ASCC 2/28/2020

385 Bricker Hall 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Brintlinger, Coleman, Craigmile, Harrod, Horn, Jenkins, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Ludsin, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Russian Language and Culture for the Professions MA (guest: Angela Brintlinger)
* The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel reviewed and approved a proposal to create a new MA program in Russian language and Culture for the Professions. The program will focus on applied Russian language knowledge and high-level language proficiency skills.
* Committee member question: Are there concerns about creating divisions in the levels of ability among students in Russian 7150 (Language Maintenance and Professionalization)? Not all students have a high level of language acquisition.
	+ It is rare to have school preparation for Russian, so most college students only get to intermediate-high on the ACTFL standards. Russian 7150 will be helpful for Russian maintenance, regardless of the level of language ability. Students can take up to 4 credit hours. The three different populations in the graduate level of the department will benefit from interacting with one another.
* Committee member question: Are there concerns about graduate students in this program taking courses with undergraduates and PhDs?
	+ Levels of language acquisition differ even among the undergraduates. This is the case at every level. Instructors in the department are used to tailoring classes to the different needs of students.
* Committee member question: Does the department already have internships in place for the short-term summer internship?
	+ Not yet, but the department has connections with many industries (e.g. study abroad, translation services, government, etc.). The department wants students to have both professional and language experience over the summer.
* A&H1 letter, Wilson, **unanimously approved**
1. Approval of 2-28-20 minutes
* Vaessin, Steinmetz, **unanimously approved**
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Did not meet
* A&H2
	+ Did not meet
* SBS
	+ Sociology 4193.03 – approved via e-vote
* NMS
	+ Statistics 3470 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Statistics 5740 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Mathematics 5635 – approved with three contingencies
	+ Mathematics 5636 – approved with three contingencies
	+ EEOB 5350 – approved
* Assessment
	+ Did not meet
1. Certificate proposal requirements
* Going forward, CAA will require assessment plans for certificates.
* Committee member question: Does this apply to certificates that have been approved with contingencies and without an assessment plan?
	+ CAA will expect an assessment plan for the certificate once it reaches their level of approval.
* Committee member comment: It seems like there is an issue with assessment plans that use specify courses in their plan. It isn’t possible to tell if students are taking the course for the certificate, a different program requirement or as an elective.
	+ This is an issue if the program uses courses for assessment. They can use other metrics at the programmatic level.
1. GE implementation report (David Horn)
* All colleges will vote on GE implementation by the end of April. Implementation will begin by May. ASCC should submit their recommendation on the GE implementation report to ASC Senate.
* Conversations are happening with the Registrar and OAA regarding what parts of implementation will start in May.
	+ Foundation courses that are not changing in significant ways will be approved first. These courses will likely be submitted as a spreadsheet.
	+ Committee member question: What should departments do about courses that they want in themes but aren’t certain if they will be approved for them?
		- These courses can be approved for the foundations later.
	+ Committee member question: Is there a plan to request assessment plans as part of this initial approval process?
		- Assessment will be handled much differently moving forward. It will be more centralized, and assessment plans will not be part of course proposals.
	+ Race, Ethnic and Gender Diversity will be the exception to this streamlined process, since there is not a one-to-one transfer. Some of these courses will be approved administratively and others will be reviewed by panel.
* The themes approval process is more complicated than foundations approval. An ASCC theme panel will review courses for how well they meet the generic theme ELOs. Expert panels that report to ULAC will approve the content of theme courses. New theme courses will also need to go through the regular panel approval process as well. The implementation report says some of this approval will happen simultaneously.
	+ The original idea was to have one large theme panel that report to ASCC with many non-ASC members. This panel would have been too large, and it would have had many non-ASC members on a panel that reports to ASCC.
	+ Committee member question: Will ASCC be involved with the assessment of the themes?
		- ULAC will assess the themes.
	+ Committee member comment: ASC will probably have the majority of courses in the themes, and we are ceding approval and oversight to a non-ASC body. We are in the best position to evaluate pedagogy of these courses.
