ASCC 4/17/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Coleman, Craigmile, Crocetta, Haddad, Heysel, Horn, Hovick, Kline, Kulkarni, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Health Communication Certificate (new; Shelly Hovick and Susan Kline)

* The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel approved a new Undergraduate Certificate in Health Communication from the School of Communication. The 12-credit program will serve degree seeking undergraduates. Students will be required to complete two foundation courses (6 credits) in the School of Communication and two additional courses from a selection of 42 courses across 11 different units.
* Committee member question: The proposal contains an amazing breadth of options for students. Can you talk about the process of coordinating with other units to develop this certificate?
  + Hovick: I teach the two foundational courses in the certificate. Undergraduates in these courses come from all over campus. Part of putting together a list of courses was to think about what students have taken these courses, what the existing research relationships are, building a list of potential courses, and reaching out to departments. Other departments were very supportive of the certificate. It provides students in their department an opportunity to gain expertise without too much extra work. Often, these were courses that students were already taking or would be interested in taking.
* Committee member suggestion: On page 18 of the proposal, the advising sheet is formatted in a way that makes it look like there are additional credit hours required. Update the advising sheet before advancing.
* Committee member question: It looks like this certificate would be good for people in health care professions. Are there plans to offer this to non-matriculating students?
  + We discussed doing this. There aren’t any opportunities like this for medical professionals, so we could fill a niche with this program. This proposal is a starting point, and there will be a lot of opportunities to expand it moving forward.
* Committee question: Do you feel like you know who to reach out to outside OSU when the School of Communication creates a certificate for non-matriculating students?
  + There are a lot of existing organizations that would be helpful for promoting this. We can do a lot of promotion outside OSU. A lot of these courses are not online yet, so we would need to do a lot of preparation to get it ready for professionals.
* SBS letter, Rush, **unanimously approved**

