ASCC 5/8/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

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

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 4-17-20 minutes
* Kulkarni, Wilson, **unanimously approved**
1. Election ASCC Chair
* The Election for ASCC Chair will be done via email. Send an email with the name of preferred Chair to Shelby Oldroyd by noon. Shelby will send tally of votes to David Horn, and he will make the announcement of the new Chair.
* Both candidates asked to discuss why they want to be ASCC Chair and their background in curricular development and related initiatives.
	+ Maria Miriti
		- Professor in EEOB. First involved in curricular and programmatic processes beyond EEOB when serving on CAA from 2015-2018. Took sabbatical in 2018-2019. Research moved beyond EEOB and focused on equity in Biology and STEM more broadly. These questions were focused on faculty experience but also resulted in an increased interest in undergraduate curriculum and pedagogy. Involved in research initiatives and projects related to equity and pedagogy. Experience on Faculty Committee on Admissions. Time on CAA included development of new GE as well as formalization of certificates. Most certificates at the time were graduate certificates. Served as Chair of CAA in 2017-2018.
	+ Wendy Panero
		- Geophysicist and planetary scientists for the School of Earth Sciences. At the College level, served on Honors Committee for several years – both undergraduate research and more recently curriculum. Within department, has done undergraduate advising and curriculum development, including the development of new subprograms. Associate Director of School of Earth Sciences – largely in charge of teaching and curriculum. Lead process of revising Earth Science curriculum starting in 2018 – considered input from student, faculty, and alumni. Also involved in advocating for universal design for learning concepts in K-12 and higher education.
1. Revision to the Communication BA (Susan Kline)
* The SBS Panel reviewed and approved a proposal to revise the Communication BA offered by the School of Communication. The revisions include updates to the specialization descriptions, replacing some core courses with other courses, updated expected learning outcomes, and an improved assessment plan. The Panel approved the proposal with a contingency to provide a transition plan, which has been met.
* Committee member comment: Page 6 of the proposal states that “other than STAT 1350 or 1450, there are no other courses students are required to take in other departments.” The sentence is unclear. These Statistics courses are not included in the list of prerequisites, but could be included, along with other options, as Data Analysis GE courses. This statement should be revised, since Stat 1350 or 1450 is not a requirement of the major.
* Committee member question: Were there any specific challenges of this curricular refresh? Were faculty interested in the process?
	+ The Communication BA is composed of different specializations. Faculty know their own specializations, but they are not necessarily interested in or knowledgeable about the other specializations. There was a description for each specialization, but not for the major overall. The process required that people were passionate about all aspects of the field of communication, not just their specializations. Everyone who participated was willing to rethink and reimagine the major.
* SBS letter, Hawkins, **unanimously approved**
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ South Asia Studies 3630S – approved with comments
	+ AAAS 2218 – approved
* A&H2
	+ Music 4588 – approved
	+ Music 5604 – approved with recommendations
* NMS
	+ Earth Science 2205 – approved with one contingency
* SBS
	+ Speech and Hearing Science 4530 – approved with one contingency
* Assessment
	+ Did not meet
1. ASCC updates
* ASCC will be meeting over the summer to approve distance learning courses. 13 ASCC members have volunteered to do so. Any members who have not responded and want to join, email Bernadette. Alison will chair until August at which time the new chair will take over.
* Alison will send a note to Stu Ludsin to have the ASC Senate consider amending the rules to allow a vice chair of ASCC in the event that the chair is absent.
1. GE revision update (Meg Daly)
* Daly: ASC Senate initially requested to delay the vote on the GE until the beginning of the Autumn semester, but they are now intending to vote at their final meeting of the academic year. Many other colleges agreed to delay their vote on the GE when ASC requested to do so. CFAES will delay their vote until the Autumn semester. The John Glenn College of Public Affairs and the College of Education and Human Ecology approved the Implementation Report. There are a lot of issues with the GE Implementation Report that Stu Ludsin and the leadership team within the ASC Senate have identified. The issue of approving theme courses presents the biggest barrier, and it will require broad collaboration across colleges to address this. Theme approval is the issue that is most different in the draft implementation report and the final report because OAA received so much feedback. In trying to accommodate that feedback, many changes were made, and it was something that ASCC was understandably not comfortable with. After meeting with APAC, OAA leadership drafted a modification that looks to mirror a process that happens at CAA and the Graduate School. It will combine two committees to function collaboratively rather than in a bifurcated process.
	+ This draft proposal was distributed to ASCC prior to the meeting.
* Committee member comment: Meg Daly and Randy Smith deserve our thanks for handling this conversation with other Associate Deans very well. This is not an easy process to facilitate.
