ASCC 3/24/2017

4138 Physics Research Building 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Daly, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Hawkins, Jenkins, King, Kline, Krissek, Lam, Montalto, Oldroyd, Ries, Roup, Savage, Smith, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 2-3-17 minutes
* Krissek, Aski, approved, one abstention
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ First-year Seminar – Leta Hendricks – approved with one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar – Amy Shuman – approved with one comment
	+ First-year Seminar – Jennifer Suchland – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ First-year Seminar- Aimée Moore – approved with two contingencies
	+ First-year Seminar – Richard Fletcher – approved with one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar- Zoe Brigley Thompson – approved with one question and two recommendations
	+ French 1101.61 and 1102.61– approved with five comments
	+ History 2680 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Philosophy 2455 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Public Affairs 2500 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
	+ Russian 2144 – approved with one recommendation
	+ WGSS 2282 – approved with one recommendation
	+ WGSS 2325 – approved with one recommendation
	+ A&H1 panel discussions:
		- Panel receives course submissions without enough information on assignments.
		- Panel ran into an issue of GE “ownership” with a GE History course outside the History Department.
			* Departments with primacy over a GE category need to provide clarification on criteria for GE courses outside that department.
			* Cross-listing can be an option in some cases of non-concurrence.
		- Suggestion: Word limit on GE rationale for course proposals. Subsequently, another member indicated a word limit may not be an appropriate solution since some departments may need to provide a longer rationale supporting their request for 2 or 3 GE categories.
		- Panel feels that courses with 3 GE categories cannot adequately meet the expectations for all GE categories.
			* This should be an issue that is revisited with the new GE.
			* Approving courses with 3 GE categories should be at the discretion of the panel. ASCC does not have the power to make a rule against 3 GE categories.
* Assessment
	+ Panel reviewed two reports since last ASCC meeting
		- Panel keeps seeing issue of reports that assess the course and not GE ELOs.
		- Panel hopes that asking for an assessment plan before a report is due will help fix this issue. Many GE courses were submitted before an assessment plan was required for approval.
	+ Finalized a list of courses to request for next course report on GE Data Analysis, GE Diversity: Social Diversity in the US, and GE Diversity: Global Studies.
* SBS
	+ Communication 1101 – approved with five recommendations
	+ Communication 3325 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ Economics 5261 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Economics 5262 – approved with one contingency
	+ First-year Seminar – Jill Clark – approved with four contingencies and two comments
	+ First-year Seminar – Daniel Strunk – approved
	+ First-year Seminar – Kevin Passino – approved with two contingencies
	+ First-year Seminar – Mat Coleman – approved with one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar – Vladimir Kogan – approved with four contingencies
	+ International Studies 3350 –approved with seven contingencies and two recommendations
	+ Political Science 1165 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Political Science 3596.01 – approved with one contingency, two questions, and one recommendation
	+ Political Science 4200 – approved with three contingencies
	+ Psychology 5603 – approved with four comments and three contingencies
	+ Political Science 7781 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
	+ SHS 6150 – approved with one recommendation
	+ SHS 6742.03 – approved with six recommendations and two contingencies
	+ Concurrence issue with Economics 5261 and 5262:
		- Fisher College would not provide concurrence because they believe the courses overlap with Business Administration: Finance 4265 and the business minor program.
		- Department of Economics gave the following response to the non-concurrence: 1) The math requirements for Economics 5261 and 5262 are more rigorous than the Finance course. 2) The scope of the business course is narrower and focuses on risk management. 3) The pre-requisites for the business course make it very difficult for economics students to enroll.
		- Panel agreed with the Department of Economics and voted to approve the course.
		- ASCC decides to endorse vote by SBS Panel: Lam, Savage, unanimously approved
* NMS
	+ Chemistry 1612 – approved
	+ First-year Seminar – Lorraine Wallace – approved with one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar – Betty Lise Anderson – approved with two recommendations
	+ Geography 2200.02 – approved
* A&H2
	+ ASC 2798.06 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Art Education 7767 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Classics 2222 and Religious Studies 2222 – approved with contingencies
	+ First-year Seminar – Thomas Davis – approved
	+ First-year Seminar – Michelle Herman – approved with two recommendations
	+ First-year Seminar – Tamar Rudavski – approved
	+ History 2070 – approved
	+ History 3312 – approved with one recommendation
	+ History 5229 – approved with contingencies
	+ Philosophy 5610 – approved with one question
1. Changes to Master of Music in String Performance and Master of Music in Brass Performance
* The proposal is to change two Master of Music subprograms so those two subprograms have a parallel structure of 32 credit hours.
