ASCC 4/1/16

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

ATTENDEES: Aski, Beecher, Bernhagen, Bitters, Burry, Craigmile, Daly, Friedman, Hawkins, Heckler, Heysel, Hogle, Holding, Jenkins, Krissek, Lam, Nini, Roup, Ruiz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 2-26-16 minutes
   * Aski, Taleghani-Nikazm, approved (1 abstention)
2. Moving Image Production BA (new major; guests: Professors Mary Anne Beecher and Ryan Friedman)
   * A&H Panel Chair, Janice Aski, presented the cover letter.
   * Art courses in the major have not been fully approved and the Panel has not received any updates.
   * One concern raised by the Panel was the lack of face to face contact with the professor in the internship course.
     + Students will meet with the professor to turn in assignments.
     + There will be two meetings between the professor and the internship supervisor.
   * Prerequisite courses
     + It will take students approximately a year to take the required courses to be accepted into the program.
     + Offering the foundational courses at the regional campuses has not been considered.
     + If students are interested in this field, ASC is encouraging students going to regional campuses to go to Newark where more arts faculty and courses reside.
   * There is a portfolio review process for students to be accepted into the program.
     + Transfer students in their second year that are admitted, based on their portfolio review, will be able to enter the program without the foundational courses.
   * Committee member question: Is there any consideration given to the idea of formalizing a minor for those that don’t get into the program?
     + The courses are built in a way for students to successfully complete them and enter the program. Students will be receiving lots of feedback from instructors as they progress through the courses.
     + Majority of students that are not admitted to the program would pursue a Film Studies major with a focus in production. There is also a Video Arts minor and there may be a way to use the prerequisites in that minor.
     + The foundational courses only total 9 credit hours.
   * Curriculum map has 4000 and 5000 level courses described as “beginning.”
     + These are existing courses and the numbering may not make sense.
     + A committee member suggested adding an asterisk to explain why “beginning” is used for 4000 and 5000 level courses as it may raise a concern when reviewed by CAA.
   * **A&H Panel letter, Vaessin, unanimously approved** 
     + **Advising sheet suggestions/changes** 
       - **Art 2555 and History of Art 2901 are approved for VPA and can count in the Open Option GE category.**
       - **The Open Option language regarding Math is BS language rather than BA language. Instead of “(except Mathematics 1151 or below)” it should state “(except Math 1075 or below).”**
     + **A conversation about who the major advisor will be needs to take place before the major is up and running.**

1. Panel Updates
   * A&H
     + AAAS 4342 approved with contingency
     + AAAS 5240 approved with contingency
     + ASC 1100.04 approved
     + ASC 4191 approved
     + Dance 2701 approved
     + Dance 2702 approved
     + Dance 2801 approved
     + Dance 2802 approved
     + Dance 8200 approved
     + Dance 8800 approved with contingency
     + Design 3105 approved with contingency
     + Design 3305 approved with contingency
     + History of Art 7189.01 and 7189.02 approved
     + Freshman Seminar approved
   * NMS
     + Astronomy 1102 approved
     + Biology 1131 approved
   * SBS
     + Sociology 3200 approved with contingency
     + Sociology 5450 approved with contingency
   * Assessment
     + Looking into ways to improve the data collection process.
       - Presentation on Tracdat system
         * Tracdat does not interpret the data.
         * Any changes would have to go through another office.
         * Panel determined that Tracdat may not be the best option right now for collecting GE assessment data.
     + The Panel is now looking into a different system called Qualtrics.
2. Service-Learning Course Proposal Grant Selection (Please read call for proposals here<http://artsandsciences.osu.edu/about/faculty-staff/faculty/service-learning-course-proposals> )
   * These are course development proposals rather than actual course proposals.
   * In the future there may be two submission deadlines.
   * Glenn Martinez proposal
     + Community partners (local school districts) have already stated a need.
     + **Krissek, Aski, unanimously approved**
   * Julia Jorati proposal
     + Focused on teaching.
     + Should work with those in the Teaching and Learning department.
       - The service project would have to go to a school district’s central administration for approval as there are strict guidelines across districts as to what should be taught day by day in the classroom.
       - Could consider making it an after school program.
       - The Teaching and Learning department has people that know how to work with the school districts.
       - There are no teaching courses required as prerequisites.
     + This project should be encouraged but consultation with Teaching and Learning is necessary.
     + **Krissek, Vaessin, unanimously approved** 
       - **Work closely with Teaching and Learning before continuing with the development of this course. Such consultation should be useful for the following reasons:** 
         * **Teaching & Learning has a well established practice of putting students in classrooms.**
         * **The planned activities might not fit into the public high school curriculum (Teaching and Learning might suggest an after school program, charter school, private school, or alternative options).**
         * **As currently proposed, the course would not include any education prerequisites. Since the course would be available to undergraduate students it may be crucial to pair students with teachers.**
   * Katherine Borland proposal
     + **Craigmile, Aski, unanimously approved**
   * Miranda Martinez proposal
     + The unit will need to create a new course number for the service version of the course.
     + Needs to be more explicit of what they want the students to achieve.
     + **Vaessin, Aski, unanimously approved** 
       - **Clarify the needs of the community and what the students will be providing to the community/community partner.**
       - **There needs to be a clear community organization that the students will be working with.**
   * Mytheli Sreenivas proposal
     + Variety of partners identified.
     + Outreach and policy research.
     + Should consider compliance issues.
       - Adjust language that refers to recruitment on behalf of the community partners.
       - Service Learning courses should not be supporting advocacy.
     + Currently taught as an undergraduate level course without the Service Learning component.
     + **Burry, Taleghani-Nikazm, unanimously approved** 
       - **The service learning part of the course is not fleshed out in the current syllabus.**
       - **The language used should be neutral. When submitting the finalized course request in the future please refrain from using language that suggests recruitment and advocacy on behalf of the community partners. For example, the committee noticed the following statements that should not be used in the final documents that will be submitted.** 
         * **Page 5 of proposal states “participating in phone banks to raise awareness and support for the organization.”**
         * **Page 6 of proposal states “they were eager to work with OSU students in order to expand their network of supporters.”**