the FRC charge mentioned previously. COG, Secretary of the Faculty, and governance are all connected. The overarching principle is that the governance of the faculty is the strongest and the most effective when those responsible are most secure. The lack of inclusion for all full-time faculty was referred to as an open wound because there was a conflict of interest that we couldn't resolve. This has been resolved with these secure contracts. This is a way to include everyone and offer the freedom to participate in all university activities without reprisal, including access to all procedural protections such as security within appointments, no disciplinary action and no termination without just cause. Security between appointments is based on regular transparent and documented reviews of performance.

Prof. Heilman (CBC) thanked Prof. Richman and Prof. Boudreau for putting this presentation together. He also thanked the TRT Council for the amount of work that they have done as well as Provost Soboyejo for listening to them.

Prof. Shue (CS) mentioned that we have discussed an implementation plan when we think about encouraging additional people to participate in voting. Do we need to have a temporarily staged voting quorum so as we are engaging new people, they start attending meetings and we can get back up to the current thresholds? He also asked if, when thinking about these contracts, we need to be concerned about the FRC in matters of compensation. A contract can be renewed but compensation amounts might change between renewals. It that were revised downward, is it something we would want the FRC involved with?

Prof. Richman mentioned that the hardest motion we would have to pass was if we put the existing Faculty Handbook to a vote. He added that when he started looking through it, he found many things that could be amended. This issue of whether compensation could increase or decrease is one of these things. When thinking about the FRC, we propose making changes that are necessary to bring the secure non-tenure track faculty to the level of protection that we currently offer our other faculty members. After this, we can go back and evaluate the FRC. In terms of quorum, Prof. Richman stated that we should think about this. The intention is that if we pass this, then we will still use the 25% rule based on the new

number of faculty. In September, we will have a larger faculty body and we are going to hope that those whom this is extended to understand that there is a responsibility to participate at faculty meetings.

Prof. Billiar admitted that he is not an expert on the handbook, and it seems much more thorough than what we do for tenure-track faculty right now. He doesn't think there is anything written in the review process. He did add that the FRC can review if someone doesn't like the decision, but people can be let go before going up for tenure. There are no 2-year or 3-year contracts for tenure faculty. The loading model for every faculty every year is written in their annual review about the expectations. This seems like a much higher bar. Prof. Richman stated that with respect to the FRC, nothing more than what is currently available right now is being proposed. There is no comparison for the tenured faculty because except for extreme circumstances, they cannot be terminated. We are trying to do what we can to make the non-tenure track faculty as secure as the current tenure-track faculty. In terms of contracts, these non-tenure track individuals will come up for renewal so they will be less secure than our tenure-track faculty in some respects. We are offering them some level of security, but it is not exactly the same as tenure. Although these faculty members won't have tenure, they will have the assurance that their responsibilities won't change within the term of their contract. Prof. Boudreau added that it is not an annual thing, but the Faculty Handbook does mandate formal review written documentation of the pre-tenure of the tenure-track faculty. This needs to go in their files for future reference. The DTC needs to provide Faculty Governance with documentation that this meeting has happened every year.

Department Head Roberts (CHE) had a few questions about motion one. She mentioned that changes to the job description are mutually agreed upon in writing, but when she looks at her job description it is very different than the job she actually does. New classes are assigned all the time for tenure-track members and non-tenure track members. She wanted to understand this provision a bit more because it needs to be mutually agreed upon by the Department Head and the TRT faculty member. Would this be for changing the courses that were taught by the faculty member or that faculty member participating in a committee? How detailed does this get? It is really difficult to quantify exactly what we do in the job description, so this may be difficult to enforce. Prof. Richman added that this is a work in progress and this feedback is valuable to hear. This depends in large part on the specificity of the initial workload and responsibilities. He mentioned that they are talking more about capacity and just not overworking people rather than being very specific about which courses they will be teaching. There could be flexibility built into this description. The concern seems to be a sudden increase in workload, which is why this will provide security. Prof. Roberts mentioned that she would like to hear suggestions on this because it is a little It too restrictive. We don't change people's job if someone takes an additional course. She is concerned that that this is creating another difference between these two groups. The idea could be that we just have new job descriptions for everyone. Prof. Boudreau added that the concern from the TRT is that they should be protected against arbitrary increases in their load because they are more precarious than those of us with tenure. We would love to hear from the Department Heads about new suggestions keeping in mind that the TRT are concerned. Prof. Roberts stated that she thinks this will be very hard to implement on a specific basis. This could be something given to the FRC if there is a discrimination suit or something that they could appeal. If someone is going to be appointed for 20 or 30 years, the job is going to change.

Prof. Stoddard (SSPS) spoke about the other part of the motion that was just discussed. She is a member of the TRT Council and what they discussed was that although the job does change often, this is not about if it changes, but rather having a discussion if the load is going to change. Within the pieces that are changing, the load can stay consistent, but this conversation is important with regard to trying to keep this load consistent.

Prof. Sanbonmatsu thanked Prof. Dominko, Prof. Boudreau, and Prof. Richman as well as the rest of COG for the work they have put into this. He expressed his strong support to these motions and stressed the importance of giving TRT faculty a voice in governance. We have been moving in this direction for a long time.

