ASCC 1/17/2020

385 Bricker Hall 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Clark, Coleman, Craigmile, Crocetta, Daly, Haddad, Harrod, Horn, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Oldroyd, Panero, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Welcome back!
2. Advanced Chemistry Knowledge for Educators graduate certificate (new) (guest: Ted Clark)
* The Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel reviewed and approved the proposal for the Advanced Chemistry Knowledge for Educators Certificate. The certificate is made up of four online courses designed to strengthen the skills needed for high school teachers to teach College Credit Plus chemistry courses.
* **Committee member question: Should this certificate be 3A only (stand-alone certificate) or 3B (embedded) as well?**
	+ **The department would like to include the embedded option. There have already been discussions with Master of Education students who are interested in the certificate.**
* Committee member comment: Future funding for CCP certificates is uncertain. It might make sense for any other certificates to be 3B as well to allow current Master of Education students to take the certificate.
* Committee member question: What has been the conversation in the department about funding?
	+ Some funding was made available through grants to other universities for teachers to take these types of courses. OSU did not have enough programs to qualify at the time. There are teachers who want to take these courses, but they have different needs than traditional graduate students. If the main goal for teachers is certification, OSU will not be the cheapest option for them. OSU needs to have a superior program and push the program nationally. Some districts will support funding their teachers for this program.
* Committee member question: Have you been supported within the department to develop this certificate?
	+ The department has been very invested and provided a complete release to the develop the certificate.
* Committee member question: Is there a break-even point for these courses?
	+ For a face-to-face option, it is only six students. Hopefully this program will be sustainable over time. We need districts that are supportive.
* Committee member comment: We need to be strategic about the ways we are replacing depleting credit hours. We are essentially training high school teachers to teach courses that are taught at OSU.
	+ It is too late to really stop this issue. We want to increase standards and rigor of the courses because they will be offered regardless. We understand the standards for AP scores, but we don’t know the standards for CCP.
* Committee member question: How is this certificate program different than other competing programs?
	+ Other universities simply open up their graduate courses to other students or film lectures and put them online. Those courses are not designed for teachers. Designing courses specifically for teachers opens up different opportunities.
* **Committee member comment: There are some issues with the advising sheet:**
	+ **The program must allow 50% overlap with other programs.**
	+ **The last two paragraphs should be removed. They come from undergraduate minor advising sheets. The department can include a statement telling students to address advising and graduation issues with the department.**
* NMS letter, Taleghani-Nikazm, **unanimously approved** with **three contingencies** (in bold above)
1. GE update (Meg Daly)
* Proposals from the subcommittees are being released and posted on the OAA website. Anyone can comment on the proposals.
* Each subcommittee will submit a final report, and these reports will be consolidated into a final report by the end of the month.
* An FAQ section on the GE is being developed for the OAA website.
* A support team will be meeting with curriculum committees in each college to talk about what is in the final plan. They will discuss issues that are specific to their college. The goal is to make sure that the other colleges are comfortable with the plan.
* The policies and procedures document is about a governance structure for making decisions during implementation.
* We want to have governance and the final report figured out before the summer so faculty know what service we need in the next academic year.
	+ The pacing of approval from other colleges is tied to needs for hiring advisors and other staff, not just populating curriculum panels with faculty.
	+ Recruiting students is also a big factor, especially for colleges with outside accreditation. They need to work with college counselors and recruiters.
* Committee member comment: There is some concern from the ASC Faculty Senate that ASC will end up underrepresented because there is so much representation for other colleges.
	+ The Glenn College is concerned about being able to fill spots, but other colleges want representation. ASC wants representation, but we don’t want a committee that is too large. We would have issues filling these roles if we had too many spots for ASC. ASCC will still maintain approval of courses, but other colleges are emphatic that they are involved in what is happening.
* Committee member question: Where are departments right now with this process?
	+ Departments seem to be waiting for the next phase. They are ready to move to implementation stage.
* Committee member question: At the last ASC Senate meeting, the chair indicated that the rest of the university views the Senate as obstructionist. Are we perceived like that?
	+ The situation is similar to how our own college and other colleges view ASCC. Some feel that ASCC is slow and disrespectful. The perception is not necessarily correct. However, there has to be a recognition of the larger landscape. If ASC doesn’t get on board with this GE and implementation plan, other colleges are ready to move on without us.
* Committee member question: What would this GE look like if they adopted a GE without the ASC?
