ASCC 5/18/12

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

Attendees: Beyerchen, Brintlinger, Butters,Collier, Fink, Fletcher, Hadad, Haddad, Hogle, Heysel, Jenkins, Kalish, Krissek, Lam, MacGilvray, Masters, Sanders, Schwartz, Vankeerbergen, van der Heijden, von Frese, Weinberg, Wurster, Yerkes

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 5-4-12 minutes

Schwartz, Beyerchen, 1 abstention, approved

1. Updates from Panel Chairs

**A&H**

* Linguistics 3604 – unanimously approved

**NMS**

* Hort & Crop Sci 2200 – unanimously approved as a Natural Science (Biological Science) BA-only for ASC students.
* Geography 2960 – unanimously approved as a Natural Science (Physical Science) BA-only for ASC students.
* Physical Activity Specialist Minor – unanimously approved with contingencies
* Revised GE language – unanimously approved
  + Reinstate but also rephrase this expected learning outcome for both Biological Science and Physical Science: “Students understand key events in the development of science and recognize that science is an evolving body of knowledge.”
  + Remove “examples” in expected learning outcome 2 (for Physical Science).

**SBS**

Has not met

**Honors**

Has not met

**Assessment**

* The panel began working on the GE Education Abroad scoring rubric and Chris Highley and Alexis Collier met with OIA to complete it. It is now ready to distribute to proposers.
* The Service Learning GE submission guidelines and scoring rubric need to be developed as well but courses have not yet been proposed for this category. The development of these documents should be quicker because they will be similar to the GE Education Abroad guidelines and rubric.

1. Critical and cultural theory minor (semester conversion)

* The A&H Panel approved it unanimously. There were errors with course numbers in the proposal that were corrected.
* It is an Interdisciplinary Minor and is a straight semester conversion.
* Suggestion by committee member:
  + Explicitly state core course on Minor Sheet to make sure that students don’t miss it.
  + Add introductory paragraph on Minor Sheet to explain the minor in order to attract more students.
* A&H Panel, Krissek, unanimously approved
  + Provide two suggestions stated above

1. Aviation minor (semester conversion)

* The NMS panel approved this minor unanimously. It is a straight forward semester conversion. When it first came to panel it was in the format for Engineering and the panel asked for it to be put in the format that was consistent for Arts and Sciences.
* NMS Panel, Beyerchen, unanimously approved

1. Proposal to ASC Senate by Professor Conn

* This proposal is going to the ASC Senate and it concerns this committee. As the committee chair, Mitch will be invited to the ASC Senate meeting.
  + Richard Fletcher, Eric McGilvray, and Pok-sang Lam were involved in the steering committee in which they read the original proposal and were asked for suggestions to create the best proposal possible.
  + The original proposal sought to abolish all of ASCC. This proposal has now been watered down because of the understanding that the approval process for the GE is necessary.
* Having review at this level helps with concurrence issues by resolving conflicts & advertising to a larger clientele to appeal to students across departments. It also ensures a level of consistency in regard to course levels. For example, a course may be changed from a 2000 level to a 4000 level with the same academic rigor.
* If this proposal passes, CAA would be doing a tremendous amount of work
* There has been concern in the past about the length of time it takes to approve a course. However, there is a new process in place to speed up the approval process.
  + ASC courses and majors have gone through CAA much more quickly than other colleges because of the vetting process in place
* Discussion on Prof. Conn’s statement that departments “own” their curriculum
  + University Faculty rules state that proposals need to be approved by the college.
    - Degrees are awarded by college, not by departments so the college has a reason to have a review process.
    - This is a university rule, not just an ASC rule that would change if this proposal passes.
      * From the ASC Senate this proposal would go to the ASC Dean and then up to the University Senate and Board of Trustees to change the language.
  + Individual faculty have to be held responsible by their department and we are doing the same thing at the college level.
  + There is an ongoing issue with understanding what academic freedom is. We have an obligation to the programs and the vetting is a quality assurance process.
* Role of the panels
  + Need to narrow the scope of the panels and make it explicit to panel members what should be a matter of review and explicitly state the intentions of the panels.
  + Discussion about reviewing content of courses
    - When reviewing courses that are not GE, panels should not question the content of the courses.
    - Sometimes it is appropriate to look at the content when there is an imbalance of the readings and expected learning outcomes. The panels are looking for a coherent syllabus.
    - The job of the instructor is to make sure that the readings address the expected learning outcomes and some panel members feel uncomfortable when deciding readings from a unit they are not familiar with.
    - This is not policing or attacking academic freedom. It is enriching to have dialogue with faculty to get the proposals as clear as possible. Faculty want students to take these courses and so they want their syllabi to be clear.
  + Faculty hours are being spent on the review process (approximately 6-8 hours every 2 weeks) and this time may not be spent in the most productive ways.
  + Need to put some of the responsibility back on the departments. Some departments do not seem to be reviewing their own course proposals because they know they will be reviewed by the Panel.
  + We should be talking about helping and coordinating with faculty rather than saying “do this or else.”
  + Coordinating with faculty is more difficult now that the structure has changed and there are no longer departmental representatives on each panel.
  + Panel members need a clear list of criteria that they are looking for in order to feel more comfortable with their role
  + A document with all of the rules including a training checklist & a statement of principle explaining what the panels are intended to do would be useful.
* Suggestion: Ease back on editing
  + The process would be smoother if the panels stop copy editing syllabi for things like font size and commas
    - The idea has been that if the panel catches these mistakes now, when the proposals go up to CAA it doesn’t look like the panels did a sloppy job.
    - Need to focus on things that are going to really get scrutinized by the registrar that may possibly require them to send back the proposal.
  + Making the disability statement 16 point font is a recommendation not a rule.
  + Someone has to check for these things because there are requirements for what needs to be on the syllabus
  + Could provide check lists of the requirements for syllabi for units proposing courses
  + Many of the clerical issues that seem to be discussed are for GE course proposals.
  + Courses are not held up just for clerical problems but suggestions are made and faculty should welcome feedback.
  + Contingencies are used more for GE courses rather than regular courses for issues concerning the absence of GE language. Contingencies are used to speed up the process to make sure that proposals do not have to go back to the panels.