ASCC 1/19/2019

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Beecher, Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Daly, Fink, Hawkins, Heckler, Jenkins, King, Kline, Lam, McGraw, Oldroyd, Piperata, Roup, Savage, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 12-1-17 minutes
* Roup, Lam, unanimously approved
1. BA and BS Medical Anthropology (new; guests: Scott McGraw & Barbara Piperata)
* There is interest and opportunity to offer this at OSU. Important to provide opportunities at the undergraduate level in this topic because students are typically on a different path by grad school. This will increase the visibility of the field.
* Committee question: Will students come from within the Department of Anthropology?
	+ The department hopes students will come from within the department and also from outside the department. This program will especially be of interest to students in health-related fields.
* Committee question: Will the large amount of credits prevent students from having a minor or double majoring?
	+ The department does not expect this to be an issue. The majority of students majoring in Anthropological Sciences, which also requires a large amount of credit hours, have a minor or a second major.
* Committee question: Can you say more about distinction between BS and BA?
	+ The major difference is that the BS approaches the field from an evolutionary perspective whereas the BA is designed to focus on an ethnographic/bio-cultural perspective.
	+ Some students are not prepared for the science-oriented perspective in the BS, whereas some students want the scientific approach. The BA doesn’t preclude students from taking a science-oriented approach to the field, but it also allows them to focus on the social science approach.
* Committee question: Why isn’t an evolution course among required courses?
	+ Introduction to Physical Anthropology covers evolution.
	+ Students who double major or are preparing for medical school will likely take a course on evolution.
	+ Comment: It seems that a more intense evolution course should be required, especially for students interested in medical school. If evolutionary perspective on medicine is something that guides the curriculum, the assumption should not be that students are learning about evolution elsewhere.
	+ Comment: If the current curriculum is approved, the department may want to look at evolutionary course as part of assessment. The department should look at where their students are going after graduation, what courses could better prepare them for these paths, etc.
	+ Comment: A genetics course at the biology level would benefit students, especially those going to graduate school or medical school.
	+ *Recommendation: Add evolution and genetics courses to the curriculum.*
		- This will be especially important for students applying to medical school or graduate school in related fields like genetics or EEOB.
		- Response: The Department of Anthropology was only able to imagine so many trajectories while creating this program. They are not opposed to adding a bio-evolutionary course. Most anthropology grad programs focus on the cultural perspective. Students applying for medical school will likely take evolutionary course as preparation in addition to the anthropology major.
	+ *Recommendation: Instead of revising the curriculum, the department can add a note on the advising sheets for students pursuing particular paths that they should take evolution and genetics courses. Assessment can be used to see if the curriculum needs formally add these courses in the future.*
* Comment: Physics has recommended tracks for students to take based on their post-graduation goals. Sample schedules are provided for students interested in industry, graduate school, high school teaching, and life-sciences. This could be a useful option for Medical Anthropology.
* *Advising comments: Anthropology 2202 is an approved GE Social Science course. It could satisfy a GE requirement and leave room for another 3 credit hour course in the 4-year plan. Additionally, it may be a good idea to specifically identify the pre-med courses rather than marking them as “other.” This will make it obvious to students that the courses are needed to prepare them for the MCAT and are typically requirements for medical school admission****.***
* *The form for the BS has the incorrect number of minimum required credit hours. It should be 46 credit hours, not 43.*
* SBS letter, Hawkins, unanimously approved with *recommendations* (in italics above)
1. Game Studies Minor (new; guest: Mary Anne Beecher)
* The Game Studies minor will allow for the academic and interdisciplinary study of video games. The program will be jointly administered by Design, Communication, and English. The minor takes the topic of video games seriously, allowing students to take a critical approach to the field of video games.
* Committee question: Will the departments move beyond the minor in the future and create a major? Why aren’t the departments creating a major now?
	+ The first challenge will be assessing demand. The interdisciplinary nature of the program presents an additional challenge for how a more focused major will be created.
