ASCC 4/3/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Coleman, Craigmile, Crocetta, Haddad, Hawkins, Heysel, Horn, Jenkins, Jones, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Martinez, Miriti, Nisbet, Oldroyd, Panero, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Science and Environmental Communication Certificate (new; Erik Nisbet and Susan Kline)
* The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel reviewed and approved a new undergraduate certificate in Science and Environmental Communication. The certificate program will educate students on the theory and practice of communicating about scientific, environmental, and sustainability topics. The 12-credit program includes two required foundational courses within the School of Communication and two elective courses from a selection of thirty-one courses across 11 departments and units in the university.
* Committee member question: How did this certificate evolve? How did the School of Communication recognize the need for it?
	+ There is definite student interest in science communications. Roughly half of students in these courses are non-communication majors. Many of the students come from the rest of ASC or outside the college, particularly from the School of Environmental and Natural Resources. We saw an opportunity to cater to the needs and interests of students both inside and outside ASC. We reached out to other departments, including those outside the college like Agricultural Communication and SENR. We recognized the importance of experts being able to communicate about sciences across a range of modalities. This new certificate has the potential to increase enrollments since non-ASC students will be drawn to this program.
* Committee member comment: This is a very timely proposal. It is imperative that scientists are able to communicate these ideas to people outside their fields.
* Susan Kline: The assessment plan was put together after the last ASCC meeting when it was announced that all new certificate proposals would require an assessment plan. A lot of work went into this proposal. We spoke directly with some departments to get their input and make sure they were on board with the certificate.
* SBS letter, Rush, **unanimously approved**
1. ASL minor (new; Glenn Martinez and Tia Jones)
* The Arts and Humanities Panel 1 reviewed and approved a new minor in American Sign Language Studies. The 12 credit hour minor consists of a required language sequence (9 credit hours) and an additional elective course, which will provide students with the opportunity to engage in high impact educational practices.
* Committee member questions. Can you discuss how this minor differs from other programs in ASL?
	+ A lot of other programs in the Big 10 focus on interpreting or deaf culture. We did not want to overlap or offer a similar curriculum. ASL Studies is a wider umbrella than interpreting or deaf culture, and we have an opportunity to develop different tracks in the future.
* A&H1 letter, Wilson, **unanimously approved**
1. Approval of 2-28-20 minutes
* Craigmile, Kline, **approved** with two abstentions
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ AAAS 1122 – approved
	+ ASC 5798 – approved with four contingencies
	+ EALL 3405 – approved with three recommendations
* A&H2
	+ Music 2013 – approved with one comment
	+ First-year Seminar – Katie Stanutz – approved with one comment
	+ First-year Seminar – Hannibal Hamlin – approved with comments
* NMS
	+ Earth Science 5268 – approved
	+ First-year Seminar – Daniel Thompson – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
	+ Physics 1231 – approved with one contingency and several recommendations
* SBS
	+ Psychology 2500 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Psychology 3331 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
	+ First-year Seminar – Jennifer Cheavens – approved with one contingency
	+ First-year Seminar – Nancy Rudd – approved with three recommendations
* Honors Curriculum Committee
	+ Spanish 4534E – approved
	+ Spanish 5630E – approved
* Assessment
	+ Did not meet
1. Information on Summer courses – David Horn
* David Horn will be talking with Randy Smith to get latest updates on the transition to online learning for the Summer session.
* The Summer semester will start a week later than originally scheduled, and all courses will be online.
* The main outstanding issue is how to convert the courses in SIS. In ASC, there are about 900 courses on the books for the Summer. 175 are online already. A majority of the remaining 725 courses are independent study, research, or other courses that do not need to be converted. There are several dozen that will need to be converted to remote teaching, which is a challenge from the Registrar’s point of view. There is also a difference in cost to students. There is no additional cost for out of state or international students.
* DL courses have to meet criteria set by the federal and state governments. We essentially got a pass on these requirements for the Spring semester, but we need to have some review that shows that courses offered this Summer will meet some minimum set of criteria. The main source of confusion is determining what this process will look like. It might be a bulk approval that happens at the college or department level.
* We want to move as quickly as possible to show students that everything that was planned to be offered will still be offered.
* Committee member question: Departments are already asking questions about converting courses for Autumn or even Spring to DL. What would this process look like?
	+ Attention has not yet turned to Autumn courses. There is some speculation whether the whole semester or part of the semester will be offered online. It might also involve bulk approval like the Summer. The Autumn semester would present challenges of a very different order, but whatever approval process is used for the Summer would likely be used in the Autumn. There are concerns that some students may not be able to return to campus even if operations are otherwise normal, which would increase the demand for online courses. This is especially a concern for Chinese students who have to meet specific requirements for online education set by the Chinese government. For example, the Chinese government has to have access to online course materials.
* Committee member question: Most Summer courses are taught by GTAs. Has there been any word about Summer funding for GTAs?
