ASCC 1/23/15

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

ATTENDEES: Adams, Aski, Bitters, Breitenberger, Buckley, Craigmile, Daly, Ewoldsen, Fink, Greenbaum, Haddad, Heysel, Hogle, Jenkins, Krissek, Lam, Li, Mitzen, Nini, Stetson, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Yerkes

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 10-10-14 minutes
	* Stetson, Yerkes, unanimously approved
2. Revision to the Public Affairs BA—addition of 3 tracks (guests: Robert Greenbaum and Chris Adams)
	* SBS Panel Chair
		+ The proposal to add three specialization tracks is based on the increasing enrollment of students and hiring of faculty in the program.
		+ The tracks would provide students with more curricular experience.
		+ The Panel had concerns with original proposal regarding concurrences, credit hour requirements, and the assessment plan which the unit addressed and the Panel unanimously approved.
	* Public Affairs representatives
		+ This proposal addresses student demand and faculty expertise.
		+ Each track requires six credit hours of foundational coursework and a menu of offerings to choose from to achieve an additional nine credit hours.
			- The nine additional credit hours will give students the option of courses from all over the university in various disciplines.
			- These courses included in the menu were carefully chosen in consultation with departments.
		+ This program will always be interdisciplinary in nature.
		+ There is a capstone course requiring a capstone paper in the student’s senior year. The capstone topic is directly related to the specialization track.
		+ Any prerequisites for the proposed new courses are addressed in the four year sample curriculum included in the proposal.
	* The John Glenn School is becoming the John Glenn College and will now be in charge of their own curriculum. The ASCC will no longer be reviewing courses and programs coming from this unit.
	* **SBS Panel letter, Yerkes, unanimously approved**
3. Revision to the Latina/o minor
	* A&H Panel Chair
		+ Proposal is to simplify the minor making it more feasible for students to complete.
			- One revision would be to change the current 3 tracks to 2 broader areas.
		+ Concurrence was not included in the proposal but by the time feedback was provided the concurrence had come in from SPPO.
	* Committee discussion:
		+ The minor is decreasing from 15 credit hours to 12 credit hours however it is not stated as a change in the proposal. The minor was originally approved for 15 credit hours so some clarification for this change is needed.
			- According to the advising sheet the old tracks required 5 courses and the broader areas only require 4 courses.
			- This could be part of their plan to make it easier for students to complete but there is no explanation that there had been difficulties for students to complete the 15 credit hours.
		+ Would be beneficial to address how current students in the minor would be affected by this change. If they are being grandfathered in it should be stated.
			- This change would require students to take courses from both tracks.
			- Students often don’t declare a minor until almost completed.
			- It would be helpful to provide guidance on the new advising sheet.
		+ Expecting 30 or more students but the proposal did not mentioned how many current students are in the minor.
	* **Vaessin, Krissek, unanimously approved with the following contingency and recommendation**
		+ **Contingency: provide a one sentence rationale for the credit hour change from 15 hours to 12 hours.**
		+ **Recommendation: clearly state how students presently in this minor will be able to complete it.**
4. Revision to Music BA
	* The school is creating disciplinary concentrations in Performance, Musicology, Theory, Composition, and Jazz Studies.
	* There was a typo in the number of credit hours (should be 121 instead of 120). The unit was informed of this in the feedback from the Panel.
	* Music has several courses counting as ½ of a credit hour which is normal in their school.
	* Junior Recital 4505 has 0 credits. This could be in order to just show on the student’s transcript that it was completed.
	* **Krissek, Vaessin, unanimously approved with contingency**
		+ **Correct new semester plan language for GE natural science requirement. For BA programs only one lab is required.**
5. Panel updates
	* Honors Panel has not met
	* NMS
		+ Developing a rubric for minimum expectations to fulfill the GE Natural Sciences requirements. Considering what should be expected and how to interpret the rules and the ASC policies.
		+ Political Science 3780 approved
		+ Linguistics 2052H approved
	* SBS
		+ Anthropology 3597.05 approved with contingencies
		+ Human Development and Family Science 2350 approved
		+ Sociology 4000S approved
		+ Sociology 4000E approved
	* A&H
		+ Music 2208.22 and Spanish 2208.22 approved with contingencies
		+ Spanish 2798.80 approved
		+ Spanish 5705 approved
		+ German 2451 approved
		+ Revision to Music BA approved

1. Global Option (Steve Fink)
	* OIA developed a model for global option designation that programs could elect to incorporate into their curriculum.
	* Several colleges outside of ASC, for example the college of Business and Engineering, are implementing the Global Option.
	* The assumption by OAA and ASC was that the Global Option would be adopted by individual major programs and not by the entire college. However, OIA’s intention is that the Global Option will be college based.
	* OIA will come to the next ASCC meeting to discuss this Global Option certificate.
	* Committee discussion
		+ It may not be feasible in every unit as it would require more courses and resources.
		+ It would be important to know what exactly the certificate means to students.
		+ Seems the only way to be feasible by division is if May term continues and it could take off in different majors. However, some programs, especially through NMS, use May term for field research.
	* Would be beneficial to know if all of the components A-F of the guidelines could be adapted by individual units to develop their version of the Global Option or if all of these have to be fulfilled to be granted the Global Option certificate by OIA. It seems only possible for divisions or the college to implement if they could choose three of the five instead of being required to fulfill them all.
	* It would be helpful to see what Engineering and Business are doing especially with the language requirement.
2. GE assessment (Caroline Breitenberger & Paul Nini)
	* The Panel has been collecting course reports by GE categories. So far reports have been collected for top enrollment courses in VPA and Cultures and Ideas.
	* Departmental reports are also being requested.
		+ These reports are being requested from departments that have several courses with a certain GE category.
		+ History has already submitted a departmental report. Additional departmental reports have been requested from SPPO, Psychology, and the Center for Life Sciences Education.
		+ In addition to reporting on the GE, the Panel is requesting that the units also assist in developing a scoring rubric for a specific GE category.
		+ Departments are being requested to include all GE categories when reporting as well as including regional campuses.
	* Reports are being developed for GE Education Abroad, GE Service Learning, VPA, and Cultures and Ideas to provide an overview of how the category as a whole is performing.
	* Course reports
		+ In most reports the closing the loop section could be improved to discuss how the findings will be used to improve student learning.
		+ Not all reports provide everything requested.
		+ Some reports are not clearly distinguishing GE outcomes from course outcomes.
	* Meetings are being held with several units to discuss concerns and ways to make improvements.
	* GE scoring rubrics have been developed for several categories and rubrics for other categories will be developed as well.
	* Committee Discussion
		+ Important to make sure that there is an assessment plan in place that directly addresses the specific expected learning outcomes for the GE category the course is requesting.
		+ There is reluctance from units to think about the courses as GE with some completely ignoring the guidelines and examples.
		+ Some find it hard to make a clear distinction between the GE and the course content.
		+ The issue is more of trying to get people invested in GE assessment.
			- More buy-in may occur if information can be provided to show that GE assessment is working to help students succeed.
			- For accreditation purposes it must be done. Everything is moving towards being driven by assessment.
			- When talking about assessment it is best when you can go to the departments and have those one-on-one conversations.
			- There needs to be some sort of faculty credit or benefit for faculty doing assessment.
		+ GE course proposal suggestion: the questions asked for GE proposals are repetitive. Could change the rationale statement and have the unit talk about the assessment making them link the rationale to the assessment process.
	* Reminder of the university-wide assessment conference taking place on February 13th.