ASCC 1/31/2020

385 Bricker Hall 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Craigmile, Crocetta, Daly, Harrod, Hawkins, Heller, Horn, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Combined French and Francophone Studies BA/MA (guest: Sarah-Grace Heller)
* The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel approved a proposal for a combined BA/MA in French and Francophone Studies. The program will allow students to complete a BA/MA in 5 years, and will increase the overall number of students in the department’s 5000-level and above courses. The panel approved after clarifying questions with the department.
* Committee member question: What were the concerns that panel wanted clarified?
	+ The main concern was about the pedagogy of 7301. This course is for graduate students who are becoming GTAs. Per Graduate School rules, combined BA/MA students are not permitted to be GTAs, so some of the content will not apply to them. This issue has been addressed by creating different provisions for students who are teaching and for students who are not.
	+ Committee member comment: Students in combined BA/MA programs can apply to graduate in their fourth year and then be considered a full graduate student in their fifth year, making them eligible to work as GTAs.
		- This would be a good solution, especially for students who want to go into secondary education.
* Committee member question: Has there been a trend at other universities to offer a combined BA/MA in French?
	+ The emphasis has been on PhDs and less so on stand-alone MAs. There are not many combined programs, but there does seem to be a shift toward them.
* Committee member comment: There is some resistance to allowing undergraduates to continue at the same university to the PhD program, but this combined program is more of a bridge.
	+ Yes, and it allows OSU to send highly qualified students to other PhD programs.
* **Committee member comment: The Graduate School Handbook language regarding required GPA is a 3.5 cumulative GPA in all previous undergraduate coursework, not just French coursework (pg. 57 of the Graduate School Handbook). This language is specific to combined programs.**
* Committee member question: Is it common in other master’s level programs that students take 8000-level courses. Is this not too demanding for students?
	+ Yes, this is common. There is not a stand-alone MA, so the focus is on PhD courses. Students will have support and mentoring.
* Committee member question: Was there a pedagogical issue the department was dealing with during the time between the first submission and the revised submission?
	+ The colleague in charge of the program left the university, so this proposal was sidelined. There were substantive issues, but they were not the main reason for the delay in resubmission.
* Committee member question: Is the department thinking about assessing long-term success (e.g. job placement, etc.)?
	+ Absolutely, but the program will be small. This type of assessment will be more personal and anecdotal.
		- Committee member comment: Mentioning this in the written assessment plan will be helpful at the Graduate School level review.
	+ Committee member comment: Departments are asked for their plans for each program (i.e. for the BA and the MA). A distinct plan for the combined program is not required.
* A&H1 letter, Rush, **unanimously approved** with **one contingency** (in bold above)
1. Approval of 1-17-2020 minutes
* Taleghani-Nikazm, Kline, **approved** with one abstention
1. Revision to the Capital Program (Todd Bitters & David Horn)
* The Social and Behavioral Science Panel approved a revision to the Capital Program. The Capital Program is a program designed between the College of Arts and Sciences and the Fisher College of Business. It provides ASC students with the opportunity to take courses in the College of Business and is distinct from the Business minor. Students take core course work, an internship, and advanced courses from one of five tracks. The revision will eliminate two of the five tracks, Real estate and International Business. Students will be able to pursue a minor in these areas instead. The revision will also replace Bus M&L 3241 with the option of Bus M&L 4241, 4210, 4211 or 4240.
* Committee member question: Why is the International Business track not popular?
	+ For some reason, it is not appealing to students like the Marketing and Management and Human Resources tracks. There are usually only 2 or 3 students enrolled.
* Committee member comment: This program is a great opportunity for students. The class experience is much different from the minor.
* Committee member comment: Is this a certificate or a minor?
	+ This program is in its own category. It has its own transcript designation.
* Committee member question: Why is it called the Capital Program?
	+ This program was created in the 1980s, and there isn’t much information on it. It is a good marketing term. For example, when asked to clarify what the Capital Program is during job interviews, students are able to talk about their experience.
* Committee member question: Why not make it a certificate.
	+ It is something to consider, however, it would remove the exclusivity of the ASC offering. Only ASC students can take this now.
* SBS letter, Steinmetz, **unanimously approved**
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Theatre 5210 – approved
	+ Theatre 5305 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Theatre 5401 – approved with one contingency
	+ Theatre 5403 – approved
	+ Theatre 5501 – approved
	+ Theatre 5502 – approved with one contingency
	+ Theatre 5503 – approved with two contingencies
	+ Theatre 5512 – approved with two contingencies
	+ Theatre 5612 – approved with one contingency
	+ Theatre 6210 – approved with two contingencies
	+ Theatre 7215 – approved with one contingency
* A&H2
	+ CLLC 3301.01S and 3301.02S – approved via e-vote
	+ CLLC 3302S – approved via e-vote
* NMS
	+ First-year Seminar – Audrey Sawyer – approved with one contingency and six recommendations
* SBS
	+ Political Science 3240 – approved with one recommendation
* Assessment
	+ Reviewed assessment report for Anthropology 3597.01 and 3597.02
	+ Assessment plans: Curriculum panels should not approve courses with bad assessment plans, as this results in weak assessment reports. The curriculum panels can send the plans to the full panel or the panel chair for comment if there are significant issues.