	+ Departments have been asked to submit proposals for what teaching staff they need. These requests are all being processed centrally, and divisional deans will be weighing in. We don’t know what funding we will have this Summer, and we don’t know when the decision on funding is coming, but there are people working on it.
* Committee member comment: It would be helpful if the link to classrooms in SIS could be disabled. It limits class size based on the classroom. We want to be able to accommodate students but are limited by classrooms that are now irrelevant. Removing a limit for class sizes may happen automatically when the course moves to DL.
	+ Some departments are already changing their class sizes. We don’t know what demand will be for online courses yet, since some students may not want to take classes DL.
* Committee member comment: All of these factors (COVID19, shift to online education, impending budget cuts) are really changing the undergraduate experience. The burden is falling on lecturers and graduate students as well as non-tenure track faculty.
* Committee member question: What can we do about textbooks for the Summer? They are generally ordered through the bookstore.
	+ This is something that instructors will need to think about. Students may have to buy books through Amazon (which is quite overloaded these days). Some students (e.g. some College Credit Plus students) need to get their books through the bookstore.
	+ The University Affordable Learning Exchange might be a resource for professors to lean on.
	+ A lot of publishers have opened access to their materials. There are signs of hope here.
* Committee member comment: This shift poses issues for courses that cannot easily be replicated online (e.g. art studios, theatre courses, labs, etc.). It puts a huge burden on students and faculty. They don’t have access to the necessary space, equipment, materials, etc. Can we put together a working group to find some solutions to this issue?
	+ There are some exchange groups being put together to discuss this. Some of the departments with the biggest challenges don’t teach many courses in the Summer. Of those that do teach in the Summer, not many have cancelled, so they do intend to find solutions.
* Committee member comment: There are a lot of field-based courses that are being cancelled. This could potentially delay some students’ graduation.
* Committee member question: There have been communication issues with regional campuses. What processes are happening to make sure that the approval for online courses is happening on regional campuses?
	+ This will depend on the mechanism used for approving courses. It will be up to the Chair to determine what courses are approved. The Chair is in a better position to determine if ELOs are being met in the online version of the course.
	+ We need clarification on whether or not courses can be approved based on the instructor who is teaching.
		- The faculty rules are murky. There needs to be a discussion between chairs and regional deans on this issue.
1. Info about ASCC Chair election
* The ASC Senate has 4 senators who are interested in serving on ASCC next year. We are hoping to get a few more names.
* Anyone who is interested in serving as Chair or would like to nominate someone to serve as Chair of ASCC should do so by Friday, April 10. Nominations can be sent directly to David Horn by email. The following ASCC members are eligible to serve as Chair next year: Peter Craigmile, Pok-Sang Lam, Maria Miriti, Alison Crocetta, Wendy Panero, George Rush (if not in Europe), Brad Steinmetz, Mike Vasey, and Luke Wilson. This is an effort to keep in alignment with ASC Senate rules. This one-year term could result in Summer service.
1. Discussion on Holub-Reitter motion
* ASC Senate Steering Committee has met and asked ASCC to make recommendations on the Holub-Reitter motion. The Steering Committee would prefer that we not vote on the motion, but to put forward feedback. The motion is still subject to revision, so they don’t want ASCC to vote on something that may change.
	+ We will add feedback to the recommendation and e-vote early next week. It is just a recommendation, not a resolution.
* What are the positives of this motion? Are there any aspects of the motion that we agree on or can endorse?
	+ Committee member suggestion: Pedagogically, an expanded GE would be ideal. From an abstract, best practices position, this proposal would be good. The lived reality is more complicated.
		- Committee member question: What purpose does this statement serve if we do not support the motion?
			* It shows that ASCC understands the pedagogical motivation of the motion, but that we have practical concerns.
		- Committee member suggestion: Make a more general statement. Affirm that we would all support expanding options, but requiring this version of the GE would limit options for too many students.
	+ Committee member suggestion: Rather than speaking to a spirit of the broad student experience, an alternative might be to try to speak in terms of recognizing the diversity of programming that lives in ASC and recognizing the challenges of distilling a meaningful GE experience given the wide range of requirements in the college.
		- Committee member suggestion: The recommendation of this body could be that we came up with this model based on the diversity of college. What is identified in the motion as the “OAA” model was already approved by this body and by the ASC Senate. There is disagreement on this model, but we have already done a lot of work on this model to represent the diversity of opportunity in the college.
		- The OAA recommendation is a product of 18 months of deliberation by ASCC and was voted on affirmatively by ASCC and the ASC Senate in April 2019.
* ASCC members take unofficial votes on each measure in the draft recommendation and discuss revisions to the draft recommendation:
	+ “Whereas the proposed additional requirements would limit the elective options of students in all ASC majors” – agreed
	+ “Whereas the proposed additional requirements would make it difficult for many ASC students pursuing science majors and tagged art degrees to graduate in four years” – agreed
		- Committee member comment: Some Social Science departments belong in this category as well.
