ASCC 9/28/2018

156 University Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

1. Approval of 9-14-18 minutes

* Roup, Taleghani-Nikazm, **unanimously approved**

1. Revision to Statistics Minor (guest: Elly Kaizar)

* The revision to the Statistics Minor reflects new courses created for the major. The new courses are also aligned with the data analytics major.
* Committee member question: Should point 4 on the advising sheet waive the requirement for 3201 instead of 4201, since 4201 is not actually required? Would 3201 be waived if students had credit for Math 4530 or Math 5530H?
  + 3201 would not be waived since subject matter is different and students would not be able to take 3202.
  + Department will advise students with credit for Math 4530 or Math 5530H to consult with an advisor rather than indicating 4201 will be waived on advising sheet.
* NMS letter, Roup, **unanimously approved** with recommendation to adjust advising sheet

1. Panel updates

* A&H1
  + Italian 1101.61 - approved
  + Italian 1102.61 - approved
  + Italian 1103.61 - approved
  + Slavic 6457 – approved
  + WGSS 3200 – approved with three recommendations
  + Russian 5320 – approved with one recommendation
* A&H2
  + NELC 3111 – approved with two contingencies and three recommendations
  + WGSS 3300.01S – approved with one question
  + Italian and Comparative Studies 3052 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
* NMS
  + Microbiology 6155 – approved via e-vote with one contingency and two recommendations
* SBS
  + Sociology 4463 – approved with one contingency and four recommendations
  + Political Science 3275 – approved with one contingency
* Assessment
  + Reviewed two assessment plans and four assessment reports for new GE courses

1. Certificates (Steve Fink)

* Committee has worked on formalizing the requirements for certificates and certificate proposals. Panels may begin seeing more proposals for certificates in the near future, and panels should be familiar with the requirements for them.
* Committee member question: What are the requirements for embedded certificates?
  + The credit requirements are listed on page 2. Most programs require 12 credit hours.
* Committee member question: What is the difference between a minor and a certificate?
  + There does not have to be a difference in curriculum. A department can have both a minor and a certificate.
  + A minor is different in that it is only awarded at graduation, and a certificate is awarded when a student completes the required courses.
  + An important difference is that people pursuing a certificate do not have to be students at OSU.
  + Most students will likely choose a minor, but may choose the certificate for professional development or if they don’t complete their major program.
  + A student cannot receive both a minor and a certificate in the same area.
* Committee member question: Is there any data on students who currently receive certificates? Are there many students who exit programs and receive certificates instead?
  + Certificates are mostly new, so there is not any data on certificates currently.
* Committee member question: How do we assess the value of certificates in the real world?
  + A certificate will be assessed like any other program and will have a home department that is responsible for it. The biggest goal of assessment should be to show whether the certificate is useful, but some things are difficult to assess (e.g. the value of diversity).
  + ASCC and ASCC panels can ask for rationale of intended population and goals of the certificate program.
* Committee member question: What happens if a student gets a certificate in a program and later returns to complete major in similar curriculum?
  + A maximum of 50% of overlap in credits will be allowed (as is the same with other programs). Students will need to take more courses to receive their degree, but we don’t want to discourage students from returning.
* It is not clear whether overlap with the GE is permissible and if 1000 level courses are permitted in certificates.
* Committee member comment: It should be clarified if EM credit counts as outside credit or OSU credit. This has already been clarified for minors, but should be clear here as well.
* Committee member question: If certificates will be encouraged to be interdisciplinary, should concurrence be required?
  + The process for requesting concurrences will likely not be systematic but will more likely be ad-hoc suggestions from panels and ASCC.
* Committee member question: If a certificate is interdisciplinary, who will manage the program?
  + This will likely be similar to interdisciplinary majors. The certificate will have a home department that is mainly responsible for administering and assessing it.
* Committee member question: If we are assessing certificates, should we also start assessing minors?
  + Assessment will not be a formal requirement, but will be a suggestion for departments. Assessment will help departments when they go through external reviews.
  + We should ask for program goals even if the certificates are not formally assessed.
* Committee member question: Will there be a way to verify if students have certificates?
  + Will be able to verify with the registrar.
* Committee member question: Will students be able to request a certificate retroactively?
  + No, and this should be laid out clearly in certificate requirements.
* Committee member question: Panels are already stretched thin by workload from courses and programs. If these are popular, can we divide work between more panels?
  + We can create an ad-hoc committee for certificates if necessary.

1. GE revision

* ASCC members worked on a statement of GE support that requested information on the fiscal impact of the GE proposal.
  + The statement was circulated and updated after departments provided feedback.
* The committee discussed how much work should be put into the GE revision without information on the fiscal impact.
  + The ASC Faculty Senate can still work on the GE proposal and reconciliation of feedback from units up until the point of a vote. A vote from the ASC Faculty Senate should be contingent on the fiscal impact statement.
  + The ASC Faculty Senate and ASCC need to be prepared to vote when the fiscal statement does come out.
  + Some members feel the pedagogy of the GE is difficult to separate from the fiscal impact, making this work difficult to continue.
  + If the budget and fiscal impact information is received but not acceptable to ASC, work will stop with the ASC Faculty Senate.
* The interim Executive Dean is working on a new budget model, but these efforts may be superseded if there is a new Executive Dean next year. This further complicates the issue of the fiscal impact and the uncertainty of budget in the future.
  + Conversations are underway about creating a hybrid budget model. Interim Executive Dean is proposing setting aside a portion of the budget for GE courses.
* The committee discussed what assurances are needed in a fiscal impact statement in order for a vote to occur.
  + Faculty, students, and the university at large were assured in the listening sessions that the new GE would not hurt departments. They were assured that pedagogy would guide the budget, but so far, this has not happened. ASC faculty needs assurance that budget model will change and departments will not be harmed.
  + A business would not restructure without knowledge of the fiscal impact. There is no reason for pushing this through without knowledge of the fiscal impact on the college.
  + Need assurances that ASC will not be negatively impacted by the GE changes in the fiscal impact statement. If we do not specify what we need, they may provide a fiscal impact statement without all relevant information.
* Rather than hold the next ASC Faculty Senate meeting on October 10, faculty can continue work in their own departments on the GE. A steering committee meeting will be held instead of the next ASC Faculty Senate meeting. Senators will be asked to prepare to discuss the fiscal impact of the GE at the October 24th meeting.
  + The Executive Dean and a fiscal officer will also be invited to attend the meeting to discuss the budget implications.
  + The statement of support from ASCC should be sent as part of the invitation.
* A revised version of the statement will be sent to ASCC members for an e-vote. Changes will include more forceful language on demand for fiscal impact and reiterate that a budget with a positive or neutral impact on ASC was promised in listening sessions.
* The committee discussed whether to keep the front bookend in the GE proposal.
  + Most faculty members feel it should be cut from the proposal as it will take too many resources, faculty members, budget needs, etc. to succeed.
  + The committee voted to eliminate the front bookend from the GE proposal. Going forward, discussions will focus on the final bookend (General Education Reflection).
  + Daly, Coleman, **unanimously approved**