ASCC 11/2/2018

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Brenner, Coleman, Crocetta, Daniels, Fink, Haddad, Hawkins, Heckler, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Oldroyd, Orefice, Puthawala, Roup, Savage, Smith, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Revision to Turkish and Central Asia Studies minor and revision to Persian minor (guests: Naomi Brenner and Jeremie Smith)

* The revision to the Turkish and Central Asia Studies minor will expand the scope of the minor to include Turkish, Uzbek, and Turkic cultures. The current non-language pre-requisite will move inside the minor. The language requirements will be reduced to the first course in Uzbek or Turkish after the 1101-1103 sequence, and students will have the option to take more courses in culture and literature in NELC, History, and International Studies.
* The revision to the Persian minor also reduces the pre-requisites by 3 credit hours, reduces the required language courses within the major, and expands the options for courses in culture, history, and in translation.
* Committee member question: Can you elaborate more on how the department is bringing these programs in line with similar programs?
  + The department did an internal review and surveyed all students. The students felt it was too difficult to meet all the requirements for the programs. The department wanted to improve scheduling and better utilize faculty. The revisions to these programs, and the other programs in NELC, are a result of deciding what is best for NELC and comparing current programs to other institutions. There are very few similar programs, and NELC can stand out with these offerings.
* Committee member question: How many students are interested in the minors?
  + There are some different populations interested in these minors: heritage speakers, students who are interested in the region and International Studies (BA) students who have a required language minor.
  + The department has good enrollment for the language sequence at the GE level, and they want to convince those students to complete a minor by taking a few more courses.
* Committee member question: Have you thought about individualized instruction for the low enrollment courses upper-level language courses?
  + It would require developing the courses, which would only be offered to 1 or 2 students a year. In the future, the department is hoping to have lecturers teach upper-level language courses.
  + In the future, the department is hoping to allow lecturers teaching upper-level language courses when there is a demand for them.
* Committee member question: To what extent, if any, is the department using CourseShare?
  + The department is hoping to build a relationship with institutions to offer upper-level language courses in the future.
  + Uzbek is now part of the Turkish and Central Asia Studies minor. NELC already teaches Uzbek regularly through CourseShare, but having it in the minor will expand offerings of the courses. NELC is one of the only programs offering Uzbek.
* Reminder to remove Persian 2301 from the advising sheet or remove it from limbo.
  + NELC might offer it next year and will request that it is removed from limbo.
* Committee member question: Does NELC have summer intensive offerings for Persian, Uzbek or Turkish? Are there summer intensive programs for these languages at other universities?
  + Summer intensive programs are rare for these languages. NELC does a summer intensive program with Arabic. It might be something NELC does for other languages if they improve their remote offerings.
* A&H1 and A&H2 letters, Heckler, **unanimously approved**

1. Approval of 10-19-18 minutes

* Roup, Savage, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* Assessment
  + Reviewed an assessment plan for Chemistry 1110 and 1210/1220
  + Reviewed assessment reports for German 2350, ASL 1103, Bioethics 2000
* SBS
  + Social Work 2200S – approved with one contingency
* NMS
  + EEOB 5480 – approved with one contingency and one question
  + EEOB 6620 – approved with four contingencies and two questions
  + EEOB 6630 – approved with three contingencies and three recommendations
* A&H2
  + Portuguese 1102.01 – approved
  + Spanish 1102 - approved
* A&H1
  + Arabic 2111 – approved with one question
  + Arabic 2112 – approved
  + Arabic 2104.01 – approved with three recommendations
  + Arabic 2104.02 – approved with five recommendations
  + Arabic 3105 – approved with one recommendation and one reminder
  + Arabic 3705 – approved with three contingencies and one recommendation
  + Arabic 4106 – approved with one recommendation

1. Revision to Speech and Hearing Science minor

* The current minor requires three courses and two three-credit courses on one of four tracks for a total of 15 credit hours. The revision will eliminate the tracks to allow for more flexibility and reduce the total credit hours to 14 to allow for the possibility of a two-credit hour service-learning course.
* Committee member question: Does the two-credit hour course need to be approved before making this a 14 hour minor?
  + No because it is a 14 credit hour minimum.
* Committee member question: What is the service-learning course?
  + The course is in development with a faculty member specializing in aphasia.
* Committee member question: Has Speech and Hearing considered creating a certificate?
  + The department has considered it, but it has not gone beyond discussion.
* SBS letter, Crocetta, **approved with one abstention**