	+ Committee member question: How do we do assessment with regional campuses when regional campus instructors are not collecting requested data?
		- Recommend that the chair of the department discuss the issue with regional deans.
		- Committee member comment: This points to a broader problem with assessment. Some departments feel they don’t need to do assessment. It is a structural problem.
1. Comments from the Chair
* Alison Crocetta presented to the ASC Faculty Senate regarding the activities of ASCC. There are a lot of misconceptions about the efficiency of ASCC.
* The committee discussed how to improve recruitment of new members to ASCC, potential summer service on ASCC, and changes in the makeup of the panel under the new GE.
	+ It has been difficult to get ASC Senators to nominate faculty to join the Senate. ASC Senate should nominate faculty to sit on the Senate. Alison will present at the next ASC Faculty Senate meeting regarding ASCC’s needs for the next academic year so they have time to make nominations.
	+ We got into a pattern where the Senate was not nominating faculty to ASCC, so they were appointed instead. We need to reset the process and make it transparent. There may be renewed interest in serving on ASCC.
	+ ASCC will vote to appoint a chair for ASCC at the end of this academic year.
	+ ASCC members should look at their availability for next academic year and notify David Horn by February 7 if they are able to serve on ASCC next year. Members should submit nominations to David Horn for the ASCC chair by April 10. The vote for the next ASCC chair will happen on April 17, the second to last meeting.
		- The chair’s work includes serving on a curriculum panel, attending an ASCC prep meeting every two weeks, chairing ASCC, and attending and addressing ASC Senate as needed. There may be additional work during the GE implementation process.
	+ There is an effort to recognize and support the work this committee will do during GE implementation (e.g. ways to package reports, move through work efficiently, etc.).
	+ Service on ASCC may include summer service in 2021. This work would likely be compensated in way similar to CAA’s compensation structure. These meetings will likely only require a quorum of members and the chair, and there may be options for electronic meetings. David would need to know if members are available for summer service if they plan to serve on ASCC next year.
	+ Committee member question: Are there plans to convene ASCC over the summer of 2020?
		- There are no plans for this summer, but if there is faculty available to do so, course conversions might start coming through in the summer.
	+ ASCC panels will likely be expanding during GE implementation.
	+ Committee member question: If ASCC is expanding, it would be good to have another student representative.
		- Currently there are not any plans to expand ASCC, aside from an ex-officio theme panel chair. ASCC deals mostly with programs, so there is not an expectation of increasing ASCC to match the expansion of panels. This would likely change the proportional representation.
	+ Committee member question: ASCC is a subcommittee of the Senate. Should the Senate vote on changes to the composition of ASCC?
		- The Senate would need to vote on a change to the composition of ASCC, which is not what is being recommended. They do not need to vote on the number or composition of panels.
* The committee discussed the final report from the implementation committee as well as the next steps for moving forward with the implementation of the GE.
	+ Committee member question: When will the final report be finished?
	+ The goal is to release it sometime next week.
	+ The subcommittee reports are more broad than the final report. The final report consolidates and identifies incongruities and processes for making decisions going forward. It identifies newly configured ULAC and ULAC subcommittees as well as methods for creating new subcommittees and lines of communication.
		- If revisions to the report are necessary, we need to find a different pool of people to work on it. Most people who have been willing to participate have already done so, and they have put off their other work to participate. It is hard to see how the process could work out differently given the existing constraints (i.e. the already approved GE structure). We already approved the structure, and now we need to develop the details within the structure. The implementation plan explains the process for assessing and withdrawing components, but we cannot change the components at this stage of approval.
	+ ASCC should offer their feedback on the report to ASC steering, because the committee is looked at as the experts on GE curriculum. ASCC also has experience working with faculty from other colleges. There are concerns about working with other colleges that are unlikely to materialize.
	+ The final proposal reflects the knowledge of staff and faculty who work closely with students. Students have to experience and navigate this GE. Faculty do not necessarily understand the issues that students have with the current GE or will have with the next GE, but the staff understand this.
		- It is important to acknowledge that this process was initially student-driven. Students recognized that the GE needed to change, and they participated in the process to develop a new GE.
	+ Committee member question: If we need to bring in new people to work on the GE, if the report does not pass, where should the faculty come from? How do we identify new people for this process?
		- We should consider where the issues are coming from that caused the GE to not pass, and identify who may be invested in those issues.
	+ Committee member comment: There is some anxiety among faculty with the themes panel not being majority ASC.
		- There is a legitimate argument for having ASC lead the process, but other colleges with a lot of students have not had enough voice in the process.
	+ Committee member comment: It seems like the only body that could stop the GE process is the ASC Senate. It seems that the consensus has shifted to wanting to approve, but deal with these issues first.
		- That is also the consensus from other colleges too. Everyone wants the best possible GE for students.
	+ Committee member comment: There is still a mixed message about when the implementation of the GE will happen.
		- These conversations are converging. Hopefully there is enough flexibility that students who come in before the official implementation as new first-year students in the 2021-22 academic year will be able to work with advisors and start under the new GE structure.
		- Some of this confusion comes from what “starting” the process means. There seems to be a consensus that a hard rollout in AU21 cannot happen. AU22 should be the hard deadline, but there will be a soft rollout before that.