ASCC 2/8/2019

200 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Daly, Daniels, Fink, Fletcher, Haddad, Harrod, Hawkins, Heckler, Heysel, Husen, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Martin, Oldroyd, Roup, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 1-25-18 minutes
* Roup, Daniels, **approved with two abstentions**
1. Math Honors program changes (guest: Bill Husen)
* The Curriculum and Assessment subcommittee of the ASC Honors Committee reviewed and approved a proposal from the Department of Mathematics to revise and add honors pathways for undergraduate students in mathematics. The revision will result in increased options for students to earn honors or distinction in Mathematics as well as provide more oversight to the Mathematics Honors Program.
* Committee member question: Will ASCC vote on all elements of this proposal or will the committee vote on the BS/MS change at another time? It is unclear in the proposal if the BS/MS option is already available to students.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Separate the BS/MS option into its own proposal and provide more information before discussing at ASCC. The graduate director should also be present to discuss the BS/MS option. The BS/MS option justifies its own discussion, and the committee needs more information that what is provided.
* The committee voted to focus on all sections of the proposal except section 5, Honors Track with Master’s Option.
	+ Daly, Kline
* Committee member question: One rationale for the change was to increase diversity by providing more options for honors. How will the changes increase diversity?
	+ In terms of diversity, the changes will bring the math program in line with the Actuarial Science program which has an almost even split of male and female students.
	+ The current honors track is mostly geared to people applying to graduate school, and there is an intrinsic diversity issue associated with this.
	+ The changes will give honors options for the applied tracks, which will hopefully be more appealing.
* Committee member question: Has the department developed advising sheets?
	+ No, the students will work with faculty advisors (one advisor for each track) to make decisions.
	+ The Honors Committee recommended that advising sheets be developed quickly.
	+ Committee request: Develop advising sheets and four-year plans before the proposal goes to NMS.
* Committee member question: What are the assessment implications of the changes?
	+ It would be helpful to provide documents showing how the current honors track is assessed and how this will change with revision and expansion of the honors program. Documents showing how the individual tracks are assessed would also be helpful.
	+ The learning outcomes for the program might not change based on the program changes, but there are other goals for changing the honors program (e.g. expanding diversity) that should be tracked. The department should think more broadly about assessment to see if the department is attracting and retaining students with the program redesign.
* Andrew Martin withdrew the motion
* **Proposal will go to NMS for review with additional supporting documents**
	+ Daly, Fletcher, unanimously approved motion to send the proposal to the NMS panel
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Italian 1101.71 – approved
	+ Italian 1102.71 – approved
	+ Italian 1103.71 – approved
	+ Theatre 3818 – approved with three contingencies and one recommendation
* A&H2
	+ WGSS 2327 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
	+ Spanish 1113 – approved with one contingency
	+ Russian 3480 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Russian 3490 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
* NMS
	+ Chemistry 1205 – approved via e-vote
* SBS
	+ Communication 2131 – approved via e-vote
	+ Anthropology 5627 – approved via e-vote
	+ Speech and Hearing Science 6770 – approved via e-vote
* Assessment
	+ Julia and Shelby are working on best practices, which will be discussed and approved by the Assessment Panel
	+ Working on developing resources for ASCCAS website to provide more support for assessment. This will include best practices documents and annotated examples of GE assessment reports and plans
	+ Committee member suggestion: Reach out to CLLC because assessment for foreign languages is particular.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Reach out to Kay Halesek in UITL now to discuss role of assessment.
	+ Committee member comment: There are good resources for assessment already, but they are not activated, and assessment is not incentivized.
1. GE revision
* The ASC Faculty Senate meeting was cancelled, but the ASCC statement on the GE was sent to senators.
* The names for the intermediate themes were removed from the ASCC statement on the GE.
* Steve Fink met with Kim Kinsel to discuss budget issues.
	+ Even if the GE is reduced, ASC students will still be limited to 10 credit hours taking outside ASC (excluding credit hours in majors or minors taken outside ASC).
	+ One suggestion would be to have students take at least 50% of effective credit hours in the themes in ASC. If this target isn’t met, it will trigger a review of the GE model.
	+ Committee member question: Why isn’t this ratio higher?
		- It is unknown how interdisciplinary courses will impact the number.
	+ Committee member question: Will the 50% effective credit hours apply to foundation courses?
		- This buffer is not formally in the model because ASC will likely offer approximately 85% of the foundation courses.
		- ASC will likely have most of the writing, SBS, diversity and humanities courses.
* Committee member suggestion: An opt-out version of this model would be preferable so foreign languages would be more visible in the model.