	+ There is also a major in creation that is focused on eSports that will be administered between multiple colleges (ASC, Engineering, EHE, and Business). It is likely that this major will complement the Game Studies minor.
* Committee member recommendation: The groups in curriculum are not a formal requirement, but Group A is weaker than the other groups. Two of the courses are variable topics courses, and the offerings are not guaranteed. Keep an eye on this if you are encouraging students to focus on one of the groups.
	+ English 2367 will create its own decimalized offering for the relevant section on video game analysis to help keep track of this problem.
* Committee question: Do any of these courses have pre-requisites?
	+ Only the CSE courses have pre-requisites, which is indicated on the advising sheet. Courses are included specifically because CSE requested they be included.
* A&H 2 letter, Aski, unanimously approved
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Art Education 7777 – approved with five recommendations
	+ Linguistics 1101 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Philosophy/Political Science Economics 3001 – approved
	+ Philosophy/Political Science Economics 3002 – approved
	+ Russian 1103.99 – approved with recommendations
	+ Pharmacy 3530 – approved with one contingency and recommendations
	+ Spanish 2202.01 – approved
	+ Spanish 2213 – approved
	+ Theatre 5751 – approved with recommendations
	+ WGSS 2326S – approved with three contingencies and recommendations
* A&H2
	+ WGSS and Hebrew 3401 – approved with two contingencies
* NMS
	+ Molecular Genetics and Biochemistry 5701 – approved
* SBS
	+ First-Year Seminar – Douglas Alsdorf – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
	+ Philosophy/Political Science Economics 3001 – approved with four contingencies and recommendations
	+ Philosophy/Political Science Economics 3002 – approved with four contingencies and one recommendation
	+ Political Science 3785 – approved with four contingencies and recommendations
* Assessment
	+ Panel reviewed one report and three assessment plans.
	+ Committee member question: How much should panels push back on assessment plans for GE course requests?
		- The panels should push back, and the panels should make sure the departments know that GE Assessment Reports will be requested in the future, so it is in their best interest to have a quality assessment plan in place.
	+ Departments still do not understand that grades and GE assessment are not the same thing.
	+ It would benefit departments to have an assessment specialist.
		- This should be the role of the Director of Undergraduate Studies.
	+ We want assessment to be a meaningful exercise. Assessment reports typically show progress, but students’ skills often show otherwise. (Some fear that department writing a bad report will no longer be allowed to teach the course.) Are there talks about revamping assessment to make it a more meaningful practice?
	+ Assessment needs to be dynamic. Some assessment plans are outdated.
	+ Departments want to show that they’ve done well in their GE assessment reports, even if it means setting the bar low for achievement instead of showing that there is room for improvement.
	+ Assessment is a lot of work for departments. It is asking a lot of departments to make it truly meaningful.
	+ There isn’t a structure within departments that maintains the quality of assessment.
	+ Program assessment is not as difficult for departments to complete, since the goals are more relevant than GE ELOs. The faculty is not interested in GE assessment, mostly because GE is not the focus of the department. It is possible that the new GE will allow for better focused GE assessment.
		- With the new GE, there may be GE-level goals. Under the current GE, assessment does not feel tied to anything in a meaningful way because there aren’t overarching GE goals.
	+ There is some concern about how non-GE courses are evaluated. Assessment practices are good practices, regardless of whether or not they are used for evaluating the GE.
1. GE revision updates
* The working title “The World Languages and Cultures Experience” emphasizes cultural aspect of the language requirement.
	+ Comment: “Cultures” are already well-represented in the GE proposal. This may be perceived as replicating other parts of the GE.
		- This experience cannot be learned in other parts of the GE. It is not overlapping or replicating other parts of the GE.
	+ Question: Is there another word that can be used rather than culture so it doesn’t seem like an overlap?
		- Considered another title “World Languages and Cultures Immersion Experience,” but it is possibly too long. This title better demonstrates that it is supporting and not overlapping the existing GE proposal, and it also differentiates between non-language cultural courses in the GE.
