ASCC 10/9/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Bitters, Chamberlain, Coleman, Daly, Frank, Haddad, Hamilton, Horn, Jenkins, Kline, Lam, Li, Martin, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Putikka, Romero, Rubright, Rush, Samuels, Staley, Steinmetz, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 9-11-20 minutes

* Kline, Lam, **unanimously approved**

1. Approval of 9-21-20 minutes

* Panero, Samuels, **approved** with one abstention

1. GIS in Demography revision (guests: Reanne Frank and Corinne Rubright)

* The combined Graduate School/Council on Academic Affairs curriculum subcommittee reviewed the proposal. This is a preliminary review before the proposal is sent to the Graduate Council or CAA.
* The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel reviewed and approved a proposal to revise the Graduate Interdisciplinary Specialization in Demography (GISD). The revision adds 13 additional elective courses to the program.
* The original GISD was approved in 2015. Students and affiliated faculty are routinely surveyed to ask about courses that can be included in the program. The list of additional electives includes new courses and courses that students petitioned to have included.
* Committee member question: What is the composition of students in the program? Are they primarily sociologists?
  + There is a broad pool of students in the program. Demography is closely related to sociology but there are also a lot of HDFS, public health, public policy, and agriculture students.
* Committee member question: Do you have a sense of the number of students in the program?
  + It’s not entirely clear because many students wait to declare the GISD until they graduate. Most students in the required seminar are in the program, and that seminar has seen growth.
* SBS letter, Rush, **unanimously approved**

1. ASCC Annual Report & First-year Seminar Report (2019-2020)

* Annual Report
  + Report of ASCC’s annual activities prepared for ASC Faculty Senate
  + ASCC has approved 31 program requests, including 1 new undergraduate major, 1 new combined BA/MA, and 12 new certificates.
  + 469 course requests approved
    - ASCC has approved fewer GE courses this past year
    - This includes small course changes that were fast-tracked.
  + Panero, Steinmetz, **unanimously approved**
* First-year seminar report
  + The program is stable after revitalization efforts a few years ago.
  + First-year seminars are an excellent chance to showcase faculty research and for students to engage with faculty in a seminar setting.
  + Committee member question: Are most of the first-year seminars in-person this year?
    - They have mostly been in-person with 6 or 7 fully online.
  + Samuels, Coleman, **unanimously approved**

1. Comments from Chair & Associate Executive Dean

* Comments from the Chair:
* There have been a few concerns that have come up. The first concern is related to changes to the syllabus template. For now, we will stay with the current syllabus template.
* The second concern is regarding procedures for online courses after the Spring semester. Ultimately OAA will make a determination in coordination with ODHE to decide if there will be an ongoing assurance process. For now, we are encouraging programs to hold off on putting courses online permanently.
* The third concern is related to the timing of the new GE implementation. There is concern that we are overburdening faculty. At this time, there have been courses already submitted for the Foundations. We will not hold up requests that have already been submitted. It is important that we are intentional about maintaining the integrity of the GE structure, ELOs, and assessment.
  + There is a meeting with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies on November 5. We expect CAA to vote on GE implementation during the third week of October. We will have an opportunity to discuss practical matters of implementation and the integrity of the GE with the Directors of Undergraduate Studies. We want to make sure that people are taking the new GE seriously and considering the ELOs when transferring courses to the Foundations.
* Comments from the Associate Executive Dean:
* The assurance Process is starting for the Spring semester, and we will be reaching out to faculty volunteers to review courses.
* Some ASC Senate members felt that the recommendation made by ASCC on PA/NP should have been made by the ASC Senate. We need to clarify rules on these issues going forward.
  + Committee member suggestion: Conflicts between the ASCC and ASC Senate come up often because the rules are unclear. We should have a committee that looks at the rules to clarify these types of issues.