1. Approval of 4-10-20 minutes

* Wilson, Taleghani-Nikazm, **approved** with one abstention

1. Panel updates

* A&H1
  + Russian 5103 – approved with recommendations

1. Discussion on GE implementation report

* The Committee discusses suggestions sent to Alison Crocetta after the last ASCC meeting:
* Committee member suggestion: Would it be feasible to propose that ASCC have full authority to approve themes courses originated in ASC and for non-ASC theme courses to be approved elsewhere, possibly ULAC?
* Committee member suggestion: Courses could go through college-level approval and then go to ULAC for a less rigorous review, like a “stamp of approval.”
* Committee member suggestion: With respect to Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity, instead of adding another panel in ASCC, we could invite a faculty member with expertise in the subject to each of the divisional panels.
* Committee member question: Do we need approval from ASC Senate to add a panel to ASCC?
  + There is not a lot in the Senate rules about specific panel rules.
  + The Steinmetz Memo outlines details about panels, but it mostly relates to how ASC Senators should be deployed on the panels. It might be the case that the ASC Senate will write new rules for ASCC.
  + Question: Would the Executive Dean be able to write these rules, since Steinmetz did this before?
    - Steinmetz wrote the rules and the Senate approved them. We are a body of the ASC Senate. They can write our rules, but they have traditionally left ASCC to decide.
  + Over the last ten years there have been adjustments to panels. We are not following the Senate rules right now (e.g. we do not have an Honors Panel). We had panels for Service Learning and Education Abroad that were created without direct permission from the Senate.
* The Committee discusses the draft response to the GE Implementation Report that was circulated via email prior to the meeting:
* Who should this response be addressed to? Should it be addressed to the ASC Senate or OAA leadership?
  + Committee member comment: In the spirit of direct communication and in order to prevent delays, it seems like we should send the response to both the ASC Senate and to OAA leadership. We should send it to Dean Ritter, OAA, and the Senate.
  + There is a group of five people in OAA who are processing the feedback. They should be one of the audiences for this feedback.
    - They are asking for feedback while we vote without any promises that they will change anything.
  + Suggestion: Address the memo just to ASC Senate but also send to the OAA group, David Horn, and Dean Ritter. It will go to Stu Ludsin who will take it forward to be discussed in last Senate meeting for the semester.
  + ASCC informally votes on this approach – approved
* Bullet point four of the response includes language stating “which for several years included non-ASC faculty…” How long have panels in ASCC included non-ASC faculty?
  + Uncertain exactly how long, but at least as long as ASC has been approving GE courses. Amend this to “for many years” rather than “several...”
* First paragraph: The Arts and Science Curriculum Committee (ASCC) has reviewed and discussed the GE Implementation Report Summary during our meetings on April 3rd and April 10th. ASCC supports most aspects of the implementation plan that have been put forward in this report, particularly the sections that relate to Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs), Bookends, High-Impact Practices, The Regional Campuses and ATI, and Advising. However, members of the committee have some reservations regarding the curricular approval processes outlined in the Policies and Procedures and Embedded Literacies sections of the report and in related appendices. Those concerns are as follows:
  + Are there any concerns about how this is written or what is says?
    - Suggestion: Instead of “members of the committee have some reservations…” say “the committee as a whole….” It is more unified.
    - Suggestion: Say “However, the ASCC has reservations…”
* First bullet point: In contrast to the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee report to the GE Implementation Committee dated December 2019, the final GE Implementation Report (page 18) recommends that new theme classes be reviewed and approved by two separate bodies: theme advisory committees, which report to ULAC-GE, would focus on content-specific ELOs, while a separate new theme panel in ASCC would focus on generic Theme ELOs. The report further recommends that these two reviews be conducted concurrently. ASCC has both practical and philosophical objections to this bifurcated process.
  + Capitalize “Theme(s)” in this paragraph.
  + Suggestion: Instead of starting with “In contrast” we should describe what the GE Implementation Report says, and then say “this is counter to the Policies and Procedures Report…” and then talk about what the Policies and Procedures recommendations are. It would be clearer and more direct. Start with the second clause “the final GE Implementation Report (page 18) recommends…”
  + Suggestion: Instead of saying “practical and philosophical objections,” we should say what the objections are. We’re talking about procedure, and that should be primary to our objections.
    - Suggestion: Say that “we have concerns about this bifurcated process.” Do not qualify the concerns.
    - Suggestion: Say “objections” rather than “concerns” to strengthen the language.
  + Suggestion: The first bullet point is a main point, and it should be its own paragraph rather than a bullet point. Move “Those concerns are as follows” from the first paragraph to the end of this paragraph.
    - Change “concerns” to “objections” here too.
* Second bullet point: Based on our collective experience and the institutional history of ASCC, the concurrent review by two separate committees of proposals for new theme courses will complicate rather than expedite the approval process, leading to situations in which departments may receive conflicting reports and recommendations for the same course. A sequential review by the two committees would further slow the approval process. We therefore recommend that a holistic review of theme courses, focused on both generic and theme-specific ELOs, be undertaken by a single curricular body.
