ASCC 4/10/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-10:30am

Approved Minutes

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

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 4/3/20 minutes

* Taleghani-Nikazm, Coleman, **unanimously approved**

1. Discussion of GE Implementation report

* Many of the recommendations made by the Policies and Procedures subcommittee, including key issues for the curricular approval process in ASCC, did not make it into the final GE Implementation Report.
* OAA has indicated that colleges should have an up or down vote on GE implementation. We are not supposed to negotiate. Any issues that arise are supposed to be worked out as we go through the implementation process. However, ASCC and ASCC panels will have to deal with these issues in the interim. We should make an attempt to address these problems now in a way that is still affirming to the GE overall.
* Committee member question: In the OAA report, There is a distinction between approving the generic theme ELOs and the theme-specific ELOs. ASCC will not approve the theme-specific ELOs, but they will approve the generic ELOs. Did the Policies and Procedures subcommittee recommend this?
  + The Policies and Procedures subcommittee recommended that all approval of themes coursework happen in ASC with a separate Themes Panel. They did not recommend that the Themes Advisory Committee or ULAC-GE approve themes courses. The Themes Advisory Committees were supposed to function as a resource and offer mentorship to develop new themes courses.
* ASCC will discuss the notes for discussion distributed by Alison Crocetta:
* Should we recommend that we have a new panel to approve courses for the Race, Ethnic, and Gender diversity foundation (and do away with one of the two Arts and Humanities panels)? Alternatively, should we have the Assessment Panel review these courses at first? We will likely continue to see a large course load in Arts and Humanities, so we still need both Arts and Humanities panels. Assessment is an interdisciplinary panel already. The Assessment Panel can continue to do their assessment work, but this work will likely be lighter at first.
  + Diversity courses in the current GE are not discipline-specific. They are reviewed by whatever panel is most appropriate, depending on what department or unit is proposing the course. They are typically reviewed by the Arts and Humanities or Social and Behavioral Sciences Panels where the majority of these courses reside. The issue of who should review diversity courses is not new. On the one hand, having one panel review these courses rather than multiple panels would help set the tone for how these ELOs are interpreted. On the other hand, it is really a necessity to have two Arts and Humanities Panels. We used to have one, and it was overloaded. This will not improve under the GE. Themes will still be reviewed by divisional panels first, so panels should expect a large course load. At the time of semester conversion, the Assessment Panel did course review, so there is precedent for this. The Assessment Panel will have less work at first under the new GE. They will mostly look at how GE assessment will move forward. This work would be positively informed by approving courses.
  + Committee member comment: We should have a single, interdisciplinary panel to review these courses. It isn’t a good idea to have a category with a clear focus reviewed by a panel without that focus.
    - In a perfect world, we would have two Arts and Humanities Panels, an Assessment Panel, and a new Panel to review this category. If we have to build out all these panels, it is unlikely that we would be able to find enough faculty to serve, especially if ULAC creates a more robust committee with subcommittees that will also need strong ASC representation.
  + Committee member comment: We had separate panels for the two new categories, Education Abroad and Service Learning, after conversion. They did not have much work, and it created an extra step for course approval. Eventually, the task of those two panels was folded into the workload of the divisional panels.
  + Committee member comment: From a philosophical perspective, we shouldn’t separate diversity into its own committee. It should be something that every panel considers. We should weave diversity throughout all the panels.
  + Committee member comment: The new foundation category is a flagship component of our foundation classes. Unlike a lot of the vetting we currently do, we will probably look at content. We might want to have people who know the literature on race, ethnicity, and gender across the Arts and Sciences to ensure that these are robust courses.
    - Committee member comment: We should expect pushback regarding this foundation if the panel is not constituted thoughtfully, especially from faculty that work in this area.
* Should the Themes Advisory Subcommittees of ULAC-GE also handle specific Theme approval, as shown on summary page 35? Does it make sense that these subcommittees oversee both mentoring and approval of courses?
