ASCC 12/1/2017

385 Bricker Hall 9-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Coleman, Daly, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Heckler, Isoke, Jenkins, King, Kline, Kubatko, Lam, Lee, Oldroyd, Ries, Roup, Savage, Smith, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 11-17-17 minutes

* Vaessin, Fletcher, unanimously approved

1. Revision to online MA Art Education

* Revision replaces Art Education 7200.1 with 7200.3 (Overview of Research for Arts Educators) and updates the plan of study to include the correct course number for Research to Advocacy (Art Education 7777).
* The online MA is mostly taken by practicing K-12 art teachers. 7200.3 is a more practice-based approach to developing research skills.
* A&H2 letter, Coleman, unanimously approved

1. Revision to BA Arts Management

* The major was created in 2012. The revision is in response to a review of the program which took place over the past year.
* The review resulted in the following changes:
  + Change pre-requisite from CSE 1110 to 1111.
  + Students will be required to take an introductory course, Art Education 2100 “Introduction to Arts Management.”
    - Instructors will complete an evaluation sheet for students wishing to enroll in major. This will allow for closer observation of students to see which students will need support in order to succeed in the program.
  + Students will be required to take either Art Education 3680 or 3681, rather than both.
    - 3680 focuses on industry and 3681 focuses on the non-profit field. Students indicated they typically have an interest in one field over the other.
  + Art Education 5683 will change from being an elective to a required capstone.
  + Replacing Art Education 4786 with 4191 to allow for tracking the number of students participating in internships.
* Question: Is there anything that distinguishes the tracks within the major.
  + No, there are no tracks in the major. The change just allows for the option of taking either for-profit or non-profit course rather than taking both.
* Question: Wouldn’t it be beneficial for students to take both the for-profit and non-profit courses?
  + The introductory course will cover both fields, and upper-level courses will also cover both fields.
* A&H2 letter, Taleghani-Nikazm, approved – one abstention

1. Panel updates

* A&H2
  + Art Education 2100 – approved
* A&H1
  + Philosophy 2680 – approved with contingency
* NMS
  + Meeting replaced by e-vote – no courses approved
* SBS
  + Hasn’t met since last ASCC meeting
* Assessment
  + Held one meeting to discuss GE Assessment Plan and Assessment Report requirements.
  + Reviewed one GE Assessment Plan
  + Discussed using Qualtrics for Assessment Reports and Assessment Plans
    - Assessment Panel will ask departments to volunteer to use Qualtrics to submit their reports online.
    - Comment: Qualtrics has a compliance issue – not all questions are ADA compliant.

1. Updates from Steve Fink

* ODHE finished the 3rd phase of the CLEP exam survey
* CLEP is a college equivalency test. The exams tend to be fairly simplistic.
  + Students receive general college credit or credit for specific courses, including GE courses.
* ODHE wanted to implement a blanket requirement that all institutions would have to accept test scores of a certain level for credit. OSU pushed back on this.
* ODHE individually evaluated the exams in phases and sent out surveys to see if colleges across Ohio agreed with ODHE panel’s recommendations.
* OSU departments voted against counting credit in some subjects. ODHE will allow credit from CLEP exams to count in all subjects reviewed except for Natural Science.
* The number of students using CLEP for credit at OSU is small. The university would like to assess how well these students do moving forward, but it is difficult to tell how they earned the credit based on what is on their transcripts.

1. BS-Statistics: new (Guests: Yoonkyung Lee & Laura Kubatko)

* The Statistics major was discontinued in 1994. With a rising demand for Statistics majors nationally and among students, the Department of Statistics is creating the BS in Statistics.
* Data Analytics is co-administered by Statistics and Computer Science and Engineering. Statistics does not offer any undergraduate majors on their own.
* Statistics and Data Analytics differ in key ways.
* Member recommendation: Add Calculus I and II to the pre-requisites.
  + These courses were initially included in the major, but were removed as they are 1000-level courses.
  + They are currently included in the mandatory GE courses as well as the 4-year plan.
* Question: Students are permitted to take 2000-level math courses for the major. Do you have concerns that students will only take the 2000-level courses rather than Math 3345 and 4547?
  + No, this is not a concern. It is permissible for students to take the 2000-level courses. There will be a difference in rigor, but many students interested in grad school will pick higher level courses.
  + Lower-level courses will still prepare students for industry.
  + The department curriculum committee suggested adding the 2000-level courses for students who are not preparing for grad school.
* Question: Is there a transition plan?
  + The department does not have one yet. There have been many requests from Statistics minors to create a major. The department will work with students in the minor and in the Math major to transition to the Statistics major during the next semester.
* Comment: There is a lot of emerging interest in Statistics for both industry and grad school. The department should not assume that all students want to go to grad school and should work to create a welcoming environment in the major for all students.
  + The major was initially created as prep for grad school. After discussion, changes were made to cater to both students interested in grad school and industry.
* NMS letter, Heckler, unanimously approved