Department Head Xiao (RBE) stated that she appreciates the clarification of the roles here. She clarified that for performance review for TRT, we cannot just base the performance on teaching, but also on service, just like for tenure-track faculty. She asked about the reasoning behind the secured term versus short term. Having secured versus short term will remind them that they are not secure even though the short-term faculty are also valuable. Prof. Richman added that there is a distinction between the responsibilities and expectations of a short-term person who has been hired to fill a temporary role. They are defined in the documents as someone who is hired to fill a short-term teaching need. Since they are expected to be here for a short period of time, there is a difference in the security that is guaranteed. The terminology that is used can be discussed, but they are very different appointments. The differences in terms of responsibilities in governance of the university flows from these differences in the nature of their understanding of how their appointments would go. Prof. Xiao also stated if a faculty member has been teaching in a particular department for a very long time, then it makes sense that we can start from 5 years directly. If this was in a new department, like Robotics Engineering, there may be faculty members who have not been teaching in this department for that long. Prof. Boudreau added that this one-year probationary period can be repeated if the department is not ready to reappoint the faculty member for another term. This is a compromise document, and they want to avoid the possibility of ongoing extensions of one-year contracts. If this doesn't work, we are trying to imagine a scenario where after a year and a half you don't know enough about a person's teaching performance to know if they can be appointed to a 3-year tern.

Prof. Dominko requested a motion to extend the meeting for 15 minutes. Prof. Medich seconded Motion to extend was approved.

Prof. Spanagel (HUA) talked about how he was serially employed at a string of higher education institutions through his career. This had about 16 years of full-time teaching at the college level before he arrived at WPI. At each place he had been hired on a short-term contract. He spent the first year assuming it was just a year but would be building new programs and working extraordinarily hard to because invaluable. He taught for four years in one place, five years in one place, and three years at another place before coming to WPI. At WPI he got a one-year job but was then offered a full time position. This path was difficult because you need to learn the culture of the university that you have joined and bring your talents and work to create something new. He added that this helped him further admire the work done on these motions to indicate that a person who was hired in the first year of a potentially secure job won't be killing themselves for nothing.

10

Prof. Dominko thanked everyone who participated in this discussion and encouraged everyone who didn't share their thoughts to reach out to COG. They will be revising these motions based on these discussions. She also thanked Prof. Boudreau and Prof. Richman.

4.President's Closing Remarks

President Leshin thanked Prof. Dominko and everyone for the thoughtful discussion. We are incredibly close to the finish line on something that we have been talking about for years. This is the right thing to do, so she commended the TRT Council, COG members, Prof. Dominko, Provost Soboyejo, and Prof. Spanagel.

President Leshin urged everyone to stay strongly connected and integrated and we get towards the finish line here because we all have a role to play in this. In the administration, she realizes how much we all want to control every aspect of the process, but ultimately this transition piece is hard because we already have people here and we want to make sure they are comfortable. One thing she is interested in exploring is how much of this is documented in the faculty handbook. It is our responsibility to make sure we are creating a transition plan that is transparent to everyone and that everyone as comfortable with it. President Leshin expressed her excitement towards seeing where this goes for the institution and what it unlocks for us long term in terms of inclusion. Part of her job here is to balance and embrace both the needs of and desires of our amazing faculty colleagues and also understanding the we are living in a dynamic environment in higher education right now. She also added that flexibility in how we do things is important. President Leshin noted that we need to recognize that things are changing, which means we need to continue to build on these relationships that we have built in this moment to work together and embrace what is coming at us. She is excited to see this process evolving and will be thrilled the first time we have a vote that includes our TRT faculty colleagues because she wants to hear their voices.

Five weeks from today is the last day of the term. She thanked everyone for getting us to this point since we couldn't have done it without everyone. There is still a little bit of an increase in covid cases after term break, but this was not unexpected. President Leshin stated that she does not think we are going to get more vaccines allocated to the campuses in Massachusetts. She has been spending her personal time trying to beg and plead with everyone including the CDC director, but the state is focused on the large-scale vaccination sites. They are going to try to do some dedicated days at Worcester State at their public vaccination site that are dedicated to higher education. President Leshin is hoping most of us will be vaccinated before the end of the term. As we get into summer, we will be paying attention to the trend in higher education about requiring vaccines for students. We need to get a very high level of vaccination on the campus for the fall, so we will be pushing really hard for this.

There is a lot to do between now and the end of the term including strategic plan stuff and the small-scale commencement activities on the quad. We will not be able to have large numbers of faculty participating in any given ceremony, but we will be getting in touch about some ways to participate. President Leshin encouraged everyone to get some downtime this summer since they earned it.