* Committee member question: How far along is the planning of the composition of the committees? Have there been any decisions on the numeric and qualitative composition of the ULAC-GE committee?
	+ The composition of ULAC is spelled out in the implementation report. The expectation is that Dean Ritter, David Horn, and the chair of ASCC will identify people who have interest and expertise to serve on ULAC. The plan is to talk to deans now to identify members to serve on ULAC broadly. We don’t want this to be something outside the normal service process. For the Theme consulting groups, a lot of names have already been suggested. We will open this more broadly for ULAC content-specific sub-committees. Membership will probably be about 8-12 members. The numbers may not necessarily be the same (e.g. there may be more members to allow more membership on Health and Wellness for representatives for the health colleges). Deans should identify members to serve, but we are also encouraging self-nominations to these committees.
* Committee member question: Of the 8-12 people that would be on the themes consulting groups, how many would come to combined meetings?
	+ We would need a quorum of them. This would create a numerical imbalance since ASCC panels are smaller. In the existing ASCC Panels, the discussion surrounding a course is more important than the vote itself. While not always unanimous, the votes typically represent the consensus view. We are expecting that these meetings will function in this way. We want both groups to feel that all their expectations are satisfied. If either group is unsatisfied, then the course will not be approved.
* Committee member question: It seemed that a lot of concerns from the last ASCC meeting had to do with workflow. What would the workflow look like for a theme course?
	+ This will probably look different over the long term vs. the short term, since there will be more submissions initially. A course will go to a Theme consulting group and the Theme panel. When some critical mass of proposals has been generated, those groups will meet jointly. Groups will probably need to meet more frequently (e.g. every two weeks) initially. Longer term, this is likely a monthly meeting. The proposals will go to the individual groups first and then be reviewed jointly.
* Committee member comment: It seems that there is still a partition between these two groups.
	+ This is probably true in concept, but the expectation is that in practice there will be more discussion. Each group will be able to provide different expertise. It would be great if we could have a single committee. However, there is a need from the other colleges to have more participation regarding Theme courses. Other colleges recognize that they do not own content, but that they have expertise and want to be able to participate more than they currently can. Other colleges feel they don’t have enough insight into the curricular approval process or that there is disrespect for their expertise.
* Committee member question: Will the number of GE courses be reduced, as was initially planned? It seems that the intention now is not to reduce the number of GE courses and simply let students “vote with their feet.”
	+ At a policy level, it is correct that the number of GEs will not be reduced. However, within colleges, especially in light of concerns regarding resource allocation, there will need to be thoughtful investment of effort in courses. With respect to the Themes, ASC Senate and OAA are invested in monitoring what the population of courses looks like (e.g. the units that are offering courses, enrollments, etc.). There will likely be a more aggressive policy of putting courses in limbo that are not being offered.
* Committee member comment: There are faculty who are concerned about the idea of a cap on courses, but the concern right now is that we will not have enough courses in the beginning, especially Theme courses. Departments will be encouraged to submit Theme course proposals at the beginning of the transition process.
* Committee member comment: As long as the proposed joint course review process is facilitative, this process should be collaborative and efficient in terms of workflow.
	+ In practice, it seems that everyone wants more collaboration, but people also want structures that protect them. When people are able to do so, they are collaborative. We want to set up a structure that will make it easier to collaborate over time.
* Committee member question: Will the ASCC Theme Panel and ULAC-GE Theme consulting groups jointly approve the courses?
	+ Yes, they will approve the courses at a joint meeting. ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services and Assistant Deans will facilitate this process as they currently do.
* Question (Stu Ludsin): The ASC asked for an oversight committee on the review process of the GE. It is possible that certain aspects of the GE approval process will not work out, such as the ULAC-GE Theme consulting groups. We will need a mechanism for change. The ASC Senate would like to see an assurance that we will be able to change things so we are not locked into a process that was decided on early on. ASCC would need to be involved with working out solutions along with ULAC-GE.
	+ It would be helpful to have feedback on where the existing structures do not work. If we imagine that there is an issue, the problem would become clear to both ASCC and ULAC. The Chair of ASCC will be able to convene a discussion at ULAC, and they would be able to make a recommendation to CAA. CAA has oversight. Because the process is already somewhat cumbersome, we want to be careful and thoughtful about adding another layer. If we need another layer of oversight, we should add one. We should think about how we can do this within our existing structures so the process of revision does not become so cumbersome that nothing can be changed. We want the process to be as clear and simple as possible.
		- Comment (Stu Ludsin): The concern is not so much about adding another layer to this process. ASC Senate would like a way to quickly check in and monitor the process before any issues can negatively impact students or colleges. The Chair of ASCC should be able to reach out and work to fix any issues without having to go through a cumbersome process.
