ASCC 11/3/2017

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Heckler, Jenkins, King, Kline, Krissek, Lam, Martin, Montalto, Nini, Oldroyd, Ries, Savage, Smith, Stotlar, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Winnubst

1. Approval of 9-29-17 minutes
* Fletcher, Savage, unanimously approved
1. Revision to General Education (guests: Randy Smith, Cathy Montalto, Larry Krissek, and Andrew Martin)
* University decided to review the GE approximately one year ago
* Rationale for review:
	+ The current GE is 30 years old
	+ GE curriculum is large and does not allow for many electives
	+ Wanted to re-envision GE for the student in 2020
* The GE Review Committee held approximately 30 listening sessions during the Spring 2017 semester
	+ Looked at GE programs at peer institutions to look for best practices across different institutes.
* During the Summer 2017 semester, the GE Committee held weekly meetings to discuss the GE revision. During the Autumn 2017 semester, the GE Committee is holding listening sessions on the new GE. The GE Committee will then hold meetings and report to pertinent bodies and administrators. The final report will be submitted by December 2017/January 2018.
* Will then go to Implementation Committee and ASC Faculty Senate for review.
* Guiding principles for the new GE:
	+ Should be integrated program with clear learning outcomes
	+ Intentional multi-year program integral to student experience
	+ Disciplinary breadth
	+ Thematic components
	+ Emphasis on understanding various modes of inquiry
* The GE Committee drafted new learning outcomes
* 3 subcommittees developed structure of the new GE program: foundations (preparation), themes (practice), and bookends (reflections and connections)
* Foundations
	+ One course from each subject area: Writing and Information Literacy, Math and Quantitative Reasoning, Art, Literature, History, Natural Science, Social and Behavioral Science
* Themes
	+ Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World
		- All students will complete this theme.
	+ Students select additional theme from list of 4 themes: Sustainability, Health and Wellness, Places and Spaces, Transformative Ideas
		- Students will select one theme and take courses in 2 subthemes.
		- Transformative Ideas theme meant to tap into notions of creativity and innovation.
	+ Additional themes can be added and themes changed in the future as certain themes become more or less relevant.
	+ Similar themes are used at universities with thematic components.
	+ Theme courses will include one data analysis course and one writing and information literacy course.
	+ Oversight committees will include experts in these areas to work as quality control.
* Bookends
	+ GE Seminar (2 credit hour) – introductory seminar course that will link to goals in theme.
		- Will introduce students to GE and explain the value of GE.
		- Will not be merged with existing survey course. It will be a separate course, but integrated with the survey course.
	+ GE Capstone
		- Will not be required of students in their last semester, but will be required late in college career (rank 3 or early rank 4)
		- There is interest in integrating GE capstone and partnership with Apple.
		- The GE Capstone will likely be an e-portfolio connecting their experience at OSU to GE learning outcomes.
* Other meetings will be held on the GE including an open ASC meeting.
* Question: Will ASCC make recommendation to ASC Senate?
	+ Yes, ASCC will make their recommendation on the new GE before it moves to the ASC Senate. No voting will occur this month.
* Question: One of the goals in creating the new GE was to make the GE universal. Can individual colleges expand on this model?
	+ Yes, that was the goal. Individual colleges can specify how students will meet specific parts of this structure or add other requirements.
	+ Goal was to design a GE that all units will work with and then add on rather than eliminating parts, as they currently do.
* Question: Who will teach the bookends?
	+ This has not been discussed in detail. Goal is to have faculty teach bookends and to provide support for faculty who teach the bookends.
* Question: How will faculty set content for students?
	+ Committee is accumulating a list of implementation issues that will need to be addressed. Other universities have made committee aware of these issues as well.
	+ Training and support will be highlighted in implementation.
	+ GE seminars will become part of faculty assignments for the year.
	+ Committee is trying to provide opportunities for departments and units to give input.
* Question: Will seminars and surveys be large enrollment?
	+ This will be an implementation issue.
	+ The GE Committee suggests that seminars and surveys can be large enrollment or have distance learning components as long as the learning outcomes can be met.
* Question: Is there a sense that one goal will be to reduce GE courses?
	+ Yes, there are currently approximately 1500 GE courses.
* Question: How will this be managed when goal is also to be open to units’ needs?
	+ Goal is to review courses in the GE curriculum on 5-year basis.
* Question: The budget is the main driver for having such a large number of GE courses. How will this model work with the budget?
	+ This will be an implementation issues and will be discussed with the Provost.
	+ The goal is to determine what is needed before determining funding.
* Question: How will students know what to do for the capstone? Will the same people teach seminar and capstone?
	+ This is another implementation issue.
	+ The GE seminar will clarify to students the requirements for the capstone. It will need to be decided how students are reminded about the e-portfolio.
* Comment: The Department of Arts Administration, Education and Policy started using iPads for e-portfolios, and it is very effective. However, the department is small. This will be difficult to implement on a large scale. It will be especially difficult to teach all faculty to use iPads.
* Question: In the current GE model, it is problematic when students take the second writing course late in their college career. How will we be sure that students take this course early enough so they have proper writing abilities throughout college?
	+ The GE Committee has had conversations about scaffolding GE. This has not been finalized, but they are considering requiring certain categories to be taken at or before reaching a certain rank.
