ASCC 11/30/2018

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

1. Revision to Andean and Amazonian Studies minor (guest: Jonathan Burgoyne)
* The changes to the program reflect updates in course offerings and a new study abroad program in Ecuador. After taking one three credit-hour course at OSU, students will be able to complete the AAS minor by participating in the Pachaysana study abroad program.
* A&H2 letter, Kline, **unanimously approved**
1. Approval of 11-16-18 minutes
* Fletcher, Crocetta, **unanimously approved**
1. Certificates
* Credits for “Leadership” certificate program in Fisher College of Business currently do not count as ASC approved courses or as upper division hours for ASC students. ASC students must complete 111 hours in ASC courses or ASC approved courses (courses outside ASC that are included in a major or minor program) and 39 upper division hours. Should courses used to complete certificates be treated as major or minor programs in terms of how they apply towards students’ degree requirements?
* Committee member question: Are there fiscal implications of allowing credits to count toward degree requirements? Have Jan Box-Steffensmeier or Trevon Logan weighed in on this?
	+ They have not weighed in on this specific discussion, but there is already concern about credit loss.
* Committee member suggestion: We may want to encourage departments to create minors to replicate certificates for degree-seeking students.
	+ We cannot force non-ASC programs to do this.
* Committee member comment: In some cases, a certificate may be better for students than a minor. There might be a better connotation for some programs (e.g. a certificate in data analysis rather than a minor in CSE, for example).
* Committee member question: Do we have a website for certificates for outreach to the community?
	+ There isn’t a central website for certificates. The responsibility is currently with departments to market certificates.
* Committee member question: Do other colleges have a reciprocal rule? Are students in other colleges required to take a minimum number of courses within that college?
	+ It is likely that other colleges do not offer enough courses to have this kind of rule.
* Committee member comment: This decision should be made by the central administration. We should be consistent across colleges.
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ History 2206 – approved via e-vote
	+ Panel is pushing back on the boilerplate assessment plan from the History Department.
* A&H2
	+ Russian 1103.61 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Slavic 2365.01 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Slavic 2365.99 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ English 2464 – approved with three contingencies and one recommendation
	+ Philosophy 3120 – approved with two recommendations
* NMS
	+ NMS panel did not meet
* SBS
	+ Psychology 5604 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ SHS 4630 – approved with one comment
	+ Social Work 5798.04 – approved with two contingencies and one comment
* Assessment
	+ Assessment panel did not meet
1. English 1110 GE assessment report (Julia Hawkins)
* The English Department seems to understand why assessment is necessary.
* They provided an assessment plan, which they actually followed. Many departments do not follow through on approved assessment plans. The plan called for rubric-based evaluation of the GE ELOs.
* Committee member question: How do departments get to the one question for an ELO that is measurable?
	+ Workshops and presentations at the assessment conference often teach this.
* The department broke down the ELOs into six categories, which they evaluated with a rubric. The department clearly laid out the data for both direct and indirect methods.
* The strongest part of the report was the “Results and Discussion” section. The English Department clearly demonstrated that they got something out of assessment, and that they did this for the benefit of their writing program.
* The department provided an additional section in the appendices discussing the evolution of the English 1110 program. This section demonstrates what can be understood from assessment. The department responded to data to improve their writing program.
* Committee member comment: The English department had the resources to hire people to do this assessment. This work falls on DUS in smaller departments. Even hiring staff would require training.
	+ This report demonstrates the need for more resources for GE assessment in the new GE.
* Committee member comment: The important part of this report is the spirit of it. The data and mechanisms used for assessment will change for every unit. The important thing is to show that GE assessment is valuable.
* Committee member comment: We should assume that some instructors and administrators will see this and be inspired by what is possible with assessment. It demonstrates that it is possible to develop rubrics and embedded questions that are measurable.
1. GE revision
* ASC Faculty Senate update:
	+ There was a motion at the ASC Faculty Senate meeting to stop discussion on the GE.
	+ The steering committee offered a counter-motion to continue discussion of the GE.
* Proposed GE model – Steve Fink, Meg Daly, Richard Fletcher, Allison Crocetta
	+ There is some concern that departments would use the 9 credit hours of overlap to guide students through a subset of courses. Students would not have a common, broad intellectual experience as a result.
	+ This model is adapted from the current GE proposal, but it sets aside fiscal concerns and gives the GE a genuine identity.
	+ Summary of changes:
		- The 3 credit hour front bookend will be a 1 credit hour module in addition to the first-year survey. It will provide an overview of the GE, and will likely take place online.
		- The arts/humanities/history foundations are reduced from 9 credit hours to 6 credit hours. The labels and configuration of the foundations can be changed.
		- The original proposal called for 15 credit hours across two themes. The 9 credit hours required in the theme of choice was designed to reflect the ASC divisions, which the other colleges rejected. The themes will be reduced to a total of 8-12 credit hours across two themes. Each theme can be completed with one high-impact course per theme. These courses can be a showcase of the GE program.
			* Ideally, these courses will be team-taught 4 credit hour courses that are interdisciplinary. This will make the GE interdisciplinary by nature, rather than students having to connect the dots within the themes. Alternatively, students can take two 3 credit hour courses that must be in different disciplines.
			* In addition to team-teaching courses, students can take other high-impact practices like courses within the theme taught in a foreign language, study abroad, service learning, etc. These courses do not have to be team-taught and can be included as long as they meet the ELOs.
			* The themes will be the signature component of the GE that the university can advertise.
			* Departments will have an incentive to develop these courses and make them accessible to a broad audience.
	+ Work is still needed to finalize the labels and ELOs for this model.
		- Committee member comment: Some people are attached to the word “citizenship” in the GE, but others are opposed to the word “citizen” in the current political climate. We should consider whether “global citizen” addresses the concerns of both parties.
		- Committee member comment: “Humans in Their Environment” is a much better title than “Places and Spaces.”
	+ Committee member question: What is the definition of interdisciplinary in this model?
		- This will need to be refined, but it will probably resemble the definition for current team-teaching courses.
* Proposed OSYou model – Chuck Daniels
	+ This model reduces the number of credit hours in the GE to 31-33 overall. Students will complete the required foundations courses (25-28 credit hours) and two 3 credit hour courses (Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World and a Global Citizen course).
	+ Drivers for this model:
		- There are no benefits to the bookends.
		- Every student would do something different with the themes courses, which would make it impossible to give the GE an identity.
		- The goals of the Global Citizen course are good. Each college would develop their own Global Citizen course, but students would be able to take this course in any college.
		- This is a student-centered approach. Students would not be restricted to courses in specific boxes, but they would be free to take more electives, a minor, or second major instead.
		- This model will work with the OTM, 2+2, transfer credit, College Credit Plus, and other programs.
	+ Committee member question: How do we assess this program? The bookends, especially the final bookend, are opportunities for assessment. We want to have program assessment, rather than current course assessment in the GE.
	+ Committee members discussed whether each college would be able to create an effective Global Citizen course that is college-specific.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Each college could create their own Global Citizen course. Students could be required to take this course outside their own college.