ASCC 3/22/2019

386 University Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

1. GE revision
* We will use this meeting to get a vote on the structure and to get feedback on constraints and implementation issues.
* Committee member comment: It is unclear if ASC Faculty Senators are reading the GE documents.
	+ Any recommendations and amendments to the GE will be synthesized and sent to senators, chairs, and directors of undergraduate studies as a starting point for conversation.
* ASCC may pass the GE revision with contingencies. The ASC Senate steering committee and ASC Associate Dean can decide if contingencies have been met in the future.
* The contingencies include that the fiscal assurances and guardrails will be met. It is likely that there will be other contingencies.
* Committee member question: There was a motion from the ASC Faculty Senate that fiscal assurances need to be met before a vote can happen. Will the ASC Faculty Senate accept the contingency as a fulfillment of this motion?
	+ There is no way to provide fiscal assurances outside the contingency. In the absence of more implementation work, which cannot proceed without an official structure, it will not be possible to get more fiscal information.
* **Context and Implementation Recommendations**
* The learning goals are tentative and are not mapped to assessment or specific courses. People wanted to see that we aren’t starting from zero with the learning goals.
* Committee member question: Will any proposed themes need to fit the specific learning goals?
	+ The goals for the themes are very broad. Every theme will need to meet these goals, but each theme will have their own specific learning goals.
	+ The themes will map to the GE goals, which are content neutral. The goals are program goals.
* Committee member comment: The goals are curriculum goals. We should develop a curriculum map for GE courses.
	+ Certain courses will meet the goals at different levels.
	+ This curriculum map will be large, but it will be helpful for implementation. We will be able to prioritize course approval by the goals and levels they meet.
* Committee member question: The learning goals align with the levels in the GE structure (goal one to the foundations, goal two the choice themes, goal three to the universal theme). How do we make sure that we are not frontloading what we want students to learn? Should we reverse the order of the goals? What we most want students to learn is goal three.
	+ We don’t usually write program goals to be more important than others.
	+ The order of the goals is an implementation issue.
	+ Broadly speaking, the goals do map to the levels, but we don’t want to lock this in.
* We will add some language in the document that states the need for a curriculum map.
	+ Students were interested in a curriculum map during listening sessions. A curriculum map makes the value of the GE more obvious.
* Committee member comment: All GE courses will lose GE status. Realistically, reevaluating every GE course will be impractical. About 2/3 of these goals are already met in the current GE. Starting over will be a lot of work and may be unnecessary.
	+ We could expedite existing courses that have recently been assessed and have good assessment plans. There is already language in the proposal about expediting the process.
	+ There are a lot of courses that are high enrollment and high demand that have had curricular drift or have weak assessment. We need to evaluate these courses.
* Committee member comment: Keeping people on the panels if there is this much work load will be difficult.
	+ There are conversations with OAA about compensation or a course release.
	+ There should be language in the GE documents that this is being discussed.
* Committee member comment: This workload is also a concern for departments.
* Committee member comment: There might be a secondary ASCC for implementation. One committee will review existing GE courses and the other will review new GE courses.
* Committee member comment: OTM courses should be the first round of courses reviewed. Existing courses that clearly map to the goals should be second. New courses should be third.
* Committee member comment: Some faculty are pushing back on the workload. Faculty say they want higher pay, but only 25% of faculty are doing the Teacher Support Program. The Teacher Support Program increases pay and supports student learning. Developing courses and supporting student learning is part of the faculty workload.
* Committee member question: Does every GE course need to meet every learning goal?
	+ No, these are program goals. The program needs to meet every goal. Students need to take courses so all the goals in the program are met.
	+ What we might find through assessment is that students are missing certain goals or that only a small number of classes fulfill the goals.
* Committee member suggestion: Include a comment in the document that GE program assessment will take complexity and diversity of course offerings into account.
* **Bookends**
* The bookends are basically non-negotiable. We need to have a means for assessment.
* Committee member comment: There should be truth in advertising here that the bookends are for assessment. Didn’t ASCC vote to not include the bookends in the GE structure?