  + Committee member comment: The Policies and Procedures Subcommittee intended for approval and mentorship to happen separately. The advisory committees were intended to be interdisciplinary across 12 colleges. They would ensure the intellectual grounding of the themes, and help create and imagine coursework for the themes. Courses were supposed to be approved by separate panels. Page 15 of the Policies and Procedures report outlines the proposed makeup of the Themes Panel in ASCC. Under this proposed model, the curricular approval process would be within ASC for efficiency. ASC would continue to approve courses and assess on the micro level, and ULAC-GE would oversee and assess on the macro level.
  + Under the model in the GE Implementation Report, ULAC-GE will be in charge of the Theme Advisory Subcommittees, which will also approve theme courses. How does ASCC feel about this shift? Could it work?
    - Committee member comment: A ULAC-level committee could be fine, especially if many of the members would be from ASC. Could there be a relationship between these 9 members and ASCC?
      * Those 9 members will not be the same as the members on the Themes Advisory Subcommittees. ULAC-GE is being proportioned to be heavily representative of ASC.
      * ASC faculty on ULAC-GE are not the same as ASCC faculty. ASCC reports to ASC Senate. ASC faculty on ULAC-GE would not report to the ASC Senate.
    - Committee member question: The report says that ASCC will approve generic ELOs and ULAC-GE will approve the theme-specific ELOs. Two bodies will approve the same course based on different things. Why would ASCC not look at the theme-specific ELOs as well?
      * OAA may be thinking this could make course approval more efficient. They may be expecting a certain workload.
      * The report says this will be the process “at least initially.” This could be the approval process for the short-term only.
    - Committee member comment: This solution does not sound workable. How do you separate aspects of a course from what would be evaluated by another committee. The idea that panels could approve the course simultaneously is silly.
    - Committee member comment: Coordinating the feedback between these panels would not be efficient or practical. When two panels review proposals, they usually come up with different feedback that is difficult to coordinate.
    - Committee member comment: It seems like approving generic theme ELOs and theme-specific ELOs separately would be an inefficient and onerous process.
    - Committee member comment: This would be maddening from the standpoint of faculty who will have courses approved.
  + Committee member question: If we don’t think this is a workable solution, is there a way ASCC can take the full load of course approval? How can we assuage OAA’s fears that it is not too much of a burden on the committees?
    - Committee member comment: The concern might not so much be the workload but that other colleges do not see ASCC as a neutral body. If we ignore this issue, we will not address their concerns.
    - Committee member comment: This concern is valid, but we should think about the practicality of these structures. Splitting up the task of course approval is a recipe for delays and frustration. We may need to have themes subcommittees that are in ASCC but have heavy membership from other colleges.
  + ASCC votes informally on the idea of having two committees, regardless of where they are located, to review generic theme ELOs and theme-specific ELOs. The majority agree that having two separate committees is inadvisable.
* The GE Implementation Report suggest concurrent review of courses. Do we support this model?
  + We have already touched on some of these concerns. Page 18 of the GE Implementation Report says that courses can be reviewed by the college at the same time as it is reviewed by the Themes Advisory Subcommittee for theme approval and the ASCC for generic theme approval. We could end up with one panel approving and another asking for a total revision. It would be confusing and would create ill-will. Departments might not even know what version is ultimately approved. We tried some kind of simultaneous review over ten years ago in an effort to increase efficiency, and it was chaos. We need a structured system with as clear a process as possible. Additionally, the electronic system is not even set up for concurrent approval.
  + We started this academic year with inquiries for how we could speed up the curricular approval process. The Policies and Procedures Subcommittee considered how to best facilitate this process for efficiency and clarity. The GE Implementation Report did not come up with a streamlined approval process. Our college is supposed to vote this proposal up or down. It puts us in an awkward position for negotiation. By the time we’re at the stage of making changes to obvious issues after implementation, this issue will already be very messy.
  + David Horn: We should separate the issue of approval from the speed of approval. This process has already sped up a lot over the past few years. There are faculty who continue to believe course approval is a multi-year process, but the evidence does not bear this out. We need to think of the best structure for GE course approval and separate the issue of speed. Efficiency shouldn’t be the reason to create new issues for ourselves.