	+ Committee also wants much more oversight over the second writing and information literacy course.
* Question: Foundations seem similar to original GE while themes are exploratory – why not change foundations and think about them less traditionally (e.g. language could be writing and information literacy)? Additionally, absence of foreign language goes against the idea of global citizenry. We could think about the foundations more creatively and fit foreign language into foundations.
	+ Subcommittee looked at existing GE for the learning outcomes and determined that a lot of the learning outcomes are still relevant. Some boundaries are outside our control like Ohio Transfer Module (OTM). Foundations aligns with OTM for this reason.
* Comment: GE courses themselves will need to be restructured to allow the simplification of the foundations. However, this is in conflict with OTM. We need to make sure that there are base competencies that are sufficiently met instead of simplifying too much.
	+ Every major will need to reexamine their pre-requisites to make sure that their pre-requisite courses will still do what they need to do.
	+ At state level, OTM is being prepared for revision. Other universities have also revised their GE.
	+ This may cause some issues with overlap with majors and GE. Uncertain how much will be allowed.
	+ When GE was originally created, GE was intended to be entirely separate. Now it must be decided if there can be overlap and how much.
* Committee comment on foreign language: Regardless of where foreign language appears in the GE, there will be opportunities for languages to expand. There are conversation occurring to offer more language courses relevant to health sciences, engineering, etc.
* Question: How will courses be chosen by students to fill themes? Currently there is a list of courses to choose from. Will this still be the same?
	+ Likely will depend on units. Each subtheme will have learning outcomes. Courses will be evaluated on appropriateness for meeting those learning outcomes. Cannot say yet what courses will be available.
	+ Units will need to decide what established courses can fit in this model and what courses they can create to fit in foundations and themes.
	+ Advisors and course management systems have helped peer institutions with this. Students are able to indicate their interest in courses semesters in advance so units can offer these courses.
* The OAA website on the GE revision allows individuals to provide input.
* The GE Committee would like someone from ASCC to serve on the implementation committee.
1. Revision to WGSS graduate programs: PhD, MA, Graduate Minor (guests: Shannon Winnubst and Jackie Stotlar)
* Program changes deemphasize the current track-based curriculum in favor of a program that utilizes core courses. The department created 8800.xx topics courses.
* Question: How will students be affected by the transition?
	+ All current students will have flexibility in their program. The gateway courses for the current curriculum will not be offered this academic year. The department will work with students based on what is being offered to determine their specific course of study.
* Question: Will each decimalized 8800.xx course have a corresponding theme?
	+ Having 8800.01-.06 will allow for enough options in scheduling so a decimal number will not be repeated with a different topic in an academic year.
	+ Courses taught with the same theme will retain the same decimal number.
* A&H1 letter, Fletcher, unanimously approved
1. Revision to the Bachelor of Science in Design-Interior Design
* Rationale for revision:
	+ The revision will allow for more focused learning in interior design specific coursework.
	+ Interior Design has accreditation from two bodies (NASAD and CIDA). CIDA has very specific accreditation requirements, which were recently updated. Course changes are in response to the new requirements for accreditation.
* A&H2, Lam, unanimously approved
1. Revision to the BA Moving Image Production
* Addition of Art 2000 as an option for fulfilling pre-major requirement. Students will not choose either Art 2000 or Art 2555.
* Committee comment: it was nice to see affordability taken into account along with curriculum considerations for this revision.
* A&H2 letter, Savage, unanimously approved
1. Team-teaching grant review:  instructions <http://go.osu.edu/ASCTeamTeachingcfp>
	* Team-teaching courses should be collaborative and interdisciplinary. Both instructors should be jointly responsible for the course.
	* College wants courses to fit in curriculum in meaningful way so the course is sustainable. The college is trying to avoid putting a large amount of effort in a course that is only offered once.
	* College is providing incentives to instructors with the goal of eliminating common barriers to team-teaching.
	* Committee suggestion: when putting out the call for team-teaching proposals, ask for a statement of intent instead of official proposals initially. This can help the college determine ways to work around barriers that exist for team-taught courses as well as more effectively remind departments about team-teaching opportunities.
	* College welcomes input on how to make team-teaching courses more visible and increase interest.
	* History 3708  <https://ascnet.osu.edu/request/3839>
	* Reviewed by A&H2
		+ Found it to be a well-designed course
	* Recommendation: iPads do not work with lockdown browser, so they will want to think of something else for students without computers for exams
	* Course will likely be suitable for multiple life sciences.
	* Hits important need of teaching history and science in a way that one individual cannot teach alone.
	* Coleman, King, unanimously approved
	* History 5710 <https://ascnet.osu.edu/request/3827>
	* Committee member: are dual enrollment courses an issue with undergrads not being prepared enough to take courses with graduate students?
		+ This typically isn’t an issue- graduate students are usually at a foundational level or have additional requirements in these courses.
	* Committee member: is the pre-requisite necessary if the point is to expose students to anatomy? Would there be any interest from students who are not pre-medicine or taking anatomy courses already? Eliminating anatomy pre-requisite could make this course appeal to more students, which could be beneficial.
		+ Likely that this will not be humanities majors but science majors who want humanities enhancement, which would be very beneficial for these students.
	* King, Savage, unanimously approved