ASCC 3/23/2018

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Coleman, Daly, Fletcher, Haddad, Heckler, Jenkins, King, Kline, Lam, Oldroyd, Ries, Roup, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 3-2-18 minutes

* Roup, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* Assessment
  + No meeting
* SBS
  + First-year Seminar— Darcy Hartman – approved with one contingency and recommendations
  + Political Science 5000 – approved with contingencies
* NMS
  + EEOB 5610 – approved with one abstention
  + First-year Seminar—Jennifer Sinnott – approved
  + First-year Seminar—Venkat Gopalan & Karl Roth – approved with two contingencies
* A&H2
  + First-year Seminar—Jacob Risinger – approved with one recommendation
  + First-year Seminar—Pedro Pereira – approved
  + First-year Seminar—David Brewer – approved with one contingency
  + Philosophy 8001 – approved
  + Philosophy 8900 – approved
* A&H1
  + First-year Seminar—Linda Mizejewski – approved with recommendations
  + First-year Seminar—Lauren Squires – approved with one recommendation
  + First-year Seminar—Andrea Sims – approved
  + First-year Seminar—Hassan Jeffries – approved
  + First-year Seminar—David Horn – approved with two recommendations

1. ASC Faculty Senate-ASCC Coordination and the new GE proposal

* ASCC conversations need to be reflected in ASC Senate. ASCC is a subcommittee of ASC Senate, but the two committees do not coordinate.
* In the short-term, Daly will attend ASC Senate meetings, but more long-term solutions are needed.
* The Committee discussed how to better coordinate conversations on GE between ASC Faculty Senate, ASCC, and departments.
  + Suggestion: Use panels to work with senators who will then report to faculty in their divisions.
  + Another member suggested working directly with Directors of Undergraduate Studies or chairs in departments, as they will be best prepared to discuss implementation issues, learning outcomes, what courses would fit in the themes from their departments, etc.
    - Some members felt it might be too early to discuss specifics with departments, since the framework is still unclear. Other members felt that delaying the conversations with faculty would only result in more pushback. Discussing the GE on multiple levels is necessary to determine the impact the revisions would have on departments, especially in NMS and SBS.
      * Suggestion: Work with ASC Faculty Senate steering committee.
    - Suggestion: Use senators as a mechanism to discuss GE with departments. ASCC cannot bypass the ASC Faculty Senate to discuss the GE with departments.
  + The ASC Faculty Senate has largely been unresponsive to GE discussions. In order to better coordinate with the senate, ASCC will send representatives to discuss the revision. ASC Faculty Senate meetings can be dedicated to specific aspects of the GE revision.
* The Committee discussed the timeline for voting on the GE. Some felt that faculty pushback to the revision may be a result of the fast pace of the process.
  + Delaying the vote on the GE until the fall would mean that new faculty on ASCC and ASC Faculty Senate would need time to learn about the GE revisions, further delaying the vote.
  + Creating a schedule for meetings would help with any delay.
    - Committee members proposed a November deadline for a vote, which will occur at the last ASC Faculty Senate meeting of the fall semester.
  + ASCC is now responsible for changing the proposal as they want. The Senate will vote on the proposal, and they can include contingencies, which would return the proposal to ASCC.
* The ASCC discussed what feedback is needed from the ASC Faculty Senate
  1. Consensus on the size (i.e. number of credit hours) in the GE
  2. Consensus on structure of the GE as it is proposed (e.g. the themes, foundation categories, bookends)
  3. Distribution of credits in proposed model
  + Discussion on the three points follows:
    - The size and structure of the GE are closely related.
    - The proposed number of credit hours is high for NMS students, especially with the foreign language requirement.
    - Students will not be able to eliminate all GE requirements with transfer credits because they will need to take higher-level courses. This helps with the issue of losing credits due to “GE bleed” (students coming to OSU with transfer or test credit), but can make it more difficult for students to graduate on time.
    - This should include a discussion of the purpose of the GE – are we trying to guide students or are we dictating what students need to learn? A 60 credit hour GE means half of graduation requirements are dictated to students, and we are not trusting students to make their own decisions and explore their own interests.
    - The GE is supposed to represent the basic levels of what students should learn. The updated GE represents broader topics because they are more important now than in the past.
      * This still gets back to the issue of what the themes actually mean. Are the themes, as they are currently defined, meaningful enough to be considered foundational knowledge?
    - There is a tension between broad ideas, which are important, but prevent from specializing. Specializing is especially important for some fields for graduate school requirements.
      * Requiring upper-level courses may help with this issue.
      * Upper-level courses often require pre-requisites. This issue will need to be discussed.
      * It is difficult to have meaningful theme courses without pre-requisites or proper preparation.
    - Some committee members feel that only having 4-5 credit hours in the natural sciences is not enough preparation, especially if the courses are lower-level.
    - There needs to be some innovation at the department level for this model to work. Departments need to be engaged in the process and appropriate time given to make this happen. If we change the model without adjusting courses, it will not fix the problem.
      * The issue is that many departments do not have faculty to devote to creating or revising courses, especially in ASC.
    - The committee questioned why the proposal includes a 3 credit hour GE Seminar. This seminar would require a big load on departments to create and teach. The committee also felt it was an inefficient use of credit hours and would create issues for transfer students.
    - Discuss whether ASC Faculty Senate agrees with double counting courses in GE and in major programs, as it is proposed.
      * Does allowing double counting wash away the GE?
    - Discuss the impact the proposed model will have on departments
      * Should consider that there is an impact of doing nothing. The university continues to lose credit hours from students who get their GE credit elsewhere. For this reason, faculty should look at this model and discuss how to make it workable.
    - Distribution is essentially a synthesis of size and structure of credit hours.
    - Determining size, structure, and distribution of credits should occur before discussing learning outcomes.
      * Looking at the ELOs as they are can help demonstrate where there are structural problems and weaknesses in the model. It can also reveal a lack of breadth in committees.
    - At this stage, ASC Faculty Senate should make concrete suggestions on how to improve the model rather than identifying problems with the model.
    - The GE proposal must be discussed along with the foreign language proposal.
* The Committee discussed who will work with ASC Faculty Senate on GE proposal.
  + Committee members who are also on senate can work to engage senators with the GE and push new members to be involved with the GE. The goal is to make the senate more interactive and deliberative rather than reactive.
  + Remaining ASC Faculty Senate meetings can focus on divisions. ASCC panel chairs or representatives from the panels can attend.