* The GE implementation document recommends that any new GE course can by default be offered on any campus. This is a big change from the status quo. Chairs will be responsible for monitoring more courses than they currently are. Departments will have a right to vet instructors for GE courses on regional campuses.
* There are two college-specific motions being prepared by the ASC Senate. The motions are joint and would be voted on together.
* Motion one: This motion would reestablish the 3 credit hour first-year seminars that were in the original proposal. This motion includes a request for 50 new faculty members to teach the first-year seminars. It would also introduce a third course for each theme with a requirement that students take courses in two different departments.
	+ This motion would likely be impossible for tagged degrees and many NMS degrees. Advising looked at this scenario for Computer and Information Science, Chemistry, and Biology – all would require 130 credits or more under this model. This motion would be unacceptable for NMS, tagged degrees, and likely many SBS degrees. This would also likely be unacceptable from the student perspective.
		- Committee member suggestion: It may be beneficial to take this issue to the ASC Student Council and have them draft a resolution.
	+ Committee member question: What is the benefit of this proposal?
		- Research suggests that interacting with faculty in an engaged way is beneficial to students throughout their undergraduate career. The 3 credit hour bookend would provide more faculty interaction.
			* Committee member suggestion: Instead of implementing this requirement, departments should encourage students to do research early. This should not be mandated, especially to departments that already have these opportunities in their major.
			* Committee member suggestion: Instead of 3 credit hours, the launch seminar could include faculty contact. It could be merged with the existing first-year seminar that already includes direct faculty contact.
		- It is also a rationale for hiring more faculty.
	+ Committee member comment: This motion would also be an issue for students who switch colleges. A lot of ASC programs depend on students who transfer colleges.
	+ Committee member comment: Part of the motivation for the GE revision was to be cognizant of the struggles of students moving through the university. Having more ASC-only requirements makes things more difficult for students to move through the university.
* Motion two: ASC would have the right to adopt any themes they endorse when they are not approved by ULAC. ASC will not have a majority of votes on the ULAC GE body.
	+ ASC already has the right under the trustee rules to control their own GE. We could wait to see if the GE is working for the college before pursuing this mechanism. However, there is not enough information to determine how the GE will be evaluated.
		- We will evaluate the GE program overall, but students may take classes outside OSU. It will be difficult to determine how well they met an ELO in this case. Theme course approval is also concerning. How an “expert” on the theme is chosen is unclear, and it is uncertain how broadly they will interpret the meaning the themes. It is unclear in the proposal how these panels will be populated.
* ASCC will respond to the issues in the GE implementation document and state their objection to the two motions put forward by the ASC Senate.
	+ ASC Senate is viewed as obstructionist outside the college, but ASCC is not. If ASCC comes forward with some of the same objections to the GE implementation document, it might lend more credibility to the objections. ASC Senate should also hear any objections ASCC has to their proposals.
	+ The document ASCC created a year ago to support the GE structure celebrated the fact that the new GE reduced credit hours and allowed for more flexibility for students to take electives, minors, double majors, and certificates. This last minute motion from the Senate goes against this spirit.
	+ The simplest way for ASCC to respond to the motions would be for the chair to write a letter articulating the support for a reduction in credit hours and opposition to the motions in the Senate. The chair can append the document from last year that gives ASCC’s support to the GE structure.
		- The motions from Senate will be circulated to ASCC members to review.
	+ ASCC should respond to the theme approval process as outlined in the GE implementation document (e.g. issues with content approval, panel structure, theme oversight and assessment, etc.).
		- Panel member should review the entirety of the document and see if there are other issues to address.
		- Any response should be sent to Senate to review first before being sent to OAA.
		- Meg Daly would need to take these changes to other colleges for approval before the university vote. Some colleges may vote on implementation before April.
	+ Allison Crocetta will write up a collective response to the Senate motions on behalf of ASCC and send them to the Senate.