5.Provost's Closing Remarks

Provost Soboyejo opened by stating that this is a special season where he comes out of hibernation. During that time, he does most of his thinking and now is his time to listen and learn from our faculty, staff and students. He realized that it is the quality of the impact that matters, not the quantity. He recommended to not worry about doing too many things, but rather choose the things that have the impact that you want to have. Provost Soboyejo assured everyone that they will find that the WPI community is a place that would really appreciate your serious contributions and not just count your numbers. The institution really values everyone's contributions and wants everyone to succeed. He hopes that the motions that were discussed today are an indication of how much investment we have in your success. He also encouraged the junior faculty to stay focused on doing their best work and know they have a long runway in which they can show that work. It is the impact and quality of the work that matters, not the quantity. Provost Soboyejo listened to the TRT faculty to identify the problems and come up with solutions. This makes his job easier since we have the richness within our faculty to not just identify the issues but comes up with the processes. He thanked everyone who has made this possible and acknowledged the contributions of the TRT Council, Faculty Governance, especially Prof. Richman and Prof. Dominko. He also thanked the TRT Task Force for the amazing job that they are doing with the TRT implementation committee. Provost Soboyejo also thanked Kris Sullivan who has been working to track all the financial implication in ways that assure everybody that we are doing whatever we are doing in a way that is thoughtful. He also thanked everyone working on drafting the contract that will provide so many of the assurances that Prof. Boudreau and Prof. Richman mentioned. He thanked President Leshin for listening and balancing the act between the faculty, administration, and the board. He thanked everyone who is providing support to ensure that the TRT faculty will have a voice and improve job security and the dignity that comes from being a teacher.

As we approach the end of D Term, he especially wanted to thank everyone who has been keeping us safe. He encouraged everyone to take time to enjoy their families and interactions with our community. He closed by encouraging everyone to enjoy the coming of summer in the most beautiful campus in the heart of New England.

6.Closing Announcements

Prof. Servatius (MA) added that we should get rid of Workday.

7. Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 5:20pm by **Prof. Dominko**.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanja Dominko

Secretary of the Faculty

12

Addenda on file with these minutes:

Motions:
- Motion to update Part Two - Section 7 of the Faculty Handbook to: include Assistant, Associate, and (full) Professors of Teaching; revise categories of nontenure-track faculty, and document terms of appointments, reappointments, and performance reviews for both *secured* and short-term nontenure-track teaching faculty members.
- Motion to add a fourth type of faculty grievance within the purview of the Faculty Review Committee.
- Motion to expand the formal definition of the WPI faculty, extend the responsibility for the governance of the faculty, and explicitly extend the full range of academic freedom to all members of the WPI faculty.

CONSENT AGENDA

CAO
1. MIS
   a. Removal of MIS 4781
   b. Update to distribution requirements for MIS Major
   c. Update to distribution requirements for BU, MGE, and MIS Majors
2. CEE – Addition of CE 4610
3. CEE – Update to EVE Distribution Requirements
4. HUA - Addition of EN1219

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Motion to remove MIS 4781 Information Systems and Technology Policy and Strategy from the undergraduate catalog approved by the Business Department on 04/06/21.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that MIS 4781 Information Systems and Technology Policy and Strategy be removed from the undergraduate catalog.

Description of Course to be Removed:

MIS 4781. INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY AND STRATEGY. Cat. II A successful MIS manager must keep up with the fast-paced changes in technology, apply technology when appropriate, and understand the implications technology has on employees and an organization as a whole. S/he must understand both the internal (e.g., political and organizational culture) and external (e.g., laws, global concerns, and cultural issues) environments. The core MIS capabilities of business and information technology (IT) vision, design of IT architecture, and IT service delivery also need to be understood by effective MIS managers. Recommended background: BUS 3010, MIS 3720 and MIS 4720 This course will be offered in 2021-22, and in alternating years thereafter.

Rationale: We have not taught this for 7 years and do not envision teaching it again. The topic of IT policy and strategy was not particularly interesting to MIS students, and as a result, enrollments were not very high. Furthermore, the professor who taught this course has left WPI.

Note changes to catalog: Delete MIS 4781 Information Systems and Technology Policy and Strategy

Impact on Distribution Requirements and Other Courses: Impacts Management Information Systems majors. MIS majors now have three additional courses to choose from, MIS 4084 Business Intelligence, MIS 4741 User Experience and Design, and DS 1010 Data Science I: Introduction to Data Science which are all Cat. I.

Resource requirements: No changes.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2021-22 Academic year.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Motion to change distribution requirements for Management Information Systems (MIS) major, approved by the Business department on 04/06/2021.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that the distribution requirements for Management Information Systems major (MIS) be modified as described below.

Existing Distribution Requirements*:
Table on p.46 of the undergraduate catalog, in the last box, the last line, starts with "Select two from:" CS 2102 or CS 2103, CS 2301 or CS 2303, CS 3041.

Proposed Distribution Requirements:
Change the table on p.46 of the undergraduate catalog, in the last box, the last line to the following "Select two from:" MIS 4084, MIS 4741, DS1010, CS 2102 or CS 2103, CS 2301 or CS 2303, CS 3041

Rationale: The change is to 1) add MIS 4084 Business Intelligence and MIS 4741 User Experience and Design, which are now both permanent courses and 2) add DS 1010 Data Science I: Introduction to Data Science, which is a new data science course, typically taught by business school faculty. This retains flexibility for MIS majors with the dropping of MIS 4781.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2021-22 Academic year.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Motion to change the core distribution requirements for Business (BU), Management Engineering (MGE), and Management Information Systems (MIS) majors, approved by the Business Department on 04/06/2021.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that core distribution requirements for Business (BU), Management Engineering (MGE), and Management Information Systems (MIS) majors be modified as described below.

