ASCC 10/19/2018

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Chamberlain, Daniels, Fink, Hawkins, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Oldroyd, Puthawala, Roup, Savage, Schlueter, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 9-28-18 minutes

* Roup, Lam, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* NMS
  + Earth Science 5310 – approved with two recommendations
  + EEOB 5440 – approved with three recommendations
  + Molecular Genetics 2690 – approved with one comment
* SBS
  + Political Science 7560 – approved via e-vote
* A&H1
  + Art Education 7000.10 – approved with three recommendations
  + Art Education 7000.20 – approved with three recommendations
  + Comparative Studies 2420 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
  + Italian 4401 – approved with one recommendation
  + Philosophy 2690 – approved with one recommendation
* A&H2
  + Italian 3798.01 – approved
  + Linguistics 2797.02 – approved
  + Persian 3704 – approved with one recommendation
  + Portuguese 1101.01 – approved
  + Spanish 2202 – approved
  + WGSS 3320 – approved with one recommendation
* Assessment
  + Reviewed 6 GE assessment reports
  + Some departments are not following approved assessment plans.
  + Oftentimes the plans are not put together by faculty that teach the course
  + Departments are still overwhelmingly assessing course goals and not GE ELOs

1. Certificates—updates

* Committee members posed questions regarding certificates at the previous meeting. APAC provided the following information for clarification:
  + 1000 level courses will be permitted as long as there is a logical and pedagogical reason
  + EM credit will not be permitted in a certificate
  + 50% overlap credit permitted with degree includes anything in the degree (e.g. major, minor, electives, etc.)
    - This overlap may be restricted in the future if it gets too confusing
  + S/U and pass/non-pass courses will be permitted, but this may change.
    - Allowing pass/not-pass courses may create some issues, since they cannot count toward the degree other than as electives.
    - Will take this issue to APAC

1. AAEP PhD revision

* The department combined two programs, Art Education and Arts Policy & Administration, into one program in 2011. However, the department has struggled to integrate the programs, and students remain in different pathways. This revision is to facilitate the meeting of the two sides of the program.
* A&H1 letter, Taleghani-Nikazm, **unanimously approved**

1. Revision to Theatre MA and PhD (Guest: Jennifer Schlueter)

* The proposed revision to the curriculum for the MA and PhD include changing the curriculum to one using methodology rather than chronology; a formal commitment to shared responsibility in developing theses, dissertations, etc.; the inclusion of a pedagogy course and comprehensive exam; shifting core coursework credit hours from 4 to 3 in order to encourage interdisciplinarity.
* Committee member question: What does the “shared responsibility” in the proposal mean specifically?
  + The shared responsibility refers to the 8995 seminar. Students will come together to share theses, papers, research, etc. with each other and not just with their faculty advisors.
* A&H1 letter, Puthawala, **unanimously approved**

1. Team-teaching grant review:

* Committee member question: Fewer instructors are offering team-teaching courses. Is it due to inability to offer the course regularly?
  + This might be a factor, but it also might be that faculty do not want to team-teach. ASCC may see another wave of proposals as new faculty come on board.
* Team-teaching courses need to have value. The GE revision may incentivize team-teaching courses because they will have a natural place in the themes.
* While there has been a dip in team-teaching proposals, there has been an increased interest in interdisciplinary programs. There is a desire to work across disciplines.
* Committee member question: Do team-teaching courses need to be in departments with very different disciplines?
  + No, they just need to be in different departments. However, there is more excitement for courses that are very different and innovative.
  + Committee member question: Can there be an exception to this (i.e. team-teaching course within French and Italian department)?
    - The pool for team-teaching proposals is small, and a department may be able to make a case.
* Committee member comment: Some existing cross-listed courses may be good candidates for team-teaching.
  + The instructors need to be motivated to team-teaching as it very labor intensive.
* Committee member question: Is there a requirement for how often the course needs to be offered?
  + It is not that specific, but it should not be a one-off course. The course should enhance the program, become sufficiently integrated into the program, and should be offered on a regular basis.
  + Molecular Genetics 2690 and Philosophy 2690 “Genes and Society”
  + Both courses will be added to the major offerings. The offerings will add a much-needed perspective for Molecular Genetics students.
  + Savage, Kline, **approved** **with one abstention**

1. GE revision

* The College of Engineering proposed a foundation – Applied Arts, Technology & Design – that will go in place of three of the nine credit hours currently dedicated to Arts & Humanities/History. ASC has three options for how to respond to the proposal: 1) Reconcile the proposal now with current proposed GE model; 2) Reject the model outright; 3) Create our own model and reconcile the two down the road.
  + This foundation category will reduce the number of non-engineering courses that engineering students would need to take. ASC students can still fulfill the category with ASC courses. Engineering wants to reduce the number of courses that engineering students will take outside the College of Engineering, because their students will not be able to complete their degree in four years with this model. They feel both engineering and ASC students would benefit from a hands-on course in the GE.
  + It is unclear if other colleges support this proposal. This is an effort on the part of the College of Engineering to maintain a unified GE.
* Many ASCC members opposed the inclusion of the Applied Arts, Technology & Design category in the foundations for the following reasons:
  + It seems that this category would fit more appropriately in the themes. The College of Engineering could use a course in the themes to decrease the number of non-engineering courses their students take.
    - The College of Engineering may already have a plan for the theme courses for their students.
  + Engineering could also create courses that fit into Arts and Humanities categories as they currently are rather than creating a new category.
  + Art units may not want to be part of this category, especially with the term “applied arts”
    - Suggestion: Change the term to “creative arts.” “Applied arts” is a problematic term, and employers are looking for creativity in applicants.
  + Members felt strongly that all students, including students in College of Engineering, should be required to take an art course.
  + The category is too broad, and too many disciplines will be able to fit courses in the category. There needs to be a strong pedagogical case for creating a GE category.
  + Comment from Richard Fletcher: The Arts and Humanities foundations need to be discussed more broadly by ASC, and not just in response to this proposal. The proposed category could be named “Arts, Technology, and Design,” but arts units would need to approve of this.
  + The GE should focus on a broad liberal arts education that includes creative and critical thinking skills, not skills that change rapidly, like technology.
* There was some support from ASCC for adding the foundation for the following reasons:
  + The scheduling problem with the new GE will also greatly affect NMS students who will no longer be able to fulfill pre-requisites with GE courses. This category could include a second lab for NMS students.
  + A couple of members acknowledged the importance of technology and expressed strong support for inserting a category in the foundations.
  + Suggestion from committee member: Use the credit hours from bookends to focus on technology and make technology central to GE.
    - Most members of the committee disagreed with the suggestion that technology should be a foundational part of a liberal arts education.
* Members of ASCC proposed discussing the matter further with the College of Engineering before formally responding.
  + Can the College of Engineering utilize credit under the themes rather than creating a foundation course?
  + ASC is dropping the front bookend, which will free up three credit hours, but ASC may propose using the credit for another GE purpose.
  + ASCC recommends approaching this as an implementation issue and finding a home for engineering courses within the proposed categories. For example, this might be achieved by defining the art category differently than in the past, and finding a home for engineering courses in the art category.