1. Majoring in Medical Anthropology (BA or BS) & minoring in Anthropology

* This issue came up because a student majoring in Medical Anthropology wants to minor in the Archeology track in the Anthropology minor. We need to decide if this is allowable and to provide clear guidelines because this is a case where a student would be majoring and minoring in the same program. The rules from Academic Affairs are such that students are not supposed to major and minor in the same subject. In this instance, there is a gray zone because there is little overlap between these programs. This issue of overlap has come up in similarly broad programs, like International Studies. They have very explicit requirements that allow a student to major and minor in two International Studies specializations. A student can major in an international issue major (e.g. Globalization Studies) and minor in an area studies minor (e.g. East Asian Studies) or vice versa.
  + Committee member comment: There are other programs that allow this as well within the same department. It should be a question of whether the courses and learning outcomes in the individual programs are distinct.
* Committee member question: Are there guidelines for what constitutes a subject?
  + What we should be concerned about is if the coursework is sufficiently distinct.
* Committee member comment: This is similar to a student majoring in Psychology and minoring in Neuroscience, which is considered sufficiently distinct.
* Committee member comment: There isn’t really any overlap between the courses in the Medical Anthropology major and the Archeology Track.
* Committee member question: Is this question about all three tracks?
  + The question arose because of the archeology track. The other two tracks have overlap in required courses with the Medical Anthropology major.
* Committee member question: Is there any way we can formalize this without considering individual cases? For example, we could allow a minor in the same subject when there are no overlapping courses?
  + There have been cases where exceptions have been made for students when only one required course overlapped, and the student took an alternative course for one program.
  + We want to be sensitive to when courses have different numbers, but the subject matter is similar. Making this rule too general would not allow for monitoring of cases like this.
* Motion to allow students to minor in the Archeology track when majoring in Medical Anthropology (BA and BS), but disallow minoring in the other two tracks in the Anthropology minor (Cultural and Physical).
* Steinmetz, Vasey, **unanimously approved**

