ASCC 4/25/14

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Buckley, Burry, Collier, Craigmile, Fink, Fletcher, Hadad, Harvey, Hogle, Jenkins, Krissek, Kuo, Lam, Sanders, Schwartz, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Von Frese, Yerkes

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 4-11-14 minutes
	* Aski, Vaessin, unanimously approved
2. Election of ASCC Chair for 2014-15
	* Associate Executive Dean Steve Fink
		+ Thank you to all who have served on ASCC and have completed their term.
		+ Additional ASCC members are still needed for next term. If any current members have colleagues that would be interested or would be good on the committee pass along recommendations to Steve Fink.
	* Meg Daly has agreed to step in as Chair for ASCC
		+ Vaessin, Krissek, unanimously approved
3. Panel reports
	* A&H
		+ Spanish 5501.10 (new course) unanimously approved
		+ Spanish 5501.20 (new course) unanimously approved
		+ Polish 3101 (new course) unanimously approved
	* NMS
		+ Discussed proposals but nothing was approved to bring to ASCC
	* SBS
		+ Geography 5503 (new course) approved with contingency
		+ Psychology 5602 (new course) approved with contingency
	* Honors has not met
	* Assessment Panel
		+ Reviewed GE assessment reports from Service Learning courses that were taught during Autumn term. The reports were fairly good and feedback will be sent to the instructors.
		+ Met with GE Education Abroad and GE Service Learning instructors teaching in the summer to review GE assessment plan.
		+ Rubrics are currently being developed for 4 GE categories with the assistance of representatives in various units.
4. FYI about 2 dual programs BA History/MA East Asian Studies and BA History of Art/MA East Asian Studies
	* Since these programs are linked to the BA they are brought to ASCC as an FYI and not up for vote. These programs are in the process of being approved by the graduate school. The graduate school wanted ASCC to be aware of the programs before they are approved and move on to CAA and to be able to address any concerns should there be any.
	* If there are no objections Steve Fink will write a letter of support to the graduate school.
	* Curriculum for the BA and the MA is remaining the same.
	* The GPA requirement for combined programs is a 3.5.
	* Request that advisors in History and History of Art be made aware of the programs. They need to know that these programs exist and what the requirements are so that they can help students and direct them to the right people about the graduate program.
5. GE revisions to BSD programs
	* The rationale for the revisions was a recommended increase in the number of Art and Design History credits to 12 by The National Association of Schools of Art and Design in their 2013 accreditation report. The following revisions were proposed and approved by the Arts and Humanities Panel:
		+ Add “History of Art 2001, Western Art 1: Ancient and Medieval Worlds” to the “Historical Study” category.
		+ Move “History of Art 2002” from the “Historical Study” category to the “Second Historical Study” category.
		+ Add “Choose one 3 credit hour course from History of Art 3000-level or above” to the “Open Option” GE category, which would effectively reduce the open credits to three (3), from the current total of six (6).
	* History of Art 2001 and 2002 are already approved GE courses that will now be required for all of their majors to take to fulfill the Historical Studies GE category.
	* Any History of Art 3000 level or above course will be able to fulfill the GE open option category even if the course has not been approved for GE status.
		+ To prevent increasing the number of credit hours in the major the unit is requesting that the higher level course fulfill the GE requirement.
		+ Since these courses are not approved for a specific GE category. assessment reports will never be requested or received to see how they are fulfilling the GE category.
			- Using assessment to track the courses that are being used to fulfill the GE Open Option category could actually help the program to decide which courses should be proposed as GE courses.
			- It would be reasonable to ask that they request GE status for the primary courses being used to fulfill this requirement.
			- Could ask the unit to address which courses are being used to fulfill the GE open option category in their major assessment report.
				* The limitation is that the major assessment report addresses how the program is meeting the national organization standards and therefore will not address the GE program.
			- **The advising office will keep track of the courses that students are taking to fulfill the GE open option category and provide the data to the ASCC Assessment Panel.**
				* **The goal is to see if there are specific courses that should be submitted for GE status.**
				* **Need to inform departments that this tracking will be happening.**
	* A&H Panel Letter, Sanders, unanimously approved
6. Discussion – the work of the curriculum panels (Janice Aski & Richard Fletcher)
	* A&H Panel concerns
		+ Course materials are sometimes put together by staff members instead of faculty and the suggestions made by the Panel aren’t getting back to the faculty member.
		+ Syllabi are coming in other languages and at times some passages are copy and pasted from other courses.
		+ Faculty are simply submitting these syllabi for the course to be approved but will not teach the course in the way that is actually proposed.
		+ The details of the syllabus aren’t of interest to the Panel. The department owns and cares about the content. The most interest is the curriculum map, concurrences, GE, and GE assessment.
		+ Not all departments have a curriculum committee and not all Chairs are aware of what is being proposed and approved since approval does not always go through the Chair of the departments.
		+ OAA requires a syllabus but do the Panels really need a syllabus to approve a course proposal?
	* Discussion by Committee:
		+ It’s important that the department thinks about the syllabus. Sometimes the credit hours on the syllabus don’t add up and the Panel can provide that feedback only if the syllabus is provided.
			- Responses
				* We could ask for a list of expectations instead of a complete syllabus. Departments should care about their courses and the responsibility should be put on the department instead of telling professors how to write their syllabus.
				* All of the information that would be on the list of expectations would need to be in the syllabus anyways.
				* We need to let professors do their job and it should be the faculty member thinking through the syllabus not the staff member.
		+ The real issue is that faculty need to take responsibility of their syllabi
			- The curriculum map is a way to get faculty to take ownership and the department will get to see if the course is doing its job in the program.
			- The curriculum workshops during Autumn term focused on best practices and reinforced that departments and faculty need to take ownership of their courses and proposals.
		+ The Chair should be part of the approval process in curriculum.osu.edu
			- The departments designate the approvers
		+ Before the merger of the 5 colleges into Arts and Sciences each college had its own “curriculum committee.” Each curriculum committee used to have one representative from each unit. That was beneficial in relaying the information and having departments take ownership.
		+ Concurrences
			- It would be difficult to write a concurrence without having a syllabus with a weekly schedule.
			- The Panel is unable to decide if the proposal needs concurrences without a syllabus.
		+ Institutional level need for syllabus
			- It is assumed that students have a clear syllabus when they walk into the classroom. For accreditation it is important that we deliver what we say we are and that is where the need for the credit hour check comes in. There has to be some sort of assurance. This is a check and balance system. When a proposal goes to OAA the assumption is that the check has already occurred.
				* Response: there is no guarantee the syllabus is being used.
				* Another response: we have to trust departments.
		+ Most departments ask for a syllabus from their instructors each semester. There is value in asking for syllabi.
		+ Individual units
			- Suggestion: if problems arise regularly from the same unit, Steve Fink could have a discussion with that unit.
			- Approval process at the unit level needs to be improved before getting the proposal at the Panel.
			- If there are significant issues, the Panel could invite someone from the unit to come to the Panel meeting for discussion to have open communication about expectations. The NMS Panel is going to start implementing this more frequently.
				* It is beneficial to have the conversation happen at the Panel and not just between the unit and Steve Fink or the A-Deans. It is a better environment for sharing best practices.
			- There are ongoing efforts to educate individuals at the department level to take responsibility for curriculum and to take it seriously.
			- Panels need to think about what the priorities are and what they are responsible for vetting and what they are not responsible for.
				* Committee member: it is important to remember that the Panels act as advocates for students.