1. Proposal to convert quarter-system Biology BS/DDS to semester-system Biology BA or BS/DDS

* The proposal will convert the quarter-system Biology BS/DDS to a semester-system equivalent and add an option for a Biology BA/DDS. Students will complete the Health Professions track and GE requirements in the first three years of study, and they will complete the first year requirements of the DDS program in their final year of study. Students who are not admitted to the DDS program will receive a BA or BS in Biology.
* Committee member question: What is the rationale for allowing a BA/DDS?
  + The BS will be 132 credit hours, which will be difficult for students to complete in 4 years. ODHE does not want programs created that cannot be completed in 4 years. The BS will be possible for students who are admitted with many credit hours from high school. The BA, which is 123 hours, will be more feasible for students without high school credit.
* Committee member question: Is offering a BA, particularly for students who are not admitted to dental school, doing students a disservice?
  + With the pre-requisites for dental school students are essentially completing BS requirements. This is just an option for high-achieving students who may not have had college credit options in high school.
  + Suggestion: Advise students who do not get into dental school to finish a BS rather than a BA. They will be ahead of their peers and it will be feasible to do in their last year.
* Committee member question: Are these programs, and other programs like them, asking too much of students? The four-year plan has a high credit hour load for most semesters. Are these programs more like five-year programs?
  + ODHE is pushing universities to create four-year programs. We can advise students that they can take longer to complete the program.
* NMS letter, Roup, **unanimously approved**

1. GE revision

* The ASC Faculty Senate revised a motion regarding the budget and the GE following the meeting with the Executive Dean and fiscal officer
  + Trevon Logan in Economics came up with a model that estimated the impact on ASC budget. He proposed creating a committee to look into the issue further.
  + ASC will wait for OAA to come up with estimates of the fiscal impact but will also do their own research.
* OAA is offering ASC $30 million total over 3 years following the implementation of the new GE. The ASC Faculty Senate thinks this is inadequate for three reasons:
  + This money would be in cash, not PBA (present budget allocation).
  + There is no explanation for why OAA chose $30 million.
  + ASC will still fall off a fiscal cliff if the budget model does not change. This only delays the issue. ASC is already losing credit hours under our current GE model. It is not clear to what extent the new GE will or will not worsen the issue.
* ASC needs to make the case for a different budget model to resolve the issue of credit hour loss. The current GE model and the new GE model are both unsustainable for the ASC budget.
* Any efforts to calculate the impact of the new GE on ASC’s budget hits two roadblocks:
  + What to compare our current model to since the new model has not been finalized and the themes are especially unclear.
  + What GE courses students are currently taking for GE purposes and not for program pre-requisites.
* ASC has serious financial issues that need to be addressed. Changing the budget will not happen quickly.
* Accepting the $30 million from OAA would be a safety net for ASC for the first three years of implementation. It would give ASC time to understand the impact and negotiate for a better budget.
  + Some members felt that the central administration cannot be trusted to provide further fiscal help after the initial three years.
* Committee member suggestion: ASCC should focus on creating the best possible curriculum for the GE and asking that the money be provided to make it possible. ASC should be able to make the case for why they need the money, rather than demanding it outright.
  + ASC should require a commitment from OAA to monitor the financial impact of the GE over the three year period.
* Committee member suggestion: ASC could put together a fiscal subcommittee to model what might happen under different scenarios.
  + The data will still leave uncertainties, and numbers will not be exact.
* One committee member made an important aside: Is there a guarantee that ASC will maintain control of the GE?
  + There are some documents that show a desire for the GE to be housed elsewhere/move to a more ULAC-based approach.
* Committee member question: Can ASC vote to approve the GE curriculum but not vote to approve to implement it if assurances are not given on the fiscal impact?
  + The ASC Faculty Senate will be asked to vote on the new GE model, then colleges will need to reconcile their individual GE models. Once there is one GE model, ASC will vote on the GE again. It would then continue to the University Senate where ASC might be able to vote it down on implementation if there are enough ASC senators.
  + Committee member comment: The optics may be bad if ASC supports something pedagogically but not enough to implement it because of fiscal impact.
* Steve Fink: Meg Daly wants to continue conversation on pedagogy. ASCC’s next step should be to complete comments on the foundations.
  + Committee member question: Can we finish the conversation about the foundations without knowing what is in the themes?
  + Committee member suggestion: We should discuss the themes first with the assumption that the foundations will approximately stay the same.
* Allison Crocetta: The Department of Art discussed changing the schematic of the GE model because it is too linear. Students will not finish all their foundations first and then continue on to the themes. As it is, the themes seem like the interesting, big ideas. This is especially problematic because the Arts and Humanities feature heavily in the foundations. The department proposed a circular model with “Informed Global Citizens” at the center, and with foreign language included.