Existing Distribution Requirements*:
NOTES SECTION: #5. Breadth Electives must include at least 1/3 unit from among the 3000- and 4000-level courses in the Business department. The remaining 2/3 units specified in the requirement may be satisfied with courses from Mathematics, Basic Science, Computer Science, Social Science, or courses with any of the following prefixes: ACC, BUS, ETR, FIN, MIS, MKT, OBC, or OIE.

Proposed Distribution Requirements:
NOTES SECTION: #5. Breadth Electives must include at least 1/3 unit from among the 3000- and 4000-level courses in the Business department. The remaining 2/3 units specified in the requirement may be satisfied with courses from Mathematics, Basic Science, Computer Science, Data Science, Social Science (except ID/SS2050), or courses with any of the following prefixes: ACC, BUS, ETR, FIN, MIS, MKT, OBC, or OIE.

Rationale: FBS is part of the new undergraduate Data Science program. Thus, Data Science courses are acceptable for meeting the breadth requirement in our three majors that have a breadth requirement.

Implementation Date: Implementation date for this action is the 2021-22 Academic year.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Motion to add Solid Waste Engineering, CE 4610 approved by Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering on 3/30/2021.

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that CE 4610, Solid Waste Engineering be added for academic year 2021-2022.

Course/Catalog Description:
CE 4610, Solid Waste Engineering, and Course Category (Cat.II).
This course will provide an overview of municipal solid waste (MSW) engineering with specific attention to municipal solid waste quantities and characteristics, refuse collection systems, landfilling, recycling and material processing, pollution prevention, biological processing, and energy recovery.

Recommended background: Basic knowledge of general chemistry (CH 1010, CH 1020 or equivalent), differential equations (MA 2051 or equivalent), fluid mechanics (ES 3004 or equivalent), thermodynamics (ES 3001, or equivalent), and Environmental Engineering (CE 3059).

Rationale: This course will enable students, especially those in the Environmental Engineering program, to develop skills in the area of Solid Waste Engineering. Solid Waste Engineering is an area not routinely covered in the program. Furthermore, the "PE exam" in Environmental Engineering has significant content in this area. Therefore, the regular offering of this course would fill a currently unmet need in the program. It will also provide an elective for other programs that may be of broad interest.

By the completion of this course, learners will be able to:
- Describe important regulations at the state and federal level related to the collection, disposal and recycling of Municipal Solid Waste (MSW),
- Evaluate trends in MSW generation, disposal, recycling, composting and energy recovery,
- Develop a conceptual design of an MSW landfill, including liner, leachate collection system, final cover, and landfill gas collection system,
- Explain the primary drivers influencing recycling rates and the primary processes utilized in material recovery facilities (MRFs),
- Understand the main principles for pollution prevention, and
- Evaluate options for energy recovery from MSW, including combustion, composting, and anaerobic digestion.

Contact: Prof. Harold Walker

Preferred term: B-term

Expected enrollment: 15

Course type: Elective

Intended audience: This course is intended for all Environmental Engineering majors as well as some students from Civil Engineering, Environmental and Sustainability Studies, Mechanical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Industrial Engineering, Sustainability Engineering (minor), and Materials Science and Engineering.

Anticipated Instructor: Prof Harold Walker

Resource Needs:
The basic resources needed to deliver this course include the following:

- Instructor: This course will be taught by Professor Harold Walker, a full-time faculty member in the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
- Classroom: This course will utilize active learning pedagogy. Therefore, a room capable of holding 15-20 students suitable for active learning would be ideal. Short lectures will be posted on Canvas. These lectures will be produced and posted prior to class time, so lecture-capture will not be needed.
- Laboratory: not applicable
- Textbook: *Solid Waste Engineering: A Global Perspective*, 3rd Edition by William A. Worrell, P. Aarne Vesilind, and Christian Ludwig, ISBN: 9781305635203. Students will be required to purchase the textbook for the course.
- Library resources: No new library resources will be needed. However, it would be helpful to have 1-2 copies of the textbook available for students.
- Information Technology: No new IT will be needed.

Assessment:

This course will be assessed based on the following elements:

- Homework: Weekly homework will be assigned and assessed in order to ensure basic skills in different content areas are developed
- Quizzes: A short quiz will be given weekly in order to assess students pre-class preparation, including their preparation for class through reading of the textbook or other assigned articles and viewing lecture videos in Canvas
- Projects: Students will be given a number of "mini-Projects" during the term in order to synthesize and apply the material. Significant class time will be devoted to project work.
- Participation and teamwork. Student participation will be assessed through activity in online discussions around specific topics. At least one of the projects assigned during the term will be completed in teams. Students will be required to perform a teamwork self-assessment and identify specific ways to improve teamwork skills.