  + Suggestion: Simplify the language of the final sentence. Change “holistic” to “single” or “unified.”
    - Suggested revised language: “We therefore recommend that a singular curricular body review theme courses focusing on both generic and theme-specific ELOs. This will provide for an intellectually coherent and timely review process.”
* Next bullet points have an “or” in between them. We need to decide which option we want to support.
* The following two bullet points are the first option that could be included in the response:
  + Having a single theme committee that reports to ULAC-GE would, however, represent an expansion of ULAC-GE’s curricular role well beyond supervision of the Bookend courses, as well as a substantial reduction of ASCC’s historic role in reviewing and approving courses for the GE.
  + It is the collective opinion of the ASCC membership that ULAC-GE should oversee the wellness and functioning of the proposed university-wide GE, while panels within ASCC (which have for many years included non-ASC faculty) should continue to review and approve courses, including theme courses, which are intended for a broad, non-specialist undergraduate student audience from all participating colleges. ASCC therefore recommends, consistent with the 2019 Policies and Procedures Subcommittee report, the creation of one or more theme panels within ASCC, each with multi-college membership.
  + Suggestion: May want to include university faculty rules, rather than “historic role” in the third bullet point.
    - This faculty rule may not support this point. It has been the historic role of ASCC though.
  + GE courses are designed for non-majors. We should still have expertise on the panels reviewing theme courses, but these courses should be able to be understood by non-experts.
    - Suggestion: Theme courses can have pre-requisites. “Non-specialist” should be dropped from this language. “Broad undergraduate student audience” is appropriate on its own.
    - Informal vote to remove non-specialist – approved
  + Suggestion: The first sentence of the fourth bullet point – “ULAC-GE should oversee the wellness and functioning of the proposed university-wide GE…” We should add “through regular program assessment” at the end of this.
    - There are more parts of ULAC-GE being built out than just program assessment (e.g. subcommittee on advising). Program assessment may be too narrow.
* The fifth bullet point (following “OR”) is the second option that could be included in the response: ASCC therefore recommends that OAA leadership convene a meeting curricular deans and other appropriate representatives of the twelve participating colleges of the GE to negotiate new structures and guidelines for theme course approval that can ensure both efficient review of curricular proposals and the speedy approval of the implementation plan by the ASC Senate and other college bodies.
  + What do we think of these two options? Do we want to ask for a renegotiation or state what we think should happen with course approval?
    - One is a stronger claim that theme approval belongs in a particular place and the other is that theme approval does not yet have a clear home.
  + Question: If we could negotiate, our stance for negotiation would not differ much from the first option. Why not make the strong claim?
    - The language here is important. We can make a lot of arguments for why course approval is best in ASC (e.g. we have worked with other colleges for years without issue, etc.) without claiming jurisdictional priority. Other colleges would be suspicious if we say outright that we have control.
      * We can say this in the document. We should come to the table with a proposal and with an argument. If other colleges disagree, they should counter with a solution.
    - Committee member comment: We should point to the success we have had working with other colleges in the past.
    - Committee member comment: Experience shows that ASCC is not biased and benefits from non-ASC faculty representation, but other colleges are suspicious of our panel system and believe that their interests are not represented. We need to do something to address these suspicions.
      * Suggestion: Policies and Procedures Subcommittee discussed having proportional representation on the ASCC Themes Panel. We could bring this language about proportional representation into the recommendation to try to address these concerns.
    - Informal vote to remove fifth bullet point with language about convening a meeting and the word “or” from response – approved
* Final bullet point: Finally, we find the proposed outline for approving program-specific Embedded Literacies plans for advanced writing, data analysis, and technology to be too sparse in its details. How Embedded Literacies are addressed within the new GE marks an important shift in curricular focus and pedagogy that must be attended to in an organized manner that assures innovation and consistency across the colleges.
  + The Embedded Literacies Subcommittee report was much more detailed. The conversation about the panel structures is most important because it will have a ripple effect on Embedded Literacies. Each of the Embedded Literacies had their own subcommittee, and each Embedded Literacy posed different challenges and had different interests across campus. We tried to come up with multiple pathways for the Embedded Literacies. What was developed was more conceptual than the specific operations, because it would need to be attached to what was decided by the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee. If we can get the panel structure right, we can make the right judgements on the Embedded Literacies.
  + For all the work that went into Embedded Literacies, they receive very perfunctory treatment in the GE implementation report. Whatever clarity we can get by pushing this issue would be useful.
  + Committee member comment: Data analysis is an embedded literacy for BS degrees already. To some degree, units that have BS degrees will be concerned that this aspect will be affected. Units may be hesitant to change this method. However, there is a lack of detail in the Implementation Report regarding Embedded Literacies.
  + Committee member comment: There is a devolutionary trend in the Implementation Report with respect to the Embedded Literacies. There is a sense that it will be left up to the departments. The language lacks specificity.