	+ We voted out the 3 credit hour faculty-taught bookend.
	+ Committee member comment: We should make it clear why the front bookend returned, even in a different form, after that vote.
* Committee member question: How are we certain that this e-portfolio will serve the student and not just the university?
	+ Students can use the e-portfolio as a career tool to show to potential employers or include in graduate school applications.
	+ Committee member comment: E-portfolios are not simple to assess, but they are useful for students if done well, especially as career tools.
* Committee member comment: The goals for the seminar and the e-portfolio are overwhelming.
* Committee member comment: It appears that the bookends are not beneficial for students and will constrain them.
* Committee member comment: Students do not like that the GE feels like checking off boxes. There is no way to articulate why the GE is important and what students gain from it. The bookends are a way to articulate that the GE is a full program.
* Committee member comment: We are not doing enough to resist the idea that students can do the GE before they get to OSU. We need a way of taking stock of where students are when they walk in the door. Even if they have taken GE courses before they come to OSU, they have not done GE courses “this way.” Students come here with skills. We need to make a narrative of how to make the skills they have work for them and how OSU can build on these skills.
* Committee member comment: Even if students do not receive college credit for their courses, many high school courses are similar to some GE courses.
	+ One opportunity would be to expand exams to test out of or place into higher courses.
	+ K-12 goals have shifted since the last GE revision, but not all schools are equal.
* Committee member comment: Needing to re-teach content is a problem with many courses. Some students, but not all, have seen the content before.
	+ We need to have a framework that can help students find the right course in the foundations.
* The one credit seminar was going to be ASC credit, but it will now be OAA credit. OAA will pay units for their participation. This will be a way for OAA to direct funds. The seminars will be graded S/U.
* Committee member question: Will the final bookend have an instructor?
	+ Students will submit e-portfolios. Someone will need to review the portfolios.
	+ Regional campuses want options with the final bookend, so there will be hybrid and in-person options.
* Committee member suggestion: Add language in the GE documents about receiving feedback on the e-portfolio in the departments.
	+ Some units may want to roll e-portfolios in their own assessment.
	+ There should be a strong recommendation that departments should be involved with e-portfolios of their students.
* **Foundations**
* Committee member comment: There will still be a problem with the arts and humanities categories.
	+ If we put 6 credit hours in one box titled “Arts and Humanities,” SBS and NMS units may question why A&H have more credit hours in the GE. We need some way to convey the breadth of arts and humanities.
	+ Suggestion: Change “literature” to “literary” to better fit in the category. Literature courses are often taught in a cultural lens and will not inherently fit in with art courses.
	+ Students will miss out on the full breadth of arts and humanities in the proposed structure, but this is the case for social and behavior sciences and natural and mathematical sciences too.
* Committee member comment: The opportunity is not for all departments to expand their courses in the foundations, but to map their courses to the themes. Departments will be able to attract non-majors to their discipline in higher-level courses.
* Committee member comment: Departments should not have the expectation that students should experience every discipline in the foundations. It is not possible for students to take courses in every unit.
* Committee member question: Why aren’t World Languages in the foundations?
	+ The World Language requirement is not universal.
* **Themes**
* There was some discussion of removing all of the choice themes and requesting faculty proposals to fill them. Three of the original four themes returned so departments can anchor themselves to something while they decide where to put their courses. The fourth theme will come from faculty proposals.
* Committee member comment: The ASC Faculty Senate does not like the theme “Places and Spaces.” It seems that the return of this theme and the repopulation of the themes in general reflects that faculty are not being listened to in this process.
	+ It feels like the repopulation of the themes is being driven by the timeline for implementation rather than meeting faculty needs.
	+ On the other hand, having no ideas for the implementation of the themes is stressful for chairs. It would be too challenging to develop all four themes in the fall, especially with new senators.
* Committee member question: Could we remove the “Places and Spaces” theme and let the other two remain?
	+ Suggestion: We could also change the name of the theme instead of removing it. The name is what most people seem to take issue with rather than the proposed goals of the theme.
