ASCC 1/25/2019

386 University Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Crocetta, Daly, Daniels, Fink, Fletcher, Harrod, Hawkins, Heysel, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Oldroyd, Otter, Puthawala, Roup, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 11-30-18 minutes

* Roup, Kline, **unanimously approved**

1. History BA program change (guest: Chris Otter)

* Students are currently required to take one 4000-level reading seminar in History and one 4000-level research seminar in History. The proposed changes will require students to take two 4000-level seminars in History with both a reading and a research component. The Panel reviewed one sample syllabus for History 4005, and the approval for this course will apply to the other 4000-level courses.
* Curriculum and Assessment subcommittee of ASC Honors asked History to change the proposal, which would have allowed students to take non-honors offerings if there were insufficient honors offerings. There cannot be ad-hoc honors embedded offerings.
* Committee member question: The approval for 4005 will apply to all 4000-level seminars. How many courses will be impacted?
  + The course change applies to approximately two dozen courses. History 4005 is a template that will apply to all seminars merging research and reading into one seminar.
* Committee member question: Will all other changes to 4000-level seminars outside this template still need to be approved?
  + Yes, the department is not approved to make other changes.
* GE language is included in the 4005 syllabus, which is not a GE course. The department needs to inform instructors that GE language should not be included on non-GE course syllabi.
* **The History 4005 syllabus should be revised before it goes to CAA.**
* Letter, Vaessin, **unanimously approved with one contingency (in bold above)**

1. Deactivation GIS in Geo-Spatial Data Analysis

* The Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Geo-Spatial Analysis was created under the quarter system but is currently infeasible under the semester system. Only one student is in the program. The program will be withdrawn once this student completes the program. The Department of Geography plans to develop a Certificate in Geographic Information Systems to better serve students.
* Both NMS and SBS panels approved the deactivation.
* Committee member question: Is there language indicating that the program will be deactivated after the current student finishes?
  + Yes, the departments will notify the Graduate School.
* NMS letter, Roup, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* SBS
  + Economics 8874 – approved via e-vote
  + Economics 8876 – approved via e-vote
  + Geography 5100 – approved via e-vote
  + Geography 4103 – approved via e-vote
* NMS
  + Microbiology 2000 – approved with one recommendation
* Assessment
  + Reviewed a departmental report from Philosophy. The Assessment Panel only requested two assessment plans, but the department submitted a report on all GE courses offered in the 2017-18 academic year. Of the reports submitted, only two courses (both of which are new GE courses offered one time each and had assessment plans approved by curriculum panels) met the standard of the Assessment Panel.
  + The panel discussed how to improve GE assessment both under the new GE and in the current GE.
    - The Panel discussed creating a list or document of best practice suggestions for departments.
    - The Panel discussed having the English faculty involved in writing the English Writing Program report come to the Assessment Panel.
    - The Panel suggested working to make UCAT a resource for faculty for GE assessment. Additionally, the Panel would like to explore ways to get funding for faculty to improve assessment.
    - The Panel suggested creating a module for assessment similar to the module for course redesign.
    - Assessment Panel members could work more closely with departments to provide guidance on assessment. This could involve getting a course release to do this extra work.
    - The Assessment Panel could work more closely with curriculum panels to identify and improve poor quality assessment plans. Chairs could screen assessment plans before they go to the curriculum panels.
  + Committee member suggestion: Get time at the divisional chair meeting and the all chair meeting to highlight how GE assessment can be part of program improvement. If the chairs think of GE assessment as something that will benefit their programs, they will be more likely to find resources for it. Contact the divisional deans to set this up.
  + Committee member question: Is curriculum a priority for all chairs? Would GE assessment as a method of curriculum improvement be appealing?
    - Funding is a priority for chairs. Improving curriculum and assessment can be an incentive to chairs. Every chair would like to have an assessment report like the one from English that would demonstrate the strength of their program.
  + Committee member comment: Assessment culture includes more than just assessing the GE. It’s part of a culture of looking at what you’re doing and whether you’re doing it well.
  + Committee member suggestion: A module and/or video could be included in the Teaching Support Program that emphasizes the value of assessment in teaching. This could be for both GE and program assessment.
    - Meg Daly will take this suggestion to the president – he values the Teaching Support Program.
  + Committee member suggestion: UCAT is being absorbed by UITL. This is a good time to make sure that the assessment functions of UCAT aren’t lost. Reach out to the director of UITL and bring this to the president to make sure that assessment is part of teaching initiatives.
  + Committee member comment: Faculty thinks that assessment is a one-way street with both GE and program assessment. They submit data but they don’t feel like they’re getting feedback.
    - The college has tried to improve feedback with programs, but we would need to scale up for this to work at a university level for the GE.
  + Committee member comment: Assessment needs to be part of the new GE.
* A&H2
  + History of Art 4798 – approved with three contingencies
  + WGSS 4527.02 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
* A&H1
  + Linguistics 5410 and Philosophy 5610 – approved with two recommendations
  + WGSS 3100 – approved with one contingency and one question
* Committee member question: Why do we do panel updates? Are oral reports on panels required? Can the panel updates be put on the back burner while the GE is being discussed?
  + The main discussion today was about assessment and is relevant to the GE discussions. The Assessment Panel should still present if curriculum panels are not presented at ASCC.
  + Suggestion: Rather than giving oral reports, panel reports could be distributed before the meeting to give an opportunity for people to comment.

