ASCC 4/20/2018

156 University Hall 9:00-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Chamberlain, Daly, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Hawkins, Hayes, Heckler, Heysel, Jenkins, Kline, Lam, Martin, Mughan, Oldroyd, Opfer, Ries, Romig, Smithies, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 4-6-18 minutes

* Hawkins, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* NMS
  + EEOB 5330 – approved
* SBS
  + International Studies 4702 – approved with contingencies
* A&H1
  + First-year Seminar- Magda el-Sherbini – approved with contingencies
* A&H2
  + Panel had initial conversations on NELC revisions
* Assessment
  + Panel has not met

1. Minor in Information Security (guests: Tony Mughan & Steve Romig)

* The minor is a joint program between the undergraduate international studies program (USIP) and OCIO. The minor is interdisciplinary and composed of 16 credit hours.
* This minor will be added to the options for students pursuing a BS in International Studies.
  + Steps have been taken to allow exceptions for students majoring in International Studies to minor in Information Security.
* Committee member question: Have the contingencies been addressed?
  + Yes, the contingencies have been addressed.
* Committee member question: What is the expected enrollment for the minor?
  + The demand for a program like this is high, as there are not any similar programs. Enrollment is expected to be high (maybe 50 students).
* Committee member question: Will international studies be able to handle the expected capacity?
  + USIP is confident they can deal with the demand.
* Committee member question: Are there any intersections with data analytics?
  + There are not any formal intersections, but there are strong connections.
* Committee member question: Does this program overlap with Management Information Systems in Fisher College?
  + Courses in MIS do not specifically focus on computer security. Additionally, it is difficult for students outside Fisher to enroll in these courses. If a similar minor existed in Fisher, students in ASC would be unlikely to pursue it.
* SBS letter, Hawkins, **unanimously approved**

1. Psychology MA to MS proposal (guests: Andrew Hayes and John Opfer)

* Committee member question: When do students receive master’s degree?
  + They receive their master’s degree after defending a master’s thesis. OSU does not offer a terminal master’s in psychology, though some students only receive a master’s if they do not complete the program.
* Committee member question: How many students will be affected?
  + Everyone in the program, with the exception of students that do not complete the second year of the program, will be affected. There are approximately 35 students a year.
* Committee member question: Will ODHE see this change as creating a new degree?
  + This change will need to go to ODHE, but they do not have specific criteria for distinctions between MS and MA. The program changes will go to ODHE with the same explanation given to ASCC.
* Committee member question: Why did this program change take so long?
  + The proposal outlines the history of the department and explains why the program was originally an MA. This is a correction of an oversight.
* The department will need to discuss with OAA how to formally replace the MA with the MS.
* SBS letter, Aski, **unanimously approved**

1. BS Sociology (guest: Andrew Martin)

* Sociology has recently seen more students interested in doing research. The BS will give formalized recognition of research and provide more rigorous study. Students pursuing the BA will still have a rigorous program with options for research. BS differs from BA with requirements for research and quantitative methods. Students will be well prepared for graduate programs. BS carries more weight for data-drive graduate programs.
* Committee member question: When will students need to declare whether they are pursuing a BS or BA? Will they need to choose a BS from the beginning?
  + Advising will be an important factory here. Advisors can indicate to students the courses they will need to take to have both options in the future. Declaring early on would be ideal, but students can declare later in undergraduate career and still graduate on time.
* Committee member question: Is there capacity in the department to support the required research?
  + There has already been an increase in students participating in research, and faculty have been willing to take on the workload. The department is not expecting a large increase in enrollments, so it should not overburden faculty. Enrollment will be monitored, and the department will reevaluate if the requirements are too much for faculty.
* Committee member question: What assistance is provided to students who are looking for faculty for the research requirement?
  + Currently, students find their own advisor or consult with Andrew Martin. The department will monitor how well this continues to work and may formalize the process. The department may use an existing research methods course to get students started on research and to find advisors.
* SBS letter, Lam, **unanimously approved**

1. PhD Philosophy revision (guest: Declan Smithies)

* Competition for philosophy positions is very high since the recession. These additional courses will make expectations about the academic job market known to students and introduce them to non-academic career opportunities. The goal is to make students aware of what they need to do to be more competitive. It is something the department has been doing for years, but is now formalizing.
* Committee member question: How does the addition of credit hours affect the number of required courses?
  + The course requirements are still far below the 80 credit hours required by the graduate school.
* Committee member question: The assessment plan uses professional development as a goal. How will this be assessed?
  + This will be based on placement seminar materials such as CVs, writing samples, and teaching portfolios. The department will also consider whether students are submitting work for conferences. Standards for first-year students will be different, but they should still be working on these materials.
* Committee member question: How many students will be affected?
  + There are about 30 students in the program currently. Approximately 5 are admitted each year.
* Committee member question: Have there been any thoughts about reducing admissions?
  + The department has already reduced admissions. The department feels that admissions cannot be reduced more while still maintaining a quality program.
* A&H2 letter, Aski, **unanimously approved**

1. Graduate student representative

* ASCC will ask for a graduate student representative from the Council of Graduate Students for next year. The ASC Faculty Senate rules need to be changed to do this.
* The undergraduate representative will still come from ASC Student Council.
* Daly, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**

1. GE conversation

* A document put together by Daly, Aski, Fletcher, will be circulated to help faculty unfamiliar with curriculum understand the GE revisions. The document will be sent out broadly – will include ASC Faculty senators, directors of undergraduate studies, department chairs, and faculty outside ASC.
* The committee discussed how they would like to receive feedback from departments after they review the document. The committee agreed that feedback should synthesize and identify issues. The feedback should not be an extension of listening sessions.
  + Committee member suggestion: Create a schedule for ASC Faculty Senate meetings for the fall with each meeting dedicated to a certain topic. Ask specific questions related to the topics with deadlines to give feedback. Departments can provide feedback in a structured format (maybe in Carmen or Google form.)
  + ASCC will create a schedule of topics for discussion for the May 9th ASC Faculty Senate meeting.
* The implementation committee will be put together and start their work over the summer. There was some pushback from committee members who feel that the implementation committee cannot start their work before the proposal is approved, especially since it may change. The committee cannot get ahead of the revisions.
  + Most of the issues that have come up are implementation issues. ASCC and the ASC Faculty Senate cannot vote on something they do not know how to implement.