  + Stu Ludsin: We are held to every part of last year’s vote on the GE. We should document any issues we have now. We don’t have a guarantee that we can adjust things later. ASC Senate may not vote until the Fall, so there is time to discuss these issues. ASC Senate and ASCC should be united on any issues.
  + Committee member comment: It seems clear that two committees would create more work. Have the people who suggested this presented any evidence for why they think this would be efficient?
    - It seems that this is an attempt to address the idea of ASCC having a bias. There is, of course, a danger that if we put theme approval under one committee the work will be completely taken out of ASC and moved up to ULAC-GE entirely.
  + The GE Themes Panel proposed by the Policies and Procedures Subcommittee would consist of 13 members, mostly non-ASC. The Policies and Procedures Subcommittee tried to keep representation proportional. Courses would need to be approved by divisional panels first, then they would move on to the Themes Panel. This Panel would be housed within ASC, not ULAC-GE. This Panel would just evaluate theme ELOs.
    - The makeup of the Themes Panel was controversial to some. It did not give weight to ASC members. People at OAA may have been concerned that other colleges would believe that ASCC cannot handle this fairly. From the experience of panel members, bias isn’t really an issue. Quality curriculum is approved.
  + Does ASCC approve of having a Themes Panel like the one proposed in the Policies and Procedures report in ASCC?
    - Committee member comment: This idea makes sense, but other colleges may have concerns about this model. For example, there is only one representative for all the Health Science colleges. These colleges would likely have different perspectives on courses.
    - Suggestion: Is there a way to have a single committee with ad-hoc advisory groups? For example, if there is a theme that is weighted non-ASC, we could consult with an ad-hoc group of non-ASC faculty proportional to what is taught in the theme.
    - The Policies and Procedures Subcommittee had representatives from all the Health Sciences. We didn’t want to make the panels too cumbersome, and the Health Sciences representatives agreed that one representative would be enough. Some ad-hoc membership could be useful.
    - Committee member comment: The proposed ULAC model is different from the proposed ASCC model. There would be a subcommittee for each theme in ULAC. There would only be one panel for the themes under proposed Policies and Procedures model.
      * Indeed, there would be several panels under the ULAC model, but their composition is vague. It is not clear how membership differs.
    - Committee member comment: It seems that the most efficient method would be to have ULAC-GE review both the generic and theme-specific ELOs. However, we should also consider that we want to protect ASC involvement in the GE, especially given the fiscal implications.
    - Committee member comment: ULAC-GE has broad representation for ASC. Perhaps it is best if we let this go and allow ULAC-GE to review the themes.
    - Stu Ludsin: If we are going to give up ASCC’s approval role in the themes, the recommendation needs to come from ASCC.
    - Committee member comment: It makes more sense to have the themes approved by one body. There is a lot of expertise across the university.
    - David Horn: There is an assumption that is built into this new GE model that is not articulated: ASC’s relationship to the foundations is different than its relationship to the themes. ASC is the natural home of the foundations, but not necessarily the themes. We need to decide if we are comfortable with this fundamental distinction that is being made.
* Alison Crocetta: ASCC still needs to discuss other implementation issues, like the embedded literacies, at the next ASCC meeting before voting on any recommendations. It seems there is a clear consensus on the need to do consecutive review rather than concurrent review of courses. A consensus on the structure for theme approval is less clear. The vote in ASC Senate is delayed, but we do not want to delay our work on discussing the GE.
* David Horn: I have received the nominations for ASCC Chair. I will discuss with those who have been nominated to make sure they are willing to serve as Chair. Additionally, I sent out information on course approval for the Summer semester. Syllabi will need to be submitted by the end of May for approval by OAA.
* Committee member question: Departments are asking questions about budget proposals and putting classes online for the Fall semester. Do we have a procedure for the Fall?
  + There are a lot of people raising that question. There is a lot of work to do this week to get courses online for the Summer, then attention will turn to the Fall. This will be especially pressing if we are allowed back on campus but still need to socially distance.
* Alison Crocetta: There is a possibility that we will need to request one more meeting of this body to finish out the semester with the best possible work to prepare for the Fall. The expectation is that we will not meet after mid-May until August.