    - The Embedded Literacies Subcommittee Report had more information and specificity.
    - The Implementation Report also watered down and at times did not accurately represent the work of the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee.
  + Committee member question: Is there an assumption that this Implementation Report is a condensed report of the Subcommittee Reports, and that we should be looking to the Subcommittee Reports, or is this Implementation Report wiping the slate clean and overriding the Subcommittee Reports?
    - Within limits, it’s the latter. It does seem that OAA leadership does recognize that some things as proposed are unworkable. How much they are willing to rethink certain kinds of reviews is unclear. To revisit these issues is to revisit a messy political process. ASC is not the only college with concerns, and other colleges are also reluctant to approve the Implementation Report the way it is.
    - Colleges are being asked to vote on the Implementation Report, and there is no language that acknowledges the Subcommittee Reports. They are not included as appendices.
    - It is unclear what the status of the Subcommittee Reports actually is. It is not clearly stated in the Implementation Report that the Subcommittee Reports should be referenced for more details.
    - Committee member comment: The appendix of the Implementation Report has the ELOs but not the Subcommittee Reports. The Implementation Report directly contradicts many of the recommendations from the Subcommittee Reports.
    - Committee member suggestion: Could we include an appendix with specific issues and contradictions from the Subcommittee Reports that need to be addressed?
      * If we include everything in an appendix it would be confusing for Senators, and it would be difficult to pinpoint these issues in a concise manner.
    - Committee member comment: The onus is on us to present an appendix with recommendations from the subcommittees. We should present hard, textual evidence of these contradictions.
      * If we include an appendix, it could be complicated and time-consuming. We need to decide if we want to vote on this recommendation today to be sent to the ASC Senate for their next meeting or if we want to take the time to create this appendix.
    - Committee member comment: Our recommendation to the ASC Senate should be as simple as possible, and we should move it forward quickly.
      * Committee member suggestion: We should make this recommendation simple and say that we are working on a subsequent document to elaborate on the more complex issues and contradictions between the Implementation Report and Subcommittee Reports.
      * Committee member suggestion: We could make a blanket statement regarding our Committee’s concerns about the discrepancies between the Subcommittee Reports and the Implementation Report.
  + Informal vote on final bullet point - approved
* The Committee discusses proposed concurrent review of courses. Concurrent review of courses as outlined in the Implementation Report could include any course, not just Themes courses. For example a course proposed by FAES as a GE themes course with service learning in another country might be reviewed simultaneously by: the CFAES curriculum committee, a generic Themes Panel in ASCC, the ULAC Theme Subcommittee, the Office of Service Learning, and the Office of International Affairs.
  + Concurrent review would not just be for Themes courses. It could be multiple panels at once. It would be chaotic, and would result in contradictory feedback from the panels. Additionally, curriculum.osu.edu is not set up for concurrent review.
  + Suggestion: This should be its own bullet point to make it clear that this concurrent review cannot happen. It can be reiterated elsewhere.
    - Informal vote on including another bullet point that ASCC does not recommend concurrent approval – approved
  + Suggestion: Since this point applies to every level of review, it should be the first bullet point.
  + Suggestion: We should lead with current first bullet point (starting with “based on our collective experience…”) because it addresses the OAA report first. The bullet point discussing concurrent review should be the second bullet point.
  + Suggested language: ASCC is very concerned about the prospect of any concurrent curricular review. The implementation report indicates that a number of approvals will occur synchronously including approval by the college, generic themes, specific themes, service learning, education abroad, embedded literacies, etc. Concurrent review by multiple committees for GE courses will very likely lead to a situation in which departments receive conflicting reports and recommendations for the same course from multiple bodies. This will complicate and delay the approval process.
* The Committee returns to previous points of discussion for the bullet point beginning with “It is the collective opinion…”
  + Do not include “through regular program assessment.” ULAC-GE is looking at wellness of the GE program overall, not just program assessment.
  + Committee member comment: “Multi-college membership” may not be the best language. Representation cannot practically be proportional, but language that makes it clear that representation would be more proportional would be preferable.
    - Suggestion: “…Theme panels within ASCC each with broad representation from participating colleges.”
* The Committee returns to previous points of discussion for the bullet point beginning with “Having a single Themes Subcommittee…”
  + The wording is too passive, and the meaning of the paragraph is not entirely clear.
  + We need to make it clear that ASCC is the body responsible for the GE curriculum, and we should not move this to ULAC.
  + Suggested language: “The proposed GE Implementation Summary Report represents an expansion of ULAC-GE’s curricular role well beyond supervision of the bookend courses as well as a substantial reduction of ASCC’s legislated role of reviewing and approving courses for the GE.”
* ASCC must take an urgent e-vote by 4pm today. The committee’s response must be sent to the ASC Senate by 5pm today to be reviewed at the next (and potentially last) meeting of the semester.