ASCC 4/6/2018

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Daly, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Hawkins, Heckler, Jenkins, Kline, Lam, Oldroyd, Roup, Saidah, Schlueter, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Workman

1. Approval of 3-23-18 minutes

* Lam, Roup, **approved with one abstention**

1. Musical Theatre Minor (guest: Jennifer Schlueter)

* Committee member question: The program goals and advising sheet emphasize the importance of history of musical theatre. Theatre 5771.05 “History of Musical Theatre” is an option for a foundational course, but it is not required. What is the rationale for this?
  + The department wants this course to be a required foundation, but does not have the faculty to teach it often enough. It is a goal of the department to make this course a requirement.
  + Committee suggestion: Change the language on the advising sheet that states, “The Musical Theatre minor supports a student’s training and career aspirations in the performance and history of musical theatre.” The language on history can be added if the course is required in the future.
* Committee member question: Are there plans to create a major in musical theatre?
  + There is student interest in a major in musical theatre, but this would be down the line. There is not enough faculty to sustain a major in musical theatre now.
  + At the moment, there are very few courses offered related to musical theatre. This can work for creating a minor, but there would not be enough for a major.
  + Suggestion: There are only two music courses in the minor. Students could take the minor without any courses in music. The Committee suggests working with the School of Music to develop more music courses.
    - Many dance courses have pre-requisites. This minor may not appeal to non-dance majors.
* A&H1 letter, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

1. Revision AAAS BA (guest: Mollie Workman)

* The AAAS BA revision makes the program more coherent and up-to-date with current scholarship.
* The department hopes the revision will increase enrollment and allow for more double majoring.
* Committee member comment: AAAS 4921 “Intersections: Approaches to Race, Gender, Class, and Sexuality” identifies race, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity as a focus. It would be nice to see religion also identified as an intersection in this course.
  + The course is cross-listed with WGSS and Comparative Studies, so the focus of the course changes. Other courses in AAAS focus on religion.
* Committee member suggestion: As the GE revision moves forward, the department should think about how courses can fit into the new model. Many courses would work well in the model to feed into the major and expose students to diversity in the GE.
* A&H1 letter, Hawkins, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* Assessment Panel
  + Approved one assessment plan
  + The Assessment Panel discussed the GE proposal
    - Panel believes ASCC should play a key role in revising the GE proposal and should take ideas to ASC Faculty Senate
    - Panel would like the role of ASC in the GE clarified. What will ASC’s role be in GE course approval? Who will handle assessment? Who owns the GE?
      * The Assessment Panel believes that ASC should maintain responsibility for GE assessment.
    - The Panel would like Steve Fink to attend an Assessment Panel meeting to discuss the GE proposal.

1. GE revision (updates)

* The Committee discussed GE assessment and the role of ASC in the new GE, based on questions posed by the Assessment Panel.
  + Committee member question: Are other colleges as involved in assessment as ASC? Is assessment another way that ASC can advise other colleges on the GE?
    - Assessment is mostly university-wide, but assessment in other colleges is typically program-based, not GE assessment. Therefore, ASC is well placed to play a leading role in GE assessment going forward.
  + The GE proposal mentions assessment as part of implementation.
    - Comment: The proposal does not clarify who will perform assessment for specific themes and for the bookends. ASC should continue to be a leader in GE assessment.
  + Committee member question: Should ASC be responsible for maintaining the GE when ASC has less of a role under this model?
    - ASC is a natural leader in the GE. The new GE model will open up the GE to other colleges, but they are not situated to lead the GE. Additionally, the model that ASC adopts will be the model for the other colleges.
  + The Committee discussed that the core of the GE should be assessed together, since it will be common to the entire university. Individual colleges should assess any addition requirements, such as the world language requirement for ASC. The question is who should assess the core of the GE.
* The Committee discussed the role other colleges will play on committees in the new GE. Currently, many colleges do not feel they have adequate representation. Assessment and themes are places where this representation could be provided.
  + Other colleges could help to direct the themes to make sure they are relevant and meaningful.
  + Committee member comment: the ideal for themes and panels would be difficult to accomplish. Faculty load is already too heavy, and this model adds more work for faculty.
* The Committee discussed how to engage faculty in the GE revision process and how to get faculty to rethink the function of the GE.
  + Some departments are not engaged with the GE revisions. These departments need to examine how the new GE will affect their programs. Some courses in these programs are also in the GE. Faculty may not realize courses are both GE courses and major courses.
  + Departments need to think about the GE differently under this model. It is a new way of approaching general education that will function as an introduction to different modes of thinking. Departments should be encouraged to adjust their thinking on the GE, rather than thinking of the GE as a way of fulfilling pre-requisites for programs.
  + Courses in the new GE should not solely focus on disciplinary content. The value of the GE is not necessarily in teaching the specifics of disciplines. GE courses should be more interdisciplinary in nature.
  + Departments can work to modify existing courses in their programs to have broad relevance and fit within the GE model. As long as courses fit the ELOs, they should be allowed in the GE.
    - Committee member comment: ELOs are currently too vague for this to happen. The ELOs need to have specific, relevant criteria that can be assessed.
  + There is not any NMS faculty pushback to the GE revisions on procedural grounds, but there is concern regarding the impact to programs. Faculty are concerned how students will fit in GE requirements and still be prepared for professional or graduate schools.
  + Many faculty members in NMS are not engaged with the GE revisions, but their input is needed.
    - Faculty should work with their senators to have feedback considered.
* Committee members discussed whether the GE should be an opt-in model, as is proposed, or should remain an opt-out model.
  + Committee member question: Why not have the GE as an opt-out model, as is currently?
    - The proposed model will provide a common core for everyone, and colleges can add on to it. The GE should be liberal arts degree preparation for the entire university.
  + Committee member question: Can credits be moved around in this model to make it a GE model with fewer credit hours? For example, could the bookends or the “Places and Spaces” theme be eliminated?
    - ASC can change these aspects. What ASC proposes will be the GE for ASC and other colleges will likely adopt the same model, without the world language requirement.
  + As the model is presented, it is not clear to the ASC Faculty Senate that world languages will be a requirement for ASC. Combining the proposals will make it clear to ASC Faculty Senate that world languages will be required for students in ASC.
  + Inserting the world language requirement in the GE will likely result in pushback from NMS and SBS, who are not as well represented in the proposed GE model for ASC in terms of credit hours. It might be more palatable to have the world language requirement as a degree requirement.
  + Including the world language requirement in the GE for the entire university would likely cause other colleges to opt-out of world languages, and could set the precedent for colleges to opt-out of other requirements as well. The new GE model is credit neutral for most colleges, since overlapping with majors will be allowed. Including world languages would cause a credit hour increase for most other colleges.
    - Committee member suggestion: Space could be included in themes for world language so other colleges can give students the option of taking world language courses as their theme courses and GE would remain credit neutral.
  + Most universities in Ohio do not include world language in the GE requirement for the entire university, but their liberal arts or arts and science colleges do.