At the end of the term, the success of the course (i.e., did the course meeting the learning objectives and outcomes) will be evaluated based on both STUDENT and INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK AND REFLECTION, outcomes of questions 1, 2, 7 and 19 of student course evaluations.

Previous Offerings as an Experimental Course

This course was offered on an experimental basis (as CE 461X Solid Waste Engineering) twice, in 2019 (B-term) and 2020 (B-term). The offering in 2019 had three students. Unfortunately, only one student completed the course evaluation. However, the evaluation was very positive with an overall course evaluation of "excellent" (5/5). Regarding whether they would recommend the course, the student commented "Yes. The course was very well organized and easy to follow. Even though most of the class required out of class work to remain on track with the material, the professor made it very easy to follow."

The offering in B-term, 2020 also had three students. In this offering, all three students complete the course evaluation. All three students rated the course as "excellent," with 5/5. The student comments in the evaluations were overwhelmingly positive. The only critiques were the low number of students in the course and one student felt the workload was a little high.

Overall, as the instructor, I felt the two offerings went well. The offering in B-term of 2020 was a bit challenging due to COVID, but based on the course evaluations I feel the students had a very positive experience. Given the small size, we were able to have in-person meetings regularly. I organized the course around active learning and spent class time going over problems and doing mini-projects and other activities. This seemed to go over well with the students. I'd like to improve the projects in the course next offering by having some external participation (e.g., perhaps through WPI facilities, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, or other entities).

Although the course had low enrollment for both offerings, the department is currently revising the Environmental Engineering curriculum It is expected that the revised curriculum will result in greater enrollment in this course in the future.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Proposed changes to the Distribution Requirements for the B.S. degree in Environmental Engineering, approved by the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department on 3/30/2021

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that the Distribution Requirements for Environmental Engineering B.S. degree be modified as described below.

Existing EVE Distribution Requirements

REQUIREMENTS	MINIMUM UNITS
1. Mathematics and Basic Science (Note 1)	4
2. Advanced Science (Note 2)	1
3. Engineering Science and Design (Includes MQP) (Note 3)	6

NOTES:
1. Mathematics and Basic Science
Must include 6/3 units of mathematics, including differential and integral calculus, differential equations, and statistics.
Must include 6/3 units of basic science, including 1/3 unit of biology (BB), 3/3 units of chemistry (CH), 1/3 unit of earth science (GE 2341 recommended) and 1/3 unit of PH (calculus based).

2. Advanced Science: Must include 3/3 units of science in biology (BB) and chemistry (CH) with a minimum of 1/3 unit in BB and 1/3 unit in CH. Advanced BB courses must be at the 2000-level or higher. Advanced CH courses include CH 1040 and CH courses at the 2000-level or higher. Courses may not be double-counted toward the basic science requirement.

3. Engineering Science and Design

Must include 2/3 units in thermofluids, including 1/3 unit in fluid mechanics (ES 3004 recommended) and 1/3 unit in thermodynamics (ES 3001, CHE 2013, or CH 3510).
Must include 2/3 units in mechanics and materials (CE 2000 or ES 2501, CE 2001 or ES 2502, ES 2001, ES 2503).
Must include 3/3 units of Core Environmental Engineering (CHE 2011, CE 3059, CE 3062, CHE 3201).
Must include 6/3 units in Environmental Engineering Electives, arranged as follows: 3/3 units in water quality and resources, 2/3 units in air and land environmental systems, and 1/3 unit in environmental management.
Must include 1/3 unit of environmental health issues (CE 3059, CE 3060, CE 3061, or appropriate experience through IQP, independent study, or appropriate consortium courses).
Must include 2/3 units with laboratory experimentation. Must include either CE 4060 or CHE 4401. The remaining 1/3 unit may be CE 4060, CHE 4401, laboratory courses in CH (CH 2640

or CH 2650, which would satisfy Advanced Science course requirements), CE 3026, or CE 2020.
Must include 1/3 unit major design experience through the MQP, or other approved design experience in a course such as CHE 4403 or ME 4429.

Proposed EVE Distribution Requirements

REQUIREMENTS	MINIMUM UNITS
1. Mathematics (Note 1)	6/3
2. Basic Science (Note 2)	6/3
3. Supplemental Science (Note 3)	1/3
4. Engineering Science and Design (Note 4)	15/3
5. MQP (Note 5)	3/3

NOTES
Mathematics (MA) must include differential and integral calculus, differential equations, and statistics.

Basic Science must include 1/3 unit of biology (BB; introductory biology, environmental biology, or biodiversity); 3/3 units of chemistry (CH) including equilibrium and kinetics; 1/3 unit of earth science; and 1/3 unit of calculus-based physics (PH).

Supplemental Science must include 1/3 unit in microbiology, ecology, spectroscopy, or organic chemistry.