1. GE revision

* The ASCC proposal amends the original OAA GE proposal.
* ASCC and ASC Faculty Senate are in a position of weakness because the next executive dean will have to make the model work. This person has no input on the process at this time. The more negotiations ASCC and ASC Faculty Senate does with deans of other colleges at this time, the more difficult it will be for the new executive dean to do the real negotiations. Therefore, we should leave the fiscal decisions to the appropriate fiscal people. It is our job as faculty to approve the structure, distribution of credits, and general framework of the GE.
* If the structure changes because it cannot work fiscally, it will need to come back to the college for approval. Decisions will be made by an implementation committee that informs the deans.
* Committee member suggestion: ASC Faculty Senate has proposed the creation of an ad-hoc fiscal committee in the ASC Faculty Senate. Would the presence of an ad-hoc committee create issues with leadership making decisions?
  + It could be reasonable to have an ad-hoc fiscal committee in the ASC Faculty Senate to play an advisory role.
  + It could be argued that there should be a permanent fiscal subcommittee, given the importance of fiscal issues in the college.
  + Committee member question: Would this ad-hoc committee be advisory to the ASC Faculty Senate or to the executive dean?
    - The committee would advise the executive dean and should also inform the senate, but the senate does not make fiscal decisions.
  + Ad-hoc committee and ASC administration would work on fiscal issues with the implementation committee.
* Committee member comment: There should be a clear statement of who oversees the GE. It appears that it might move outside ASC. In her new role, Beth Hume in the Office of Undergraduate Education “provides oversight” to the GE. It needs to be clarified what that actually means. There is a difference in oversight and coordination of the GE.
  + Oversight of the GE is moving from Randy Smith to Beth Hume. This means that the GE is valued as part of teaching and is not a threat to ASC’s role in the GE.
  + ASC puts more into maintaining the GE administratively that should be reflected in a revised budget.
  + The day-to-day administration of the GE will remain with ASC.
* Committee member question: What is ASCC’s current role in the GE? We have approval of revisions to the GE, but who generates the changes?
  + The power to initiate review of the GE could come from ASCC. In this case, ULAC initiated the call for revision. We are charged with bringing a proposal to the full ASC Faculty Senate. We still have the responsibility of approving GE courses, and we are the only body responsible for the content of the GE.
* Committee member question: The proposal discusses approving structure but not content. Should we talk about content?
  + Content will be the courses. This will be the responsibility of faculty.
* Committee member comment: There is concern from the ASC Faculty Senate that the structure did not come from the ground up.
  + ASCC is the ground up. We took the proposal from OAA and modified it.
* Committee member comment: There is concern that we are describing the container (the structure) without discussing what will fill it.
  + Focusing on the structure allows individual units to make decisions about where they fit in the GE curriculum. It gives bottom-up control to the GE.
  + There has not been enough conversation about the themes to make sure they are representative of ASC units and that they see a place for their courses in the structure.
* Committee member comment: It will be difficult to discuss the foundations without discussing content and disciplines more specifically. Discussing themes will also require more specific conversations regarding content.
* Committee member comment: The themes are already confusing and non-specific (e.g. Humans in Their Environment is sustainability). It will not be clear to departments where their courses fit. We need to make it clear what is new in the GE and why it is part of the GE: the idea of themes, Building a Diverse and Just World, and the bookends. This should be part of the rationale.
* There is a conversation about who should develop specific themes: ASC Faculty Senate or ASCC.
* Committee member question: The themes overlap now. Will we specify what should fit in the themes or will overlap be allowed? Will the themes be more clearly delineated?
  + This is essentially asking if we should allow courses to count in more than one theme. The idea is to not allow overlap. We need to better specify what the themes are because there is too much overlap possible now.
* Committee member question: Where are foreign languages in this proposal?
  + The foreign languages can fit in two places: foreign languages will be allowed in high-impact courses in the themes and in a category specific to ASC, which is not included in the universal model.
* Committee member suggestion: Why don’t we have a call for proposals for currently relevant themes. If there is a call for themes, the proposals should outline potential topic areas as well.
* Committee member suggestion: The ASC Faculty Senate does not have as much expertise as ASCC on the GE and curriculum matters in general. We should focus work for the Senate on things they have the expertise to do, and they should trust ASCC to do the work with the GE. We shouldn’t rely on the Senate to do all the work involved in creating a GE model. The proposal made by OAA involved a lot of work and discussion.
  + The Senate does not want to restart the process. The concern with the Senate is how to make them feel more involved. There is confusion about the process and concern that proposal is coming from above the Senate.
  + ASCC is part of the Senate. This GE proposal is not being imposed on them, it is coming from within. Senators pushing back for that reason are misunderstanding the role of ASCC.
* Committee member suggestion: We can vote to informally approve this structure and further discuss the specificity of the themes.
* ASCC voted to identify this proposal as the framework for further discussion. ASCC will continue to work on the specifics of the proposal.
* Vaessin, Kline, **unanimously approved**