1. GE discussion

* The GE Committee has had 25 listening sessions across campus to discuss the draft GE document.
  + Will have listening sessions on all campuses and with all colleges.
* Question: Has anyone tried to run a model or models to try to predict the impact of the new GE on departments?
  + No, not to date. The GE Committee is still at a phase where they are receiving feedback on the recommendation before it goes to a working group who will develop an implementation plan.
  + Funds will need to be set aside for the redesign, including the development of new courses and the bookends.
* Question: Can an assurance be given to departments that the new GE will not bring harm to their departments? What is best for students in the new GE may not be what is best for departments.
  + There should be two statements of reassurance: on toward students and one toward departments.
* Comment: It is hard to determine what will happen to the departments because we don’t know what courses will be included in the new GE, especially in the themes.
* Comment: It should be possible to determine in certain scenarios how enrollment, the budget, etc. will be impacted by the new GE.
  + The GE Committee has not used any models to look at how the new GE will affect these things, but it is approaching the time when these models will be created.
  + The GE Committee can look at a range of possibilities, but not absolutes.
  + The ASC Faculty Senate wants a substantive analysis of what the GE revision will mean for departments, enrollment, the budget, etc.
* Question: Is the model used for semester conversion adequate? Were there deficiencies in this model that should be taken into account if used for converting to the new GE?
  + The timeframe for semester conversion worked.
  + Right now, there is not enough known about the structure of the new GE to know if the model will be adequate. The transition will likely be more complex.
* Senate Fiscal Committee will start working with GE Committee.
* The GE Committee has discussed the GE with all chairs from SBS, NMS, and A&H.
* ASC Faculty Senate made two motions on the GE proposal at the November 29th meeting:
  + Motion 1: That we, the ASC Senate, forward to the ASCC the document titled *Proposal for GE Requirement on “Race, Ethnicity, and Gender” in the Foundations section of the New GE Curriculum for OSU* and request that the ASCC incorporate the spirit of this proposal into any GE recommendation that they present to the Senate for review/approval.  [Note that Professor Theresa Delgadillo and other members of DISCO and the committee that prepared this proposal would be happy to meet with members of ASCC to discuss how best to include/incorporate this.]
    - Comment from ASCC: This category would be the only explicitly interdisciplinary course in the foundations. This area is not covered in K-12 curricula, so it is important that it is included in the GE.
  + Motion 2: That we, the ASC Senate, respectfully request that any GE curriculum proposal presented to us for review/approval by the ASCC include an analysis of the costs, consequences (including benefits to undergraduate students), and implementation issues/needs that will result from approval of said proposal.
* Changes can be made to the proposed GE, but the goal is to make the new GE as uniform as possible.
  + Any ideas that one college has for changes or additions to the GE can and should be shared with other colleges. It is not required that the GE is the same in all colleges, but this is the goal.
* Comment: It would be useful for ASCC to know which departments, colleges, campuses, etc. are making certain recommendations.
  + The GE Committee can try to get this information to ASCC whenever privacy is not an issue and when it is known who made what recommendation. However, this information should not be important as long as the recommendations are good. ASCC should be more concerned with the quality of the ideas.
  + The goal should be to decide what is best for ASC students. The proposal for the new GE will benefit from ideas across the university.
* Comment: The motivation for some of these recommendations is important. Some colleges or departments may be making recommendations to the GE Committee for accreditation purposes.
  + It would be difficult to tell what these motivations are based on the recommendations alone.
* The new GE must have some inclusion of OTM requirements. This requirement comes from higher than the GE Committee and OSU.
* There is also a need to limit the size of the GE. It currently accounts for nearly half of students’ courses. The GE Committee would like to make it closer to 1/3 of courses.
  + The OTM and the size of the GE impose a lot of structure on the new GE program.
* Comment: Level of collaboration between colleges is better than before this process started and better than at semester conversion.
* The GE Committee would like to create navigation panels that can assist faculty in creating courses for the themes before they reach the faculty panels for approval.
  + There is some concern that these panels may appear to faculty like another barrier to getting GE status or getting a course approved, even though this is not the goal.
  + The navigation panels will be interdisciplinary and should facilitate rather than supervise the creation of courses.
  + It is also becoming clear to the GE Committee that assistance will be needed for the bookends.
* Comment: Navigation Panels should also work with courses in the foundations as well.
* Question: How can we maintain the foundations and the interdisciplinary goal of the GE while also maintaining departmental names of the foundations?
  + Further discussion of this is necessary, especially with A&H.
* The GE Committee should regularly update ASCC on the progress of the GE proposal.