Engineering Science and Design

Fundamental Engineering Science
Must include 1/3 unit in fluid mechanics (fulfilled by ES 3004) and 1/3 unit in thermodynamics (fulfilled by ES 3001)
Must include 2/3 unit in mechanics and materials (selected from CE 2000 or ES 2501, CE 2001 or ES 2502, ES 2001, ES 2503)
Must include 2/3 unit in mass transfer, heat transfer, and/or system engineering (selected from ES 3002, ES 3003, ES 3501)

Environmental Engineering
Must include 2/3 unit in core topics, including Environmental Engineering and Hydraulics (fulfilled by CE 3059 and CE 3062)
Must include 2/3 unit of laboratory experimentation (fulfilled by CE 4060 and one of CE 2020 or CE 3026)
Must include 5/3 unit of environmental engineering breadth and depth courses at the 3000 or 4000 level (selected from CE 3020, CE 3041, CE 3060, CE 3061, CE 4061, CE/CHE 4063, CE 4600, CE 4610, and at most one of CE 3070, CE 3074, or CE 4071)
Must include 3/3 unit of MQP, including 1/3 unit of capstone design

Rationale

This proposed EVE curriculum provides for a degree that meets the needs of current and future EVE graduates. The updated curriculum results from a number of considerations related to the recent ABET review, and also a series of meetings among the Environmental Engineering faculty in which some shortcomings of the current EVE curriculum were identified and addressed. The objective was to provide students with the required fundamentals in environmental engineering, along with flexibility to pursue the areas of interest within their field. The resulting updates include math and basic science requirements, supplemental science, fundamental engineering science, environmental engineering laboratory experiences, and environmental engineering breadth and depth courses.

Proposed Changes

Math and Basic Science
Adjusted the requirements for Mathematics and Basic Science - These updated requirements involve defining the number of courses for mathematics and basic science. These adjustment further clarify the math and basic science background required for environmental engineering and closely match requirements for ABET.

Supplemental Science
Removed the 2/3 unit advanced science and replaced this requirement with 1/3 unit of supplemental science - It was recognized that the existing advanced science requirement is not required for ABET and many students had been meeting the requirement by taking courses that do not provide essential background for environmental engineering. The adjustment to require 1/3 unit in microbiology ecology, spectroscopy, or organic chemistry assures that students will have an additional science course that provides background suitable to environmental engineers.

Engineering Science and Design
Updated Notes 3a and 3b with requirements for Fundamental Engineering Science – The fundamental engineering science courses were updated to include: fluid mechanics and thermodynamics, mechanics and materials, and heat transport, mass transport, and/or systems engineering.

Updated Notes 3c through 3f to provide a concise, clear set of requirements for environmental engineering science and design – The updates include adjustments and clarifications to core courses, laboratory experimentation, and breadth and depth courses. The curriculum review committee agreed that CE 3059 and CE 3062 provided sufficient core background, because the other core courses in the previous requirements were either covered in other classes or not feasible for students to include in their schedules. Similarly, the laboratory courses were adjusted to include courses that students could fit into their schedules. It was also determined that ABET requirements and appropriate bread and depth could be satisfied without defining categories currently listed under Notes d and e of the current requirements.
MQP

Updated Note 3g to clarify requirement for capstone design – All students in environmental engineering have been satisfying their capstone design requirement through the MQP. This adjust simplifies the distribution requirements and clarifies this requirement.
Impact

These changes won't have an impact on other programs or course populations. Most environmental engineering students have been taking the courses listed in the updated requirements anyway, so no course changes are required at this time. In addition, the ES courses are taught campus wide in multiple terms, and thus no significant impact is expected. The EVE courses have had variable populations over the past decade (e.g., CE 3059 has had as few as 35 and as many as 70), and thus can accommodate a range of populations.
Implementation Date: Implementation date for this motion is the 2021/2022 academic year.

Proposed Program Chart Environmental Engineering Program Chart

Students earning an ABET-accredited B.S. degree in Environmental Engineering must complete 15 units of study, distributed as follows:

UNIVERSITY REQUIREMENTS (12/3 units)		
Humanities and Arts	6/3 units	See WPI Requirements and Note 1
Interactive Qualifying Project	3/3 units	See WPI Requirements
Social Sciences	2/3 units	See WPI Requirements and Note 1
Physical Education	1/3 units	See WPI Requirements

MATHEMATICS (6/3 unit) (Notes 2 and 3)		
Differential and Integral Calculus	4/3 units	MA 1020/1021, MA 1022, MA 1023, MA 1024
Differential Equations	1/3 units	MA 2051
Statistics	1/3 units	MA 2610 or MA 2611

BASIC SCIENCE (6/3 units) (Note 2)		
Biology (introductory, environmental, or biodiversity)	1/3 units	Select one: BB 1001, BB 1002, BB 1045
Chemistry (including equilibrium and kinetics)	3/3 units	CH 1010, CH 1020, CH 1030
Earth Science	1/3 units	GE 2341
Physics	1/3 units	Select one: PH 1110, PH 1111

SUPPLEMENTAL SCIENCE (1/3 units) (Note 2)		
Microbiology, ecology, spectroscopy, or organic chemistry	1/3 units	Select one: BB 2003, BB 2040, CH 1040, CH 2310

ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND DESIGN (15/3 units) (Note 2)			
Fundamental Engineering Science	Fluid Mechanics and Thermodynamics	2/3 unit	ES 3004, ES 3001
	Mechanics and Materials	2/3 unit	CE 2000 or ES 2501, CE 2001 or ES 2502, ES 2001, ES 2503
	Mass Transfer, Heat Transfer, System Engineering	2/3 unit	ES 3002, ES 3003, ES 3501
Environmental Engineering	Core Courses	2/3 unit	CE 3059, CE 3062
	Laboratory Experimentation	2/3 unit	CE 4060 and one of CE 2020 or CE 3026
	EVE Depth	5/3 unit	CE 3020, CE 3041, CE 3060, CE 3061, CE 4060, CE 4061, CE/CHE 4063, CE 4610, and at most one of CE 3070, CE 3074, or CE 4071

MQP (3/3 units)		
MQP	3/3 units	Including 1/3 unit of capstone design

Free Electives (2/3 units)		
Free Electives	2/3 units	To meet 15 unit WPI Requirement. See Note 1.

Note 1: First year Great Problems Seminar (GPS) courses can only be used to fulfill the HUA, SSPS, or the Free Elective requirement.

Note 2: The courses in the above chart can be replaced by other equivalent courses, with the approval of the EVE Program.

Note 3: To fulfill the MA requirement, MA 1023 and MA 1024 can be replaced by MA1033 and MA 1034, respectively.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Operations (Prof. Mathisen, Chair)
Re: Motion to add EN1219 Introduction to Creative Writing, as approved by the Humanities and Arts Department on 11/06/2021

Motion: The Committee on Academic Operation recommends, and I move, that EN 1219 be added as described below.

Course/Catalog Description:

EN1219. Introduction to Creative Writing. Cat I.

In this introductory course, students will learn about the craft of writing poetry, creative nonfiction, and fiction. They will study contemporary published poems, essays, and stories written by international masters and use these texts as inspiration for their own creative work across genres. They will also read and respond to the work of their peers. Through an equally balanced studio/research approach, this course will develop students' skills as literary critics and creative writers. Students may not receive credit for both EN1219 and EN121x.

Recommended Background: None

Rationale: Creative writing classes are in high demand at WPI, frequently filling beyond capacity well in advance of a given term. Enrollment in creative writing classes has not waned even during our unusual 2020-2021 school year. With the recent hire of two new full-time creative writing faculty members, the HUA department seems poised to capitalize on student interest by expanding, strengthening, and refining the catalogue's creative writing offerings. Although WPI's catalogue has 2000-level courses in creative writing, no 1000-level course yet exists to serve as a gateway for WPI students to explore their abilities and interest in the three major genres of creative writing in which HUA offers coursework: fiction, poetry, and creative nonfiction. Such a class could also help lay the groundwork for more advanced and genre-specific instruction at the 2000-level. Additionally, an introductory-level course is a key building block in recently approved minor in creative writing at WPI, distinct from the English literature minor, which models successful efforts at peer institutions like Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (which offers minors in both creative writing and literature) and Rochester Institute of Technology (which offers both a creative writing minor and a less credit-intensive creative writing immersion option).

In regard to WPI's new creative writing minor--approved provisionally by CAO on March 16, 2021--this course is first in a sequence of creative writing courses, 1219 (this course), 2219, and 3219. EN1219 is being taught in an experimental iteration (EN121x) for the first time this term, D2021. It is above enrollment capacity, with 22 out of 20 seats filled and 5 waitlist seats filled, despite opening for enrollment late, on December 8, 2020. We anticipate student interest in this course will remain high, especially considering it fulfills requirements for the new creative writing minor.

A summary of student feedback for EN2219 Creative Writing, the next level in the creative writing sequence, is included below, and outcomes from questions 1, 2, 7, and 19 of course evaluations are presented below for both C21 section C02 (12 responses) and C21 section C01 (7 responses):

	C21 section C02	C21 section C01
Q. 1	4.8	4.7
Q. 2	4.8	4.7
Q. 7	3.5	4.0
Q. 19	1-5 hr/wk: 7 6-10 hr/wk: 4 11-15 hr/wk: 1	1-5 hr/wk: 3 6-10 hr/wk: 4

Contact: Joe Aguilar

Preferred term: A2021

Course type: lecture / discussion

Intended audience: Students pursuing their HUA breadth or depth requirement in English; Professional Writing students; English and International Studies minors and majors; IMGD minors and majors

Anticipated Instructor: Prof. Joe Aguilar, with Prof. Michelle Ephraim, Prof. Jim Cocola, Prof. Kate McIntyre, and Prof. Angel Rivera as capable alternates

Resource Requirements:
a) What <u>currently available</u> resources will be needed: A classroom.

b) What <u>new</u> resources will be needed. No new resources will be required.

Assessment: This course will be assessed via attention to enrollment demographics, instructor feedback, course reports (including data from questions 1, 2, 7, and 19), and departmental review.