		- Committee member suggestion: Change this to “pursuing a range of majors and tagged degrees…” to avoid separatism. This is a cross-college problem.
	+ “Whereas the proposed additional requirements might deter students from continuing or transferring into ASC majors and might therefore have negative financial consequences for the college” – agreed
		- Committee member comment: Trevon Logan will address ASC Senate with Dean Ritter regarding the financial implications for the new GE and will address some questions on COVID-19 impact. We don’t want to overshadow that financial analysis.
		- Committee member comment: We don’t necessarily need to address the financial aspect. We could rephrase to “might therefore have negative consequences for our major programs.”
		- Committee member comment: The assumption of the Holub-Reitter motion is that students start in one college and stay there. Any proposal that assumes this is not going to help. This will restrain our students’ ability to study what they want to study.
		- Committee member comment: We should remove the financial aspect here. The academic part is important enough. A successful GE will encourage students to change their major, and this proposal will work against that.
		- The goal of the GE is encourage students to intellectually inquisitive, which will naturally lead to changing majors. The Holub-Reitter proposal would hamper this.
		- ASCC members take a straw vote on the decision to remove financial language – agreed
		- Committee member suggestion: One tact when the financial issue arises is to say “we will direct all financial questions to Dean Ritter and Trevon Logan.”
	+ “Whereas a negative vote on the motion does not preclude the college from offering first-year seminars or encouraging students to take additional courses in thematic areas on a voluntary basis” – agreed
		- Committee member comment: With a leaner GE, there is space for departments to grow out certain aspects of their major programs, within reason.
* Alison Crocetta and David Horn will amend the recommendation.
* Committee member question: What departments are being canvassed for feedback with respect to this proposal?
	+ Senators were supposed to go to departments to get feedback. It seems that there has been some level of discussion on the proposal in some departments but not in others.
1. Discussion on GE implementation report
* Would like to hold an additional ASCC meeting on Friday, April 10 from 9 to 10:30 to discuss the GE implementation report only. The time remaining at this meeting is insufficient given the importance of the report and its implications for ASCC.
* There has been some confusion as to whether ASC will act on implementation report this semester or not.
	+ There has been some back and forth on this. The Steering Committee initially discussed delaying, as the focus of most faculty is elsewhere. However, they don’t want to stop discussion either. There is also uncertainty regarding the financial promises made by OAA. The Steering Committee did decide to have Dean Ritter and Trevon Logan come to ASC Senate to discuss the financial modeling they have been working on. The Steering Committee is waiting to decide how to move forward on discussion of the implementation report until the financial discussion takes place.
* We need to make clear recommendations from ASCC to ASC Senate, possibly in the form of a resolution. We need to look closely at the implementation report, especially in relation to ASCC.
* Committee member question: It seems like final approval of courses as outlined in the report is done by ASCC after going to ULAC-GE. Is this correct?
	+ The report from the Policies and Procedures subcommittee had more detail on this. It outlined a much clearer division of labor and oversight. ASCC continued to have oversight of course approval. It seems that significant changes have been made since then that are important to ASC and ASCC in particular. Oversight is one of the concerns the Chair will outline for discussion at the next meeting.
* ASCC Chair’s concerns and issues to discuss next week:
	+ Our committee’s focus should be on the curricular approval process, given that the overall structure has already been approved. We should push to have any recommendations that we make considered now, before a vote occurs, rather than have these issues addressed as implementation moves forward.
	+ Discuss the approval of themes courses outlined on page 35. Course approval for themes will now be handled by ULAC-GE, rather than ASCC. The initial idea was to have themes advisory committees that would help to mentor and support the development of themes courses. This report suggests that this same panel of experts will also approve courses. It is problematic that the people who are mentoring are the same people that are approving courses.
	+ Discuss a suggestion to have a distinct panel for the Race, Gender, and Ethnic Diversity foundation. This suggested panel would likely need to be interdisciplinary.
	+ Suggest that there is one robust and interdisciplinary themes committee within ASCC that would evaluate the ELOs for themes courses.
	+ The report recommends concurrent review of courses rather than consecutive review. This would likely present issues for providing clear feedback. The Policies and Procedures subcommittee discussed ways to make the approval process easy to navigate and not too cumbersome on departments.
	+ We need to discuss the embedded literacies. The initial plan was to have an additional faculty member on panels to address the embedded literacies during approval. It seems that this concept has been left out of the implementation report. It may be that individual departments put forward a plan on how they will address embedded literacies within their own programs.
* ASCC members should send any additional concerns that they would like to discuss to Alison Crocetta and David Horn by Sunday night.
* The audience for recommendations made by ASCC is not just the ASC Senate, but also the implementation team in OAA.