ASCC 4/5/2019

385 Bricker Hall 8:30-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

* Approval of 3-1-19 & 3-22-19 minutes
* Crocetta, Kline, **approved with one abstention**
* Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Certificate (guests: Andrew Martin, Townsand Price-Spratlen, and Reanne Frank)
* The Department of Sociology proposed a new Certificate in Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. The certificate has been designed with an interdisciplinary curriculum consisting of 12 credit hours, including one required course (Sociology 3463 “Social Stratification: Race, Class, and Gender”). The certificate will be offered as an embedded certificate for degree seeking undergraduates (Type 1b) and as a stand-alone certificate for post-bachelor degree students (Type 2).
* The Department of Sociology will work with ASC Communications to market this certificate.
* Committee member question: Does the department have any sense of how many current students may be interested in an embedded certificate?
	+ The department is hoping to reach non-ASC students, especially students in professional schools and the College of Engineering.
* Committee member suggestion: Students in the College of Engineering would struggle adding more courses to their program of study. It might be better to reach out to Fisher College of Business.
* Committee member suggestion: Pre-medicine students may also be interested in the certificate.
* Committee member question: What is the capacity of this program? What if the estimate of students was too conservative?
	+ This shouldn’t be an issue, as the courses are frequently offered.
* Committee member question: Are the courses full every semester?
	+ The core course is usually offered 2-3 times a semester in Sociology. The department has the capacity to offer more sections of this course.
* Committee member question: Do you see this certificate overlapping with the GE as proposed? For example, students could complete some of the requirements for the certificate with the “Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity” foundation and possibly with a theme course. This certificate seems ideal for this case.
	+ The department will likely revamp the “Social Stratification: Race, Class, and Gender” course to fit in the foundation level.
* Committee member suggestion: In addition to reaching out to Fisher students, also reach out to Fisher College to do marketing for the certificate. It would be worth reaching out to business people for professional development.
* Committee member question: A similar graduate-level certificate would also be helpful for graduate students who must demonstrate cultural competency. Is the department considering developing a graduate certificate?
	+ This was originally considered as a graduate certificate, and the department may return to this idea in the future.
* Committee member question: Does the department have a plan for monitoring enrollment and doing assessment?
	+ The department will work in conjunction with the advising office to monitor students.
	+ Suggestion: The department can also work with ASC to look at data for students who are enrolled as ASC students, non-ASC students, and non-matriculated students.
	+ It would be useful to track how the certificate benefits the career of post-bachelor degree students especially.
* Committee member suggestion: Indirect assessment, particularly in the form of a survey, could be very useful for this certificate.
* Committee member question: Will this certificate only be available on the main campus?
	+ Sociology 3463 is not offered online, but it is offered on regional campuses. There are discussions about developing an online offering for this course.
	+ With the diversity of offerings, this certificate should be able to be offered on regional campuses now or at some point in the future.
* SBS letter, Vaessin, **unanimously approved**
* Math Honors program changes (guest: Bill Husen)
* The program changes will create honors versions of the tracks (with the exception of the education track) in the math major. Currently, only two honors tracks are available in the math program. The proposal was reviewed by the Arts and Sciences Honors Committee and by ASCC. ASCC requested additional information and sent the proposal to be reviewed by the NMS panel. The department provided four-year plans, advising sheets, assessment plans, and corrected typos and other issues.
* Committee member comment: The summary indicates that students must take a designated number of honors eligible courses, including “certain specified math courses at the 5000-level or above.” It should be clarified that students must receive permission from the Graduate School to enroll in courses above the 5000-level.
* Roup, Daniels, **unanimously approved**
* Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ AAAS 1121 – approved with two contingencies
	+ History of Art 2001 – approved with three contingencies
	+ ASC 2121 – approved with two contingencies
	+ First-year seminar – John Schrock – approved with two contingencies
	+ Suggestion: Ask for a statement from instructor explaining as part of the checklist for online courses how they will engage with students. It is difficult to tell how involved instructors are with their students.
		- Randy Smith will be at the next ASCC meeting to discuss distance learning.
		- Suggestion: A statement of instructor engagement should be in the syllabus, not just in a checklist or cover letter, because it helps students when this is clearly articulated.
* A&H2
	+ Reviewed revisions to Hebrew and Jewish Studies majors and minors, which will be reviewed at the next ASCC meeting.
* NMS
	+ First-year seminar – Ozeas Costa – approved via e-vote
* SBS
	+ Sociology 5950 – approved via e-vote
	+ The panel discussed what to look for when reviewing a certificate proposal (e.g. rationale for certificate, how it will be assessed, etc.).
	+ Since certificates are so new, we do not know their true value yet. It seems that we need to consider if the certificate will be effective and valuable.
	+ Committee member comment: This is especially important because we could receive pushback from ODHE if they prove to not be effective.
		- ODHE wants us to develop certificates, and they are unlikely to push back on them. The value of assessment is for the program itself. Certificates have a similar value to a minor for matriculating students, but we need to prove that they are valuable for non-matriculating students.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Departments should have a rationale and goals for their certificates as well as a way to monitor the results.
	+ Committee member question: Can we push back on proposals if they do not provide a method of assessment?
		- Assessment is not required for certificates, but we can make a strong recommendation that they do assessment with regard to the usefulness of the certificates. The certificates should have a tangible benefit, especially for non-matriculated students.