	+ Suggestion: Having ELOs for language that emphasize immersion will help sell this idea too.
* Incoming first-year students will be strongly encouraged, although it cannot be required, to take a language placement test during orientation and registering for the next class for their first semester. This will hopefully prevent students from waiting too long to take courses and losing skills.
	+ The expectation, based on current trends, is that students will come to OSU with more college credit through College Credit Plus, AP, IB, etc.
		- Comment: College Credit Plus is college credit, unlike high school classes or AP credit. OSU will not be able to require students to take a class beyond 1103 if it is College Credit Plus.
	+ If students test out of 1103 or earn it through AP tests, they will be required to take the next course in the language sequence.
		- High school credit is different everywhere. Placement tests cannot capture all ability levels. Most high schools do not teach immersion courses, whereas colleges do. Requiring at least one course on campus will make sure they get the speaking and cultural experience.
	+ Comment: There will probably be push-back on the requirement for one additional course after 1103. It will probably be seen as penalizing students by requiring them to take a course beyond what other students must take. The proposal also needs to address students who receive credit as transfer students, especially from Columbus State.
	+ Suggestion: It may be conceptually better to tell students they have tested out of language skills, but not the immersion experience. It may eliminate confusion for students when they need to continue beyond 1103.
		- Suggestion: If students test out of 1103, maybe they can take a reduced credit-hour course to get an immersion experience.
	+ Suggestion: Use term “gateway” instead of “placement tests.”
	+ Placement tests do not necessarily test for all skills. Students often test into higher levels than they are ready for.
		- Comment: Foreign language tests have the same issues as all placement tests. Using placement tests this way could set the precedent for expanding requirements in other GE categories, making it impossible for students to graduate in a reasonable time.
		- Comment: If students are testing out of courses, but are not prepared for the course they test into, there will need to be a mechanism to deal with this. Requiring a course beyond 1103 if they test out will not fix the issue of students being underprepared.
	+ Question: Will international students be required to take foreign language?
		- No, not if they are native speakers.
		- Students who grow up with foreign language but do not graduate from high school in that language will be considered heritage speakers. They will be encouraged to take a placement test in the language they speak. Heritage speakers often do not have writing and reading skills in their spoken language.
	+ Comment: The placement guide states that the course beyond 1103 could count for a GE category. The proposal needs to be specific about which GE category(ies), how it will count, and which courses they can take.
		- There are many courses taught in a foreign language that meet other GE categories’ ELOs. They should count for these other GE categories. It will require planning and identification of the courses.
* Comment: One passage in the proposal is contradictory on the European experience of foreign language compared to the American experience. In Europe, the language experience is almost always pre-university.
* Comment: This requirement will need an assessment plan.
	+ All foreign languages have assessment plans in place already.
		- Comment: Need to clarify how it will be assessed as part of the new GE. Need to articulate how it will fit in to the new program, indicate who will oversee the assessment process, how it will be assessed, etc.
		- Suggestion: Will it be overseen by ASCC still? The change in the GE could mean a change in how assessment is handled. If there is a new GE office at the university level, assessment requirements may change. Address how foreign language assessment will be handled in this case.
		- Suggestion: Should also be careful about the language in the assessment plan. This will no longer be a GE category. It will be an ASC program requirement.
		- Comment: Cannot just say assessment will happen the same way, because the assessment process may change. The current structure may not be possible. Need to explicitly say how the language requirement will be handled.
* Suggestion: The paragraph on the top of page 5 seems condescending as it is currently worded. Could say something more positive like “Since our students are increasingly global citizens…”
* Question: Who handles placement tests?
	+ The Center for Languages, Literatures and Cultures. They are currently working on creating online tests. There is also an issue of some languages not having placement tests.
	+ Question: Are these tests being reworked, since they seem to overestimate student ability?
		- Yes, but certain things cannot be tested such as conversation, extensive writing skills, etc.