* Committee member comment: Leaving one choice theme undeveloped allows departments to find places for their courses in the three proposed themes. Departments will be able to populate the fourth theme with learning goals that are not addressed in the three existing themes.
* Committee member suggestion: The themes have descriptions and goals that were developed. Including the descriptions in the proposal may be helpful in relieving anxiety for some members. The description for “Places and Spaces” states “Students understand issues related to humans and their lived environments through both objective and subjective lenses inclusive of physical, biological, cultural and aesthetic space that individuals occupy, and the relationship between humans and their natural environment.”
* Committee member suggestion: The choice themes should all be removed with a contingency that they are developed by faculty by January.
* Committee member comment: The other colleges are strongly in favor of articulating specific themes at this point. They feel that they are being asked to write a blank check otherwise.
	+ It would look like a step back if we left all of the themes blank. The themes were developed by faculty.
	+ Other colleges would not have a sense of where their courses fit in the themes if we leave them all blank.
* Committee member suggestion: Change “Places and Spaces” to “Lived Environments” to better reflect the description.
* Committee member suggestion: Add the descriptions to the documents or faculty will get too hung up on the titles of the themes. The descriptions better reflect the breadth of disciplines and opportunities for the themes. If the descriptions are not included, too much time will be spent debating the themes.
	+ Suggestion: Do not let senators discuss the themes until the descriptions are read.
	+ Suggestion: The documents should include language that indicates that the names of the themes can be adjusted to better reflect their descriptions.
* Committee member question: Will senators think that the themes are in flux with the name change?
	+ Changing the name better reflects feedback from faculty and their concerns.
* Committees will need to determine ELOs for the themes during implementation. ELOs for the themes will determine where departments can fit courses.
* Committee member comment: Having only one theme to develop makes it feel like the others are mandated and non-inclusive of faculty input.
	+ The three proposed themes were developed by faculty. Leaving one theme open is a recognition that while the themes here are supported, they do not meet everyone’s needs. We may find out that we don’t need a fourth theme.
	+ A fourth theme allows for continuous discussion. It could be rolled out at the same time as the entire GE or in the future.
	+ It seems like art and physical sciences might not be well-represented in the existing themes.
	+ We want the goals of the themes to meet curriculum goals and breadth of endeavors at the university.
* Committee member suggestion: Place “Lived Environments” first out of the three named themes. By putting it third, it looks like the tail end of the two themes that have a more obvious place in the GE.
* **World Languages**
* Committee member suggestion: Put “World Languages” under the foundations. It looks isolated on the side of the foundations.
* Committee member comment: It needs to be clearer in the motion that ASC is adopting GE and World Languages as separate requirements simultaneously. The GE is contingent on World Languages. World Language is a program requirement but not a part of the universal GE.
* Committee member suggestion: Add “but highly encouraged” to exemption on tag degrees.
* **Writing**
* Second-level writing will be a major program requirement instead of part of the GE.
	+ Students need better second-level writing courses, but we would like it to be disciplinary specific.
* It was initially proposed that writing was supposed to be in the choice themes, but it would constrain students too much.
* Committee member comment: Some faculty may not support this requirement because they believe writing should be part of the GE.
* Committee member comment: Communication should be included in the units that can offer advanced writing courses.
* Committee member question: How resource intensive will it be for the Writing Center to do training? How intensive will it be for instructors to go through training?
	+ It will likely require significant investment, which is already stated in the document, but writing is almost universally a concern among the faculty.
	+ Any department who does not want to invest in the writing enterprise can outsource to other departments.
	+ We need to make sure that all instructors who teach writing are well-trained.
* Committee member question: How can we guarantee that this requirement will be funded?
	+ This requirement is a contingency.
	+ This whole proposal will need support from the Provost, and this requirement is one element of that.
* Committee member question: How do we insure that other colleges include the writing requirement?
	+ Other colleges are some of the most motivated because this is an issue they hear about from employers.
* ASCC will vote on the proposed GE structure via e-vote.