1. Approval process and submission requirements for new GE (Meg Daly)

* CAA will vote on GE implementation in October. A majority of the colleges have officially approved the GE.
* ULAC-GE will meet for the first time on October 26, and they will discuss and potentially act on the documents shared with ASCC for today’s meeting. Hopefully ULAC-GE will be able to discuss the Theme development process.
* The time window for implementation will likely need to be adjusted. The initial calendar mapped to the Spring rather than the Fall calendar. We are organizing and hoping for an Autumn 2022 rollout. We recognize that COVID and ongoing events may impact this timeline. OAA is doing what they can to make sure we meet this deadline, but they are willing to adjust if there are challenges that necessitate doing so.
* We are using the same RFP for interdisciplinary team-taught courses that ASC has used for years as part of an evaluation process to build out checklists and expectations for team-taught courses.
* Glenn Martinez from CLLC is leading a faculty working group on language courses.
* ODEE is meeting with vendors and leading the process on e-portfolios. There are three platforms that are in the budget and meet the guidelines for the e-portfolios. We want to identify vendors and start building out the e-portfolio for both bookends.
* Committee member question: Will there be a strict cutoff for students in the current GE or will they be able to begin the new GE before 2022?
  + New students in Autumn 2022 will start with the new GE. Students who start before Autumn 2020 will continue in the old GE. We are considering allowing students who start in Autumn 2021 to choose which GE program to follow. We will allow transfer students to choose.
  + Courses that are in the new GE can be offered before the new GE starts. This will need to be worked out logistically. For example, if a student starts in Autumn 2021 and takes a course like this, they may want to participate in the new GE. We will need to decide what to do in cases like this.
* Courses that are brand new in the Foundations are the easiest to address. They will go through the existing approval process. Courses that are already in the GE and Theme courses will be different. We need feedback on these processes the most.
* Committee member question: How long will it take to get a consensus in the two groups that will review Theme courses?
  + Hopefully this will not take long since both groups will meet together. They will likely come up with a consensus at the end of the meeting. It is important that there are safeguards so each group has independence and authority. This likely won’t be a contentious process because courses are usually clear – either they meet the requirements, or they don’t. The process will probably become faster over time.
* Committee member question: The existing foundation courses have large variation in assessment. This should be the time when we’re getting things in order in terms of conformity of assessment. Will assessment slow down the process of fast-tracking courses into the Foundations?
  + It is true that we want more uniformity in GE assessment. It is very difficult to aggregate data now because there is no standard method. The solution that has been suggested is that individual courses will not start with assessment plans, and instructors will agree to a collaborative assessment process. When that course category is assessed, the instructors will commit to developing shared assessment tools and implementing them. Then we will be able to aggregate and compare results. There will not be any assessment plans at the time of submission. This may cause some concerns, but the existing plans are not binding and may not be good quality.
  + Committee member question: A survey for submitting assessment reports was created using Qualtrics. Will this be used?
    - We are hoping to use Carmen rather than Qualtrics, but this knowledge will be used going forward. We want to avoid reinventing the wheel.
  + Committee member comment: Using a top-down approach to assessment may not work, especially if it is after the fact. The way that courses are assessed will differ a a lot by category. Additionally, a lot of course design theory is built around integrating assessment into the design of the course rather than overlaying assessment later. This seems contradictory.
    - Assessment will be done by category, and instructors will collaborate to determine how assessment will work for their category. We are envisioning this as a collaborative process. We will have expertise and support from departments will strong assessment. A lot of faculty do not know how to effectively do GE assessment and will need this support. Part of committing to the GE is committing to it as a program, including assessment. We will not say courses are doing a bad job and remove them from the GE. It will be about informative data and benchmarking.
    - This is a good point on course design. There still should be some backwards design with the ELOs, which will allow assessment to be integrated easily.
    - We don’t want assessment to be too prescriptive (e.g. demand using specific multiple-choice questions), but we want to set standards (e.g. collaboratively develop rubrics for rubric-based evaluations).
    - This is realistically the only way to do GE assessment. If we tried to evaluate assessment with these higher standards as courses are approved, it would create a logjam.
  + Committee member question: Will any courses be required to have an assessment plan upon approval?
    - Existing GE courses should already have one, but we will not evaluate it right now. Any departments with good assessment will be recognized as leaders. Departments will need to commit to assessment. Hopefully this lower barrier of entry will increase participation and quality of assessment.
* Committee member comment: The forms used for the assurance process are useful because they were clearly formatted and allowed work to be spready equitably to faculty. These checklists and GE assessment should be like this. It should be clear and should be able to be completed by any faculty. This work should not fall solely on the DUS.
* Committee member question: What is the relationship between ASCC and ULAC-GE?
  + The plan is to have one ASCC Theme Panel which will review courses for the generic Theme ELOs. These ELOs will be the same for all Themes. The ASCC group will also pay attention to integrative practices, if relevant. The Theme Advisory Groups will discuss Theme-specific ELOs in a joint meeting with the ASCC Theme Panel. The Theme Advisory Groups are large, and it is unlikely that all members will come to every meeting with the ASCC Theme Panel. We’ve set the membership so the ASCC Theme Panel will not be overwhelmed by the Theme Advisory Group. The two groups will come to an agree on whether the courses meet all standards.
  + Committee member question: ASCC currently does not evaluate service learning. Will they in the future?
    - Yes, because it will be part of the GE in the integrative practices. There will still be courses that are service learning without being in the GE.
  + Committee member question: Does the vote of one of the groups outweigh the other?
    - ASCC will come to their own internal agreement, and so will the Theme Advisory Group. They will then have to agree on larger issues or on issues that the group evaluated. The process should be collaborative.
* Line-item feedback or any other feedback is welcome on these draft documents. Feedback will be shared with ULAC-GE, and the updated documents will be shared with ASCC.

1. Course updates

* A&H1
  + Dance 2301 – approved with one contingency and five comments
  + Mathematics 2010S – approved with contingencies
  + Art Education 5687 – approved via e-vote
* A&H2
  + English 1110.02 – approved with three comments
  + History and AAAS 3083 – approved with four contingencies and two comments
  + History 4125 – approved with two comments
  + AAAS 1101 – approved with four comments
* NMS
  + Math 5634 – approved with one comment
* SBS
  + Geography 3801 – approved with three recommendations
  + Political Science 7095.02 – approved with three recommendations
  + Political Science 7317 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
  + SHS 6771 – approved with two contingencies
  + Geography 5103 – approved with two recommendations
  + Geography 5200 – approved with two contingencies
  + Geography 5210 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
  + Geography 5212 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
  + Geography 6020 – approved
  + Communication 7715 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
  + Psychology 5800 – approved
  + Economics 8721 – approved
* Assessment
  + Reviewed 5 reports
    - Bioethics 2000
    - Music 3364
    - History 3575
    - Pharmacy 3530 – very good report
    - Slavic 3333
* Honors
  + SHS 3330H – approved with one contingency
  + Spanish 4567H – approved with one contingency
  + Spanish 5670E – approved with recommendations