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Policy (Prof. Dudle, Chair)
Re: Motion to Revise Mathematics and Science Requirement in Undergraduate Catalog

Motion: The Committee on Academic Policy and I move to revise the language for "The Mathematics and Science Requirement" within the "WPI DEGREE REQUIREMENTS" section of the WPI undergraduate catalog to read as follows:

> The specific requirement is two units of work in science, engineering, mathematical science or computer science. Two-thirds units of work must be in Quantitative Science; two-thirds units of work must be in Natural or Engineering Science; the final two-thirds unit may be from any of the Quantitative, Natural, or Engineering Sciences. Each major program may decide which courses and/or prefixes count for each category. Each major program may set more restrictive requirements as the program sees fit.

Rationale

The current math and science requirements for the degree requirements (pg 7, 2020-2021 catalog) states:

> The specific requirement is two units of work in science, engineering, mathematical science or computer science. Two-thirds units of work must be in Quantitative Science (courses with prefixes CS or MA count by default); two-thirds units of work must be in Natural or Engineering Science (courses with prefixes BB, BME, CHE, CE,CH, ECE, ES, GE, ME, PH or RBE count by default); the final two-thirds unit may be from any of the Quantitative, Natural or Engineering Sciences. Each major program may set more restrictive requirements as the program sees fit. Programs may also propose other work to fulfill any portion the two-unit Requirement; such alternatives must be approved by the Committee on Academic Policy and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

Recently, several new programs related to the Natural/Engineering Sciences – Aerospace Engineering (AE), Architectural Engineering (AREN), Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (BCB), Data Science (DS) and Neuroscience (NEU) – have been approved. Because of these additions, the current language in the catalog is out of date, and any program that wishes to count courses other than those with the listed prefixes must seek the approval of CAP and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. It is also possible that additional programs and/or majors may be added at a future time, thus rendering the catalog to be out of date again if the catalog continues to list specific prefixes. Therefore, the recommendation is to remove the listing of specific prefixes for each category, such that this language does not need to be updated every time a new major/program/course is added. This places the responsibility on each program to decide and update what courses best fit into the degree requirements.

<div align="center">**COMMITTEE BUSINESS**</div>

Date: May 6, 2021
To: WPI Faculty
From: Committee on Academic Policy (Prof. Dudle, Chair)
Re: Motion to Revise Language on Overloads in Undergraduate Catalog

Motion: The Committee on Academic Policy recommends and I move that the wording in the current (2020-21) undergraduate catalog be modified as follows:

Modifications to Undergraduate Catalog Language (2020-2021 catalog):

1. Global Project Program (page 19)

- Delete Existing Language: "Students are highly discouraged from overloading during the preparatory term and may only overload during the project term with the permission of their project advisors."
- Replace with Proposed Language: "Students must also follow all policies and procedures for off-campus projects which are overseen by the Global Experience Office: https://www.wpi.edu/student-experience/resources/off-campus-projects/policies ."

2. Office of the Registrar; Registration; Overload of Courses (page 216):

- Delete Existing Language: "A student may not include any portion of qualifying work as part of an overload without the approval of both the academic and project advisors. Written approval will be requested before registration can be completed."
- Replace with Proposed Language: "Students are strongly encouraged to consult with their academic advisor before registering for an overload".

3. Office of the Registrar; Registration; Overload with Project (page 217):

- Delete Existing Language: "Students may not register for an overload (more than 7/3 units per semester) without the electronic approval of the academic advisor."
- Replace with Proposed Language: "Students are strongly encouraged to consult with their project advisor(s) before registering for an overload."

Rationale:

The current catalog wording has some inconsistencies and portions are also not currently being followed as practice.

First, with regard to single-term, off-campus projects: Typically, a student would not be able to overload if they were off-campus as students would be geographically unable to attend an in-person class at WPI. However, the availability of remote classes in the recent year has expanded

the potential to overload while away at a project site. It is uncertain whether classes may be offered in remote formats in the future. As such, policies for one-term, off-campus projects may change with time, and there may be circumstances in which policies could be different for different global project locations. Therefore, the proposed wording notes that students must follow policies/procedures as set by the Global Experience office, and this wording allows for the policies to be updated on the website rather than requiring changes to the catalog.

With regard to overloads of courses: Faculty do not currently have to approve overloads, and the concept that a student needs official faculty approval seems inconsistent with the WPI philosophy that students should be allowed to challenge themselves without the kinds of restrictions common at other universities (such as required pre-requisites). The NR system allows them to do so without affecting their GPA if the challenge proves too much. The concept of developmental advising which WPI embraces should allow the student to be responsible for the decision making and the impact of that decision, while encouraging the opportunity for discussion with the academic advisor.

With regard to overloads with project: The academic advisor may not have appropriate knowledge of the nature of the project work a student is proposing to undertake in order to decide if an overload with project is acceptable. Logistically, requiring approval from both advisors often leaves the student unable to register for the project as one or the other advisor fails to provide official approval. Additionally, enforcement of the current policy is unequally applied depending on when a student has registered for the project relative to the decision to register for an overload. Consistent with the philosophy noted for overload of classes, the language for projects has been changed to indicate that consultation with the project advisor(s) is strongly recommended.