	+ Foreign languages will still be required for ASC students and will be available to students in the themes.
	+ Foreign language should be visible and prominent to all students, not just ASC students, because the universal theme of the GE is “Building a Diverse and Just World.”
	+ If we add a component that is opt-out, we are switching the entire rationale for the revision. The idea is that everyone will buy into this model. Changing this would have profound consequences.
	+ We should think of how to make the “special note” about high-impact courses more visible.
	+ Allowing students to take foreign language courses in the themes creates opportunities for students to take foreign language courses. Students who test out of 1103 will be able to take more foreign language courses in the GE.
* Meg Daly: We need to focus on a few issues before we vote to send the proposal to the ASC Faculty Senate by the end of the academic year. We should focus our discussion on the foundations. Is the committee okay with the model, including the size and scope of the foundations, and what are the key implementation issues that will need to be resolved related to the foundations?
	+ We should expect backlash from departments over the conflation of 9 credit hours to 6 credit hours in the humanities, as well as the addition of literary to visual and performing arts and the combination of history and cultures and ideas. It takes these categories out of the domain of one department. Are there other foundation categories that will have a similar problem?
	+ There may be a related backlash from the idea of students only needing to take one history course, literature course, science course, SBS course, etc.
		- BA students can finish their degree without taking a science course if they enroll with AP credit, or they can complete the requirement by taking just one course.
		- This is why we need to discuss what the goals of the GE should be. We should consider the purpose of taking a history course or a science course. We shouldn’t think of the foundations in terms of divisions but rather what we are expecting in terms of modes of inquiry.
		- The critical difference will be in the themes, not the foundations. Students have done much of the foundation-level coursework in high school. We want to best serve students.
	+ Considering whether foundation courses are too similar to high school courses should be a major implementation issue.
	+ We need to have strong rubrics for what will be included in these categories. This is an issue under the current GE, and we need to be stricter going forward.
	+ We shouldn’t carry forward any GE courses automatically to ensure that all courses are meeting the goals of the GE. This needs to be part of the proposal to make sure it is implemented.
* Committee member question: Foreign language courses at the 2000-level or above are 3 credit hours but would need be 4 credit hours in themes. Why don’t we allow 3 credit hour foreign language courses in themes?
	+ 4 credit hour courses are high-impact courses only, like service learning, foreign language or team-taught courses.
	+ The 3 credit hour courses would need to be reworked. Theoretically, the additional credit hour would be needed for the course to meet the thematic learning goals.
	+ The themes are intended to be interdisciplinary. Courses in foreign language meet the goal of being interdisciplinary in one course (rather than two 3 credit hour courses) because they meet the goals of the themes and are taught in a foreign language.
	+ The criteria that make these courses 4 credit hours need to be explicit.
* Committee member question: Can courses in a foreign language be taught in the foundations as well or do the foundations need to be taught in English.
	+ It would not work with the OTM to have a foreign language course in the foundations.
	+ 1101-1103 would be pre-requisites for any of these courses. Under the current GE, courses are supposed to be readily available to students without pre-requisites.
	+ We could rethink this as long as the courses are being assessed. We could indicate in the proposal that we are open to courses that have pre-requisites being part of the GE foundations.
* Committee member comment: There needs to be a robust assessment practice to make the themes work.
* Committee member question: Why was the allowed overlap between the GE and the major reduced from 9 credit hours to 7?
	+ 9 credit hours would essentially be the entirety of the themes.
	+ Only allowing 7 hours of overlap will be prohibitive for large majors.
		- The goal of reducing the GE is to not make it prohibitive for large majors. Even if major credit hours and pre-requisites are around 60 credit hours, the GE will only be 30-40 credit hours, some of which will overlap with pre-requisites and major credits.
* Committee member question: Are we unlinking “Building a Just and Diverse World” and “Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity”?
	+ Yes, there is a better chance of “Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity” becoming part of the OTM if it is not linked to something OSU-specific, like the themes.
* Committee member question: Should we be specific about course levels in the themes (e.g. 2000-level and above)? Course numbering isn’t necessarily reflective of level of difficulty.
	+ We could consider not having limitations on the level of courses in the themes.
* Committee member comment: We may be underestimating the timeline for implementation if all classes in the GE will need to be reviewed.
	+ We may need to flag the top courses in the foundations and try to expedite them.
	+ It is necessary that we look at all courses for curricular drift and quality assessment plans.
	+ We would need rubrics and templates or standardized forms to streamline submission and review.
	+ Current panels cannot handle this workload. We would need to have a modified approval process.