ASCC 11/16/2018

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

1. Approval of 11-2-18 minutes

* Hawkins, Savage, approved with one abstention

1. Panel updates

* Assessment
  + Reviewed three assessment reports and one assessment plan
    - The assessment report for English 1110 was very well-done.
* A&H1
  + Art Education 7000.30 – approved with one recommendation
  + Russian 5460 – approved with three comments
* A&H2
  + Russian 2104.61 – approved via e-vote
* NMS
  + EEOB 5340 – approved with one comment
  + Entomology 1350 – approved with one contingency and nine comments
    - The GE Entomology course demonstrates curricular drift. The committee discussed the importance of having a mechanism under the new GE to remove GE status.
* SBS
  + AEDE 2400 – approved via e-vote

1. Revisions to MA Art Education & online MA Art Education

* Students in the in-person MA Art Education will now be required to take both ARTEDUC 7000.10 and 7000.20 during their first semester, rather than just 7000.10. Students will also be required to take ARTEDUC 7701 and 7100. The total required hours for the degree is now 31, instead of 30. Students in the online MA Art Education will now be required to take ARTEDUC 7000.30, which will replace the current version of 7000.10.
* Shari Savage answered questions regarding the MA Art Education & online MA Art Education program revisions.
* Committee member question: Can you elaborate more on the rationale for the changes?
  + Students are in silos in their studies (Art Education and Art Administration and Policy). These changes are an effort to provide more synergy. They were also recommended by an outside accreditor.
* Committee member question: How large is the online component of the program?
  + There are currently 16 students from across the country, but the program is growing. It is on track to have 20+ students next year.
* Steve Fink comment and question: The department should provide the rationale for changes in their annual assessment. There was some concern from the department that it would be difficult to maintain both the in-person an online program. Is this still a concern?
  + They are distinct programs. Department is creating a museum and cultural policy specialization for the in-person MA. The online version is intended for practicing teachers.
* Committee member question: What makes the online program a lot of work, and is the department providing support?
  + Shari’s personal experience is that it is difficult to build personal relationships in online courses. It is time-consuming to give feedback to students in the online course where it would be much faster in-person. Students are typically educators, so using Skype or phone calls is very difficult.
    - Committee member suggestion: Use personalized videos or voice messages rather than typing emails to students.
* Committee member question: Can you provide more information on course changes?
  + 7000.10 and 7000.20 will change from 3 credit hour 14-week courses to 2 credit hour 7-week courses. By reducing the credit hours and requiring both courses, the department is using faculty in a more efficient way and allowing students to have an introduction to both specializations.
* Committee member question: Was there a lot of overlap in course content in the intro courses?
  + Some content was eliminated. The courses were changed from two 14-week courses to two 7-week courses. In the past, these courses have had to be combined due to low enrollment in one or the other, so there has been some experience in combining the content already.
* A&H1 Letter, Vaessin, **unanimously approved**

1. GE revision

* Implementation date for the GE will be in Autumn 2021 when Workday is released
* Steve Fink and representatives from other colleges discussed how the GE will impact programs and time to degree at an APAC meeting. The foundations have the most impact on time to degree because they currently serve as pre-requisites for programs.
  + ASC is the only college with a fiscal stake in the GE revision.
  + Most colleges agree that there should be higher-level content in the GE, but there is not a consensus on the structure.
  + There are major credit implications for other colleges under the new GE model. Programs need to fit in 121 credit hours, which is easy for some programs but makes others very inflexible.
  + 8 colleges have high-stem emphasis programs with limited flexibility in their programs. All of these colleges agreed that there are not enough STEM courses in the foundations, and this will increase the time to degree for their students.
  + Most colleges like the idea of the model (themes, higher-level courses), but it imposes a high burden on STEM majors, transfer students, students who change their majors, regional campus students, and others.
  + The breadth requirement in themes is unlikely to be implemented because other colleges do not want to use ASC divisions.
  + Other colleges like the College of Engineering’s proposal for a foundation in Applied Arts, Technology & Design.
  + The credit implications are also an issue for ASC students, especially natural science majors.
  + Other colleges would like the model if there was more flexibility. Their ideas for adding more flexibility are creative, but they undermine the idea of the foundations.
  + Trying to accommodate the model is driven by trying to prioritize major programs, which undermines the GE curriculum. We will end up with a new model that duplicates the problem of the current GE model.
* One major issue is that many programs are professional or have a focus outside the liberal arts (e.g. dental hygiene, pharmacy, etc.). These programs would not necessarily have a liberal arts component at other institutions. There is pressure from ODHE to fit programs into 4 years when they would be more appropriate for 4-5 years.
  + Committee member question: Why can’t professional schools function as professional schools and offer a different degree?
    - This would be a radical change. This would require abandoning the unified GE model.
    - Students would have more difficulty moving between colleges than they do now.
    - We are committed to providing students with a liberal arts degree. Students have the option of attending professional or arts schools but coming to OSU means they have a liberal arts aspect of their education.
  + Why don’t programs with high credit needs make the case to ODHE that they can’t do their programs in 121 credit hours? It would be possible for engineering and others to do a liberal arts GE without compromising their own programs if they can have 135 credit hours.
    - It is unlikely that they would get a sympathetic hearing, but they could make their case.
* The takeaway from various conversations that are happening is that we need to decide whether to abandon the unified GE or take the proposed model as a starting point but reconsider how to make a unified GE curriculum that addresses all of the concerns of the different colleges.
  + Committee member suggestion: We should step back and examine the GE ELOs to determine what we want students to learn.
* The committee discussed options for how to reconsider the proposed GE model.
  + Committee member question: Why are there three courses in the themes?
    - It was originally meant to be a correlation between three courses and the three ASC divisions.
  + Committee member comment: We should not look as the foundations as preparation for the themes. Students do not go through undergraduate studies linearly.
  + Committee member suggestion: We could create a hybrid model where some aspects of the GE are universal and others are decided by individual colleges. The foundations can differ between colleges with each college establishing their own foundations and the themes will be the common aspect of the GE. We should think of the GE in terms of competencies instead of “boxes.”
  + Committee member suggestion: Rename the general education to give it a more descriptive title and a distinct identity.
  + We need to make it clear to students that they are gaining competencies, not just checking off boxes.
  + Committee member suggestion: Students could take foundation courses before proceeding to the themes. The themes could be a seminar, rather than a set of courses.
  + Committee member suggestion: Create a “flower model” with the center as the only common curriculum. Each college would decide the curriculum outside the center.
  + Committee member suggestion: Reimagine the proposed model as a circular model that does not separate the foundations and themes as much. The core of the circular model should be citizenship, which values experiences (e.g. service learning, STEP, study abroad, etc.) because deep competencies are not always possible in a general education curriculum.
    - We should simplify the ELOs in the proposed model to 5.
    - Engineering said communication, leadership, and teamwork are skills their students need. They can gain this through a GE curriculum that emphasizes experiential learning.
* Conclusion of conversation: Faculty seem to be rethinking fundamental concepts of the GE model. Members will brainstorm ideas and think of GE models taking the current GE as a starting point, while keeping in mind the fundamental problems of the GE. Members should consider models that either maintain the goal of a unified GE or abandon the unified GE model.
  + In order to accommodate the needs of high-credit programs, a unified GE model would need to be around 30 credit hours. The current proposal is about 40 credit hours.