			* This is how the process of addressing issues will work. The proposal could more clearly articulate that ASCC will be a part of this process, and that any concerns can be brought to ULAC by the Chair of ASCC or the Chairs of the Theme consulting groups.
			* Committee member suggestion: The document that has already been circulated could be modified to include a statement that says something like “We agree that these are the goals of structure, and if the goals are not being met we agree to revisit the structure.”
* Committee member question: Will the university budget be changing so that the GE isn’t viewed only as a revenue source? Departments are essentially incentivized to offer GE courses as a source of revenue. Has this incentive structure been reconsidered?
	+ The budget model is not something that is being discussed in the short-term. It may be something that is looked at going forward.
* Committee member question: What is the timeline for approving new GE courses? When will departments be able to submit courses for the new GE?
	+ We can start approving courses as soon as the GE implementation has been approved. This will probably be in the Autumn semester, since some colleges have delayed their vote. In the background, the Office of the Registrar and OCIO have been working on changes to curriculum.osu.edu so departments will be able to submit courses for the new GE. The system should be ready by July. The beginning of the Autumn semester is probably a reasonable target to begin submitting courses.
* Committee member suggestion: The last sentence of the third paragraph of the proposal (In the joint meetings with the Theme consulting groups, the ASCC panel will be especially focused on the broad expectations of all Theme courses (=Theme generic ELOs) and the alignment of proposals with expectations for e.g., interdisciplinary team teaching, research designation, other high-impact practices, or distance learning.) We may be making the process too cumbersome by attempting to streamline it. We should consider putting together a working group this summer to look at this part of the approval process so that there is clear wayfinding for units when going through the approval process.
	+ There is some discussion on this, but is has not moved very far. We want to develop process maps and rubrics that can be shared with units and set clear expectations. We want to be able to facilitate approval and not put ASCC in the position of policing other groups.
* Question (Stu Ludsin): The ASC Senate is supposed to vote on GE implementation on Wednesday. One of the outstanding points is the concern about the approval process. Is there a way that ASCC can vote on this proposal before Wednesday?
	+ Meg Daly: Will edit the document based on this conversation. ASCC will then be able to evaluate a clearer document that reflects the suggestions made at this meeting.
	+ Alison Crocetta: Will circulate the amended document for an e-vote before the ASC Senate meeting on Wednesday.
1. Preparing for Autumn semester (guest: Ian Anderson)
* Committee member question: ASCC will need to approve courses over the Summer semester for distance learning for the Autumn semester. What issues should we be aware of with distance learning? What is happening with planning for distance learning courses for the Autumn semester?
	+ Ian Anderson: There has been an uptick in departments wanting to get their courses online. One department submitted about 20 courses, and they were all put together by the same person. If there was an issue in regards to the distance learning aspects of the course, they can be easily fixed. Having one person submit distance learning requests for a department can help streamline the process.
	+ David Horn: The uptick in distance learning submissions indicates there will be a fair amount of work for ASCC. There are conversations going on in every department regarding the decision of which courses to teach online on an ad-hoc basis and which ones to have approved for permanent DL status. There will be a number of departments bringing forward proposals in the next few weeks. Departments should be encouraged to be thoughtful about these requests. We don’t want departments to go through all this work if they do not intend to offer a course online after the Autumn semester.
* Committee member question: When will plans be announced for the Autumn semester (e.g. in-person class offerings, class size limits, etc.)?
	+ President Drake has said plans will be announced by the middle of June, but they might be announced by the end of May. Dean Ritter is on a university-wide panel discussing the public health, curricular, and residential concerns for the Autumn semester. We already know that large/full classrooms will not be permitted. What this means exactly is not clear. It may be that courses will be hybrid offerings or they will be fully online. We don’t know the answer to these questions yet. There are a lot of different classroom models being considered.
* Committee member question: There have been talks of a “high flex” option where courses are implemented online and in-person. There are concerns that this would essentially double the workload for faculty. Is this option actually being considered?
	+ David Horn: We don’t have a working definition at OSU of what high flex is. One model could be a very labor intensive version with both in-person and online components. Another version which could be much less work would be to have an in-person class that is recorded and posted online. High flex would include a range of options. Hopefully it will be left up to departments and instructors to determine what the best model is for the instructor and for the students.
	+ Ian Anderson: The model we are more likely to adopt is a hybrid model rather than a high flex model. A hybrid model is roughly 50/50 split of online and in-person instruction instead of creating two parallel courses.
* Committee member question: If we change our in-person offerings to a hybrid model, do we need to create a course revision change for this?
	+ Ian Anderson: We have had to change courses from in-person to hybrid before. Considering the number of courses that will need to be revised, this may be loosened dependent on leadership.
