ASCC 2/14/2020

385 Bricker Hall 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

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

AGENDA:

1. Revision to the Biomedical Informatics Specialization in the Data Analytics BS (guest: Christopher Hans)
* The NMS Panel reviewed and approved a revision to the Biomedical Informatics specialization of the Data Analytics BS. The proposed revisions include changing the name of the specialization to Biomedical and Public Health Analytics, revising the learning outcomes, reducing the required credit hours in the specialization, and including the College of Public Health as a new partner in the Data Analytics program.
* Committee member question: What was the process for making these revisions?
	+ The interdisciplinary Data Analytics major was created 6 years ago. Faculty from different colleges across the university discussed the possibility of creating this major. This collaborative process was facilitated by OAA. Data Analytics maintained a steering committee with representatives from the different colleges involved in the process to discuss assessment, outcomes, issues, etc. One of the issues that emerged was that students were having trouble with the existing Biomedical Informatics specialization. There are too many credit hours in the specialization, and many of the Biomedical Informatics courses are offered irregularly. The steering committee decided to revise the program to make it easier for students and to connect with other parts of the university. Working with Public Health broadens the scope of the specialization. Data Analytics worked with representatives from Public Health and Biomedical Informatics to revise the curriculum.
* Committee member question: How will Data Analytics communicate with existing students, and what is the expected enrollment in the revised specialization?
	+ Advisors will work with current students in the specialization according to the transition plan included in the proposal. Data Analytics will communicate the new opportunities in the revised specialization with pre-majors and through survey. Information on the specialization will be included on the updated webpage. Data Analytics will work with the College of Public Health to communicate with any of their students who may be interested in the specialization.
	+ There are approximately 20 students in the existing specialization, which is one of the smallest. There are roughly 400 students total, including both majors and pre-majors, in the Data Analytics program. The revisions will likely lead to an increase in students in the specialization.
* **Contingency: On page two of the proposal, revise the minimum credit hours required in the specialization to 15 and total minimum credit hours to 131. Adjust the total hours on the four-year plan on page 10 to 131-133 credit hours.**
* Letter, Panero, **unanimously approved** with **one contingency** (in bold above)
1. Approval of 1-31-2020 minutes
* Panero, Kulkarni, **unanimously approved**
1. Revision to the Theatre MFA: Design (Brad Steinmetz)
* The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel reviewed and approved a proposed revision to the Master of Fine Arts Design program from the Department of Theatre. The revision is based on feedback received from the National Association of Schools of Theatre (NAST), an external program review, and the program’s self-assessment. The revisions align the program with NAST guidelines, provide more opportunities for cross-disciplinary collaboration, increase integration of the Lawrence & Lee Theatre Research Institute, maximize course enrollments, and increase faculty teaching efficiencies. The revisions will also redefine levels of courses, merge existing courses, adjust course numbers, create new courses, and add the new Media specialization.
* Committee member comment: It was very useful to have Brad Steinmetz come to the A&H1 meeting to discuss the revisions.
* Committee member question: What was the process for revising the program?
	+ The program is small – there are only four faculty members and nine students, so the process had to be completed with few resources and faculty. The department has been teaching group studies versions of courses that students need, which took the pressure off the department to complete the revision process quickly.
* Letter, Coleman, **approved** with one abstention
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Philosophy 2458 – approved via e-vote
* A&H2
	+ Russian 5160 – approved via e-vote
* NMS
	+ Math 5630 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Math 5633 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Microbiology 2100 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Chemistry 7310 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Earth Sciences 1108 – approved with two recommendations
* SBS
	+ Turkish 3350 – approved with one recommendation
* Assessment
	+ No meeting
1. Comments from the Chair & Associate Executive Dean
* David Horn discussed concerns regarding ASCC at the last ASC Faculty Senate.
	+ ASCC is operating under two contradictory sets of rules in regards to the selection of the chair. One set of rules says the ASCC chair is appointed and the other says the chair is elected. ASC Senate was asked to clean up these rules.
	+ ASCC should have nine elected representatives from the Senate. They are currently appointed. We have asked the Senate to consider electing representatives, but it is unlikely that they will find nine people who are willing to serve.
	+ Terms of service on ASCC are supposed to be limited to three years. We have traditionally not limited terms but we may do so now. This would open up spots for elected Senate representatives.
	+ There are some rules that are unnecessary to ASCC operations that we can get rid of (e.g. having two members from the Honors Panel on ASCC).
	+ We want to clean up these rules quickly to improve good will with the Senate.
	+ We will need to think of how to articulate these rules going forward under the new GE (e.g. how will themes panels, assessment, etc. operate).
	+ We should acknowledge that members who have been on ASCC for a long time and bring a lot of experience and expertise will be rolling off at a time when we will have a higher work load. We should encourage ASCC member home departments to get their colleagues involved in the Senate to serve in these roles.
	+ Committee member question: Is this animosity between the ASC Senate and ASCC new?
		- Yes, the GE revision process has really brought forward these issues. The Senate did not meet for a while. Some of these issues come from concerns about the GE curriculum approval being taken away from ASC under the new GE, which is really an unfounded concern.
	+ Committee member comment: Having members who are critical of ASCC and our process serve on ASCC and ASCC panels is actually useful for making sure we are operating by the rules and listening to concerns.
* ASCC discussed how to improve assessment under the new GE.
	+ Our current assessment process does not work. We need to think of a new way of doing assessment. Other institutions work collaboratively to approve assessment plans. Alan Kalish created a schedule for approving and implementing assessment plans that will space out assessment over a five-year cycle. We will invite units across the colleges to create rubrics and tools for assessment that everyone will use. We will be able to gather meaningful data and analyze if we are asking the right questions.
		- We created two working groups to pilot this process. There will be one working group for Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning and one for Race, Ethnic and Gender Diversity. We will try to measure how the current ELOs measure against the new ELOs. It will open up the conversation around assessment.
	+ Committee member question: Are there any plans to use tools to collect data for assessment?
		- Yes, the plan is to use Qualtrics and/or Carmen.
		- Committee member suggestion: Reach out to departments like Statistics and Design to help make these more effective tools. We can use these departments’ technical and organizational expertise.
		- Committee member comment: We also need to be sensitive to the needs and concerns of faculty. There are valid concerns from faculty about the use of Carmen, especially regarding privacy and data sharing. We do not want to dictate its use to faculty.
		- Committee member comment: It would be good to discuss the use of Carmen and other tools with the ASC Senate and with students to get consensus recommendations. We need discussion and leadership on this issue. The issue of tech use goes beyond GE assessment.
* In advance or releasing the final report, OAA is meeting with every college to discuss issues and obstacles of GE implementation. We want to make sure that all concerns are heard and attended to or managed before the final report comes out.