	+ Other colleges would still need introduction courses from ASC, but the themes would likely be interdisciplinary across the other colleges. No one wants this, and it would be a loss for all students.
* Committee member comment: Enrollment in ASC is down 1.5%. Hopefully this new GE can get students to see ASC disciplines as vital and exciting.
* Committee member question: There are concerns about the number of credits in the themes being too low. Could students take more courses in the themes to make them real themes?
	+ It is challenging for highly structured degrees (e.g. pharmacy, engineering, the arts, and many NMS programs) to include more credit hours in their programs.
* There is a concern that students will put off their embedded writing course until their last semester, when they will get the least benefit from taking it. We want to embed the writing course in the program where students will benefit from them the most.
* Committee member question: How will having only one required course fix the issue with writing?
	+ The second-level writing will be embedded in all programs to make it discipline-specific. Programs may opt to have students take an English writing course or other writing course outside their department or they can embed it in the program, make it specific to that discipline, and require that students take it at a certain time in their program.
* Committee member comment: We need to keep in mind that if we increase requirements for our college, we will block students from moving to ASC from other colleges or Exploration.
* Committee member comment: Buildings from themes to create minors, certificates, and other programs will create opportunities for students. They will want to do these if we invest in creating quality programs.
* Committee member comment: Small departments are looking at how to fit their high enrollment courses into the new GE and are looking for opportunities for new courses they can create, but they do not have the faculty or support to create them as enrollments decline.
	+ Even without the GE revision, departments would need to think critically about how to create new courses and increase enrollments. It may be possible that there will be funding from OAA, but it is not guaranteed.
* Committee member question: Will the first-level writing still be English 1110? This issue is uncertain with the ELO subcommittee.
	+ Uncertain if this will change, but will work to clarify.
* Committee member question: If members of the committee have concerns, what mechanisms do they have available to get these concerns addressed?
	+ It depends on what the concerns are. If it is a college-specific concern, address it to David Horn. If it is GE specific, address it to Meg Daly.
1. Approval of 12-6-19 minutes
* Panero, Lam, **unanimously approved**
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Italian, Comparative Studies, and NELC 5061 – approved via e-vote
* A&H2
	+ Arabic 2241 – approved with comments
	+ Arabic 3702 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar – Mary Thomas – approved with one recommendation
* NMS
	+ Microbiology 8161 – approved via e-vote
* SBS
	+ Communication 3466 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Communication 3414 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ Communication 3800 – approved
	+ Geography 5222 – approved with two comments
	+ Geography 5225 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Political Science 7095 – approved with two contingencies
* Assessment
	+ Reviewed four assessment reports for Linguistics 2051, Communication 1100 and 1101, and Classics 1101.
* Alison Crocetta: Presented report to ASC Senate about ASCC’s activities this year.
	+ If members have suggestions for improving the process of selecting members and the chair of ASCC, email them to David Horn.
1. Draft Goals and ELOs for GE World Languages (Carmen Taleghani-Nikazm)
* More students are testing out of languages, transferring language credits, or earning language credits through AP testing.
* The new GE provided the opportunity bring the ELOs in line with the new GE program goals as well as the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) standards.
* Most language programs were involved in the drafting of the ELOs. Directors from the departments as well as instructors in the language programs came to two meetings to discuss the ELOs. The ELOs were written in way that will also include ASL.
* The two goals focus on language and intercultural competence respectively. Communication and culture are tightly connected.
* Question: Was the overlap with the diversity category in goal 2.2 intentional?
	+ The language is intended to align with the GE program goals. It is not the same language as the diversity category.
* Committee member comment: Since this is an ASC-only requirement, we will essentially require our students to take another course with a diversity component, which is good.
* Committee member question: Are we changing the required credit hours?
	+ No, the requirement will still be 12 credit hours.
* Committee member question: Do the courses need to meet all the ELOs?
	+ Yes, but at a level that is appropriate for the course.
* Committee member question: ASC Faculty Senate approved the requirement for the World Languages. Should they also vote on the ELOs for the World Language requirement?
	+ ASCC is the curricular body of the Senate. ASCC should vote on it and present it to the Senate. The Senate does not need to vote on it.
* Committee member question: If the ELOs are changing, will the placement tests also change?
	+ Not at the moment. They will eventually be revised or replaced, but CLLC coordinates the placement tests and lacks the staff and funding to do so now.
* Proposal, Rush, **unanimously approved**