	+ Committee member comment: It seems that programs that have a more focused list of course options will be more valuable for students. Assessment might show this for some departments.
		- It is probably true that a more focused certificate would be more valuable, but it is difficult for interdisciplinary programs to limit the offerings.
	+ Committee member suggestion: It seems that some people get stuck on the word “assessment.” We could ask how they will address specifics of the program that are related to assessment. For example, we could ask “How will students be guided through the program? How will the department show that the program is evolving? How will the department show the impact of the certificate?”
	+ Committee member question: What particular challenges should be considered when designing a certificate between colleges?
		- The biggest pitfall of a cross-college or cross-department program is the question of administrative ownership. It needs to be clear how advising will work and how spots will be guaranteed for students in other colleges.
	+ Committee member question: It seems that people who are coming from the workforce would want certificates to be focused so they can walk away with a specific skill. Is there a reason that there can’t be multiple certificates that are related rather than one certificate with a broad approach?
		- This is the approach that colleges are taking with leadership certificates (e.g. business leadership, social work leadership, etc.). This will probably be better for students, but it may cause internal problems.
	+ Committee member question: Will credits earned outside ASC for certificates count toward graduation credits?
		- Right now credits earned outside ASC for a certificate will not count toward graduation credits. We should keep track of how many students this is impacting to see if this should be reevaluated.
		- It would be difficult to have a blanket policy revision to allow credit hours in the certificate to count toward an ASC degree. Some of these courses may not meet the mission of ASC.
		- This issue should be on a future agenda for ASCC and APAC.
* Assessment
	+ Working on documents explaining best practices of GE assessment
	+ Julia Hawkins talked with Kay Halasek in UITL. UITL is working on creating an assessment endorsement. Also discussing having brown bag discussions on assessment with UITL in the fall.
	+ Julia Hawkins also discussed the importance of assessment at the all-chairs meeting and asked for the chairs’ support for assessment.
* GE revision: updates
* The committee discussed proposed amendments to the GE structure.
* Some departments (i.e. History, German, and NELC) are concerned that there are not enough themes.
* Many faculty members want to populate the fourth theme now, but we should really take the time to fully develop all the themes.
* Committee member suggestion: “Theme IV+” or “Theme(s) under development” with a statement that the number of themes is flexible. Being elastic with the themes gives us the flexibility in implementation that we need.
	+ We are really voting on how many credit hours there are in themes.
	+ We should agree that the number of themes needs to be limited in some way or it will be diffuse and difficult to define.
	+ In the future, it will be much easier to add themes than to take them away. We should be concerned about a slow expansion of themes to an unreasonable number.
* Committee member suggestion: We should specify when to evaluate the themes. Evaluating in 8 years will allow for two complete cycles of undergraduate cohorts.
* Suggestion to add the following amendment: Propose that at least three different units participate in a theme.
	+ We need to define what a unit is in this sense. A unit needs to be qualified in some way so they are not closely related in discipline (e.g. Fischer, Economics and FAES Environment, Economy, Development and Sustainability).
	+ Committee member suggestion: Refer to units as “disciplinary distinct units.”
* Committee member comment: The discussion of protecting ASC should not come before doing what is best for students. There are likely very few credit hours that other colleges will be able to claim. Furthermore, this particular amendment will not go to the next senate meeting, therefore the committee moves on to another topic.
* Proposal from the Department of History: Change the foundation “Historical and Cultural Ideas” to “Historical Studies.”
	+ The Department of History also suggested the addition of “in the past” to Goal 3, which the steering committee adopted.
	+ The department suggested this change because the skills learned in history and historical studies refer to a set of critical thinking skills that are necessary for all students to learn. According to the department, removing culture from this foundation would not result in a loss because it could be learned in many of the other foundations.
	+ ASCC decides to call the foundation “Historical and Cultural Studies.”
* Amendment from French and Italian: The department wants to amend the language for the Lived Environments foundation, which they feel is too closely related to STEM.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Remove the word “natural” to solve this issue.
* Weinberg text proposes that the final approval of the revised GE will require a future affirmative vote after the implementation plan is complete.
	+ The committee is concerned that this would require getting senators back up to speed on the GE and on implementation issues.
	+ There is hesitancy among Senators to approve the GE. The Provost did not guarantee the guardrails.
		- These assurances are contingent on the status quo anyway. If the Provost left the university, these assurances would be meaningless.
* Since the last Senate meeting, there has been work to offer concrete assurances:
* The bookends will be OAA credit. OAA will distribute the revenue to the offering units. Any credit going to non-ASC units will also be paid to ASC for the first three years.
* For the themes, they have agreed that ASCC and CAA will continuously monitor the submission of theme courses to make sure that ASC is receiving at least 50% of the credit hours. 50% is the minimum.
* OAA will offer money for course development and redesign.
* OAA and CAA will work to ensure that the freed elective hours are not used to expand credit hours in undergraduate programs.
	1. Professional health science colleges are advising their students to seek breadth outside their own colleges.
	2. ASC asked for less passive language here. May ask all colleges to revisit their requirements to see if they can eliminate some pre-requisites or other requirements to allow for more electives.
	3. Committee member comment: There needs to be exceptions allowed to the expansion rule. For example, some programs may need to add a writing course.
* OAA is acknowledging that the budget model is under review and a new budget may impact these assurances.
* Committee member suggestion: Amend the last sentence to the Weinberg text to say “a future affirmative vote on implementation details,” rather than the structure as a whole.