ASCC 9/14/2018

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Crocetta, Daly, Daniels, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Hawkins, Heckler, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Oldroyd, Puthawala, Roup, Savage, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Welcome and introductions (ASCC Chair)
2. Approval of 4-20-18 minutes
* Kline, Fletcher, approved with six abstentions
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ AAAS 2253 – approved with four recommendations
	+ AAAS 4610 – approved with three recommendations
	+ AAAS 2275 – approved with three recommendations
	+ CLLC 2301.01S/2301.02S/3202S – approved with one recommendation and one contingency
	+ Theatre 6702 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Theatre 7710 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Theatre 7720 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Theatre 7730 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Turkish 3350 – approved with three contingencies
* A&H2
	+ German 1102.61 – approved
	+ Religious Studies 3666 – approved with four contingencies
* NMS
	+ First- year Seminar – Daniel Pradel – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ Microbiology 5161 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Microbiology 5270 – approved with four recommendations
	+ Statistics 6500 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Statistics 7630 – approved with three recommendations
* SBS
	+ Political Science 3798 – approved with three contingencies and two recommendations
	+ Political Science 4131 - approved
* Assessment
	+ Reviewed GE Assessment Plans for:
		- English 2220
		- Sociology 3597.01
		- Sociology 3549
		- Communication 1100
		- Communication 1101
		- Classics 2220
1. Termination Microbiology BA
* The department intended to strengthen the BA after semester conversion, but some requirements (e.g. math pre-requisites) are similar for BA and BS, and the department felt students are better served by receiving a BS. The demand for the BA is very low.
* Students who are interested in a Microbiology BA can likely have their needs met by a Biology BA. There aren’t any students currently pursuing a Microbiology BA.
* NMS letter, Kline, **unanimously approved**
1. ASCC Annual Report & First-year Seminar Report (2017-2018)
* Annual report: Highlights work that ASCC and the ASCC panels did in 2017-18 academic year.
	+ Provides an overview of assessment activities
	+ Overview of new programs and program revisions approved at both the graduate and undergraduate level
	+ Data on approved courses includes GE courses, non-GE courses, graduate courses, course revisions, and withdrawn GE courses
	+ Fletcher, Lam, **unanimously approved**
* First-Year Seminars
	+ 47 First-Year Seminars offered in the 2017-18 academic year with 81% of seats filled.
	+ First-Year Seminars will continue through at least fall 2019 until new GE is determined.
	+ Suggestion: Gather information from instructors of FYS to see if they see an overlap between the FYS and the proposed GE seminars.
		- It is a good idea to capitalize on this when there is more information on what the GE seminar would entail.
	+ Vaessin, Taleghani-Nikazm, **unanimously approved**
1. GE revision
* The first ASC Faculty Senate meeting of the academic year was held on Wednesday, September 12.
	+ Departments were asked to complete a “conversation starter” document with their faculty before the meeting.
* It was initially intended that each ASC Faculty Senate meeting would focus on one aspect of the GE revision. Senators would go back to their departments where discussions would be held about individual aspects of the GE proposal (e.g. the bookends, foundations, themes, etc.). Professor Weinberg from the Department of Astronomy proposed a procedure for discussing the GE proposal.
	+ Under the proposed procedure, ASC Senate members should make specific suggestions in two categories: changes to the proposal and implementation recommendations. The proposal lays out a procedure for discussing and voting on the suggestions.
	+ Voting will happen throughout discussions rather than discussions building up to one vote. The votes will function as contingencies to the existing proposal. If the contingencies are not sufficiently addressed, the University Senate can be advised to not approve the proposal.
	+ The goal of using this procedure is to avoid starting the GE proposal over from scratch. The GE Committee already worked to create the existing proposal with knowledge of its limitations and the limitations on the university (e.g. the OTM, Ohio Department of Higher Education, etc.). Additionally, other colleges are working with the GE proposal already. If we make a new model, reconciliation will be impossible down the line. The Senate and ASCC should build on the work of the GE committee, not start over.
		- Suggestion: “changes to proposal as it stands” should say “modification to proposal” to more clearly indicate that it is not an open invitation to completely change the proposed model, only to adjust the model.
		- Committee member question: How will the process work when faculty members bring up similar issues?
			* Member suggestion: It will be time consuming to discuss similar proposals at different times and vote on them separately. It would be more efficient to ask for proposals on specific issues by a certain date so all pertinent issues can be discussed and voted on at one time.
	+ Committee member question: How involved should ASC Senators be with the process and with their departments? How should they report feedback from departments?
		- Senators should be more involved than they have been in the past. Senators are not expected to bring a consensus opinion from their department if one does not exist. If senators do not bring feedback from their department, the ASC Faculty Senate will have to move on without their input.
* The committee discussed how much the budget should be considered when discussing the proposed GE model.
	+ Committee member comment: Small departments need to understand how the new GE will affect their departments and their budget before they can vote.
		- It’s impossible to truly understand how the GE will affect departments because effects will only be known when a new model takes effect. Information will likely be unsatisfactory to departments. A fiscal model may not bring clarity to the effect of the GE on individual departments, and the budget will likely change under the new GE.
	+ Committee member question: Has the university ever provided ASCC with a picture of the financial wellness of the college under the current GE model? Is the impact of the current GE model on the college well understood?
		- It is impossible to disaggregate the numbers on enrollment in GE courses. Students may take GE courses to fulfill a GE requirement or as an elective.
	+ The budget is already a problem for departments. The budget is inhibiting departments regardless of the GE model, and many departments make decisions based on enrollment and the budget rather than the curriculum. The GE curriculum is changing because the current program does not reflect what students need to learn, and the goals are not measurable. Faculty should work to create a GE curriculum they believe in and that better serves students, and then faculty should push for a budget that supports the GE curriculum. The model needs to be identified before a budget can be created.
	+ Committee member question: Is it possible that faculty will create a GE model that the university will reject based on budget considerations?
		- It is possible this will happen, but it is more likely that certain aspects of a GE proposal will be altered due to budget considerations.
	+ Suggestion: ASCC should draft a statement that acknowledges that the budget is an issue that will need to be resolved, but that it should not be taken into consideration while deciding on the GE model.
		- ASCC members (Daly, Fletcher, Crocetta, and Puthawala) will work on drafting the statement. Fletcher will make a motion to University Steering Committee.