* The String Performance subprogram will increase credit hours from 30 to 32.
* The Brass Performance subprogram will decrease from 34 to 32 credit hours.
* A&H2 Letter, Roup, approved
1. GE Review listening session (Randy Smith, Cathy Montalto, and Larry Krissek)
* GE Committee members distributed the following questions to the panel regarding the new General Education program:
	+ What should be the big-picture goals of OSU’s General Education program?
	+ What should all Ohio State graduates know and be able to do?
	+ What structure(s) will meet these goals? Be coherent? Serve student needs? Be adjustable for the future? Integrate assessment?
* The new GE will need to work on all campuses.
* Committee member question: Will the new GE program continually be assessed and updated? Furthermore, will assessment of the new general education program be more coherent or will it continue to be assessed on course-by-course basis?
	+ Response to questions: ULAC was established 10 years ago to look at GE program on a broad level. ULAC’s role will be maintained, but could be tightened up going forward.
* Committee member suggestion: Change the name of the GE program.
* Committee member suggestion: Integrate STEM more in the GE and do not make STEM requirements lower for BA students.
* What skills should all students learn by graduation? General education should be necessary skills that are not learned elsewhere.
* Committee member suggestion: All students should have experience, at least at a basic level, with a programming language by graduation (e.g. Python or R).
	+ Are other universities requiring this?
		- University of Buffalo recently revised their general education. It now includes a required capstone course that is online, and knowledge of HTML is required.
* Committee member suggestion: all students should take at least one online course. The capacity to learn online is essential.
* GE committee members noted an interest in the overarching theme of citizenship from the other sessions.
	+ Programming could be an element of preparing students for digital citizenship.
* Committee member suggestion: Writing needs to be part of new general education. Undergraduate students are still struggling with writing.
	+ Insist that writing requirements are taken early on in undergraduate curriculum because many students are putting off their writing courses.
		- If a capstone component is required in new general education, a writing course could a pre-requisite
		- Suggestion: Keep writing in English department instead of integrating writing into other departments. Not all professors are able to teach writing
* Committee member suggestion: All students should have to take a foreign language, regardless of their college.
* Committee member suggestion: Students need to learn critical thinking skills
* OSU GE model is a distribution model, which is not widely used anymore.
	+ Other models have “themes” and courses are under the themes. There are even hybrid models that mix distribution and thematic models.
* Why are students choosing the courses they choose for GE? Are these choices based on convenience, ease of curriculum, etc.?
* Students do not understand the purpose of general education. They view it as checking off boxes without an understanding of what they are supposed to be gaining from the courses. University should make effort to clarify the purpose of general education to students.
* Committee member suggestion: Have an awareness campaign that articulates the value of GE to students (awareness campaign should be implemented on all levels and involve advisors, deans, the president, etc.).
* If faculty are passionate about general education, it will increase the value for students. GE should be faculty-driven. Currently, lecturers and GTAs teach many lower-level GE courses.
* Committee member concern: Are the two issues of “what should all Ohio State graduates know” and “what structures to meet these goals” at odds with one another?
	+ The budget is currently driven by course enrollment.
	+ How is it possible to avoid the same problem we have now with the budget?
		- GE review committee told not to think about the budget and focus solely on academics of general education
		- Provost said he won’t restructure the budget until there is a recommendation about the new general education program
* Committee member suggestion: Have a recommended set of GE courses for different majors or areas of study so GE courses can be used as pre-requisites
	+ Other committee member concerned this would not lead to inter-disciplinary general education in which students experience courses outside their area of study
* Committee member suggestion: Should GE progress through levels so students are fulfilling GE requirements throughout their undergraduate career?
* Comments on GE from Randy Smith:
	+ GE is already considered a program by HLC.
	+ The new GE should realign with the new university mission.
	+ Students need to learn creativity.
	+ The university should consider what the foreign language requirement should be 2017.
	+ Emphasize the importance of ASC in the GE process.
	+ Faculty needs to be involved in GE and take leadership in GE.