	+ David Horn: The university definition of hybrid is anything between 25-75% online. In ASC, anything that is more than 50% online needs formal approval. We do not have a stand-alone approval process for courses that are below 50%. What is likely to happen for the Autumn semester is that courses that do not need formal approval and hybrid courses that are over 50% online will have an expedited approval.
* Committee member question: It sounds like we are preparing for the best-case scenario for the Autumn semester, but it seems less likely that it will be safe to be face-to-face in the fall. What will the administration do for faculty who do not feel it is safe to return to campus, if the government and university administration are saying otherwise?
	+ David Horn: The conversations on reopening are being led by Amy Fairchild, the Dean of the College of Public Health. That committee is in conversation with Amy Acton and others at the state level. They are talking about social distancing, wearing masks, etc. The challenge is that social distancing requirements will cut class size by about ¾. It is unlikely that anyone who is uncomfortable about teaching face-to-face (e.g. due to age, health, etc.) will be forced to do so. We will also need to consider this for students who will need accommodations. There are a lot of factors to consider, but the conversations about reopening are very connected to the state of public health in Ohio.
* Committee member question: If we are considering hybrid models or predominantly online courses for the Autumn semester, students may not need to return to campus at all. How will students know in time that they will not need to return to campus?
	+ David Horn: This is part of the conversation on the president’s committee. There are many factors to consider (e.g. residence halls, dining halls, class size, etc.), and at some point it may be deemed too dangerous for anyone to return to campus. Currently, it seems that the plan will be for at least some people to return to campus. This is rooted in the assumption that some people want to come back to campus.
	+ Ian Anderson: Regardless of the class experience, there are a lot of reasons that students want to be on campus. There are resources that are available here that aren’t available elsewhere (e.g. libraries, internet access, technology, etc.).
* Committee member question: Does OSU have the autonomy as a state entity to develop its own rules and policies for reopening and having students on campus given that the state has already announced plans to reopen?
	+ David Horn: Not sure if there will be a statutory obligation to reopen. At the moment, we are operating on the assumption that it is our choice on whether and how to reopen. It is likely that the choices that OSU makes will be modeled by other institutions in Ohio. It does not seem that OSU is under external pressure to do more than what we feel is safe.
* Committee member comments: There is still uncertainty about how many students will enroll in the Autumn semester. Most high school seniors did not have a pleasant experience with distance learning during this crisis. They do not know what to expect from distance education in college, and they would hopefully be pleasantly surprised by the difference of online education in college and their experience in their final weeks of high school. This is a challenge to overcome. Hearing that more classes will be online may persuade some students to wait until next year to enroll.
	+ Committee member comment: There is an effort from higher education institutions state-wide to get the message out to high school students that colleges are working to provide the best education possible for students during COVID.
* Committee member question: There are some courses that are dependent on close interaction (e.g. dance, theatre, etc.). What do we do with these courses? Do we still offer them in a distance format? Do we cancel them? If we cancel these courses, what do we do for students who are dependent on these courses for pre-requisites and graduation requirements?
	+ We have to be guided by public health concerns. It may be possible for some of these courses to happen with proper PPE. There are particular challenges for certain programs that we do not know how to address. Hopefully there will be more guidance by the end of May, but some departments will need to decide what to put online, what to cancel, what to offer in-person in the safest way possible, etc.
* Committee member comment: International students may not be able to return to campus for the Autumn semester. This might mean that all courses need to have a distance-learning version, especially for entry-level and GE courses.
	+ David Horn: We are trying to make sure there are enough GE courses so that students who cannot come to campus, both international students and domestic students, can still make academic progress. If students are taking all of their classes online, we are governed by their home state or country.
	+ Ian Anderson: We may be able to consider distance as an accessibility concern to offer course material online for certain students without having to have a distance version of the course.
	+ Andrew Martin: APAC is putting together a group to specifically look at this issue for international students.
* Committee member question: Are there conversations regarding the issue of internet access for students?
	+ Ian Anderson: OCIO has been working on getting hotspots to people. This does not solve the problem for students who live in rural areas without cell service. These hotspots are free for students, and have addressed the majority of cases for students without internet access. We have also loaned out iPads and laptops for students, faculty, and staff without devices.
	+ Committee member question: Can international students use hotspots?
		- The hotspots only work on US networks. There is some VPN access for international students.
* Committee member question: Is there a way we can put together an inventory of courses that may be proposed for distance learning so we can understand if the courses can be approved within our current process or if they will need to be approved in batches? We want to make sure things are approved efficiently but also in a rigorous manner.
	+ Departments will be able to teach courses remotely in the Autumn semester regardless of the formal approval process. There will be an ad-hoc process that allows departments to offer their courses online temporarily. We should not feel panicked that we need to get all courses formally approved before the semester starts.