ASCC 12/4/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Angel, Bitters, Coleman, Craigmile, Daly, DeBlieck, Horn, Jenkins, Kline, Kwiek, Lam, Li, Martin, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Putikka, Romero, Rush, Staley, Steinmetz, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 10-9-20 minutes

* Kline, Coleman, **approved** with one abstention

1. Forensic Anthropology Certificate (new) (guest: Jules Angel)

* The Social and Behavioral Science Panel approved a new Undergraduate Certificate in Forensic Anthropology, which will be offered as both Type 1a and Type 1b. The 16-credit hour certificate consists of five courses, including four core courses and one additional course from three options.
* Angel: The Department of Anthropology works with law enforcement at the state, national, and local levels. Students can get hands-on experience. The prime consideration is that law enforcement is not be able to do forensic work alone, but they will know more about preserving the scene and who to contact.
* Committee member question: What are the plans for marketing or promoting the certificate?
  + Recruiting and retention efforts are difficult when we’re not in-person. The department has contacts with law enforcement that they will reach out to. They will also reach out to other majors and minors where students may be interested (e.g. criminal justice, security and intelligence, etc.)
* SBS letter, Wilson, **unanimously approved**

1. Microbiology Combined BS/MS (new) (guests: Jesse Kwiek and Matt DeBlieck)

* The NMS Panel reviewed and approved a proposal for a combined Microbiology BS/MS. The program allows advanced Microbiology students to earn a BS/MS degree in five years. Students will achieve the goals of both programs in a shorter period of time. Students will be able to complete either a thesis or non-thesis-based MS.
* Kwiek: The program was initially reviewed by NMS last year. The review process made the proposal better as it grew over time. The department anticipates a lot of demand for the program. There is already a lot of demand for the standalone Master, and it is expected that this will appeal to advanced students and honors students.
* Committee member question: There is a thesis and non-thesis option for the program. Will most of the advanced students doing research or focusing on courses? Will it impact if they choose the thesis or non-thesis option?
  + Most honors students are doing some form of research, but it is not clear if it will translate into them doing the thesis or non-thesis option.
* Committee member question: What are employment options with a Master’s in Microbiology?
  + There is some demand from biotech companies. Some students will go to professional and graduate programs, including medical school. The department has made a big push to connect students to non-academic employment. Employers recruit undergraduates for employment and internships, and these partnerships can be incorporated into these partnerships as well.
* NMS letter, Craigmile, **unanimously approved**

1. Panel updates

* NMS
  + EEOB 3270 – approved via e-vote
  + EEOB 8896.21 – approved with one recommendation
  + Statistics 3201 – approved with comments and recommendations
  + Statistics 3202 – approved with comments and recommendations
  + Statistics 3301 – approved with comments and recommendations
  + Statistics 3302 – approved with comments and recommendations
  + Statistics 3410 – approved with comments and recommendations
  + Statistics 6550 – approved with comments and recommendations
* SBS
  + Geography 5223 – approved via e-vote
  + Economics 8714 – approved via e-vote
  + Economics 8732 – approved via e-vote
  + Communication 3513 – approved via e-vote
  + Anthropology 7007 – approved with comments
  + Anthropology 7777 – approved with comments
  + Geography 5101 – approved with one contingency and comments
  + Geography 5201 – approved
  + Geography 6299 – approved
  + Political Science 7260 – approved with one comment
  + Economics 8713 – approved with one comment
  + Economics 8723 – approved with one comment
  + Speech and Hearing Science 5860 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
* A&H2
  + Spanish 1101 – approved via e-vote
  + History 2700 – approved with three recommendations
  + FRIT 3054 – approved with three recommendations
  + Portuguese 5501 – approved with two recommendations
  + Pharmacy and History 3708 – approved with four recommendations
  + Philosophy 1100 – approved with two recommendations
  + Philosophy 1500.02 – approved with two contingencies and several recommendations
  + Russian 3470.99 – approved with one contingency and several recommendations
  + Spanish 4564 – approved with one comment
* A&H1
  + Linguistics 3803 – approved via e-vote
  + Spanish 3450 – approved via e-vote
  + Portuguese 1103 – approved via e-vote
  + Persian 1101 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
  + Persian 1103 – approved with two contingencies and three recommendations
  + Arabic 1101.01 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
  + Arabic 1103.01 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
  + Turkish 1101 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
  + Turkish 1103 – approved with two contingencies and one recommendation
  + Uzbek 1101 – approved with three contingencies and three recommendations
  + Uzbek 1103 – approved with three contingencies and three recommendations
  + History of Art 2301 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
  + Philosophy 3830 – approved
* Comment on Proctorio: ODEE recommends not using Proctorio. It is not available on all devices, and it is not ADA compliant.
  + There’s a technical component to this recommendation but also a pedagogical one. The conversation is moving away from high-stakes exams that require proctoring.

1. GE assessment plan for changes to existing GE courses

* Currently, an assessment plan is required for all GE course changes. We are not requesting reports for these courses as we transition to the new GE, so we are asking for assessment plans that will not nee to be implemented.
* Committee member question: Is it true that courses that go into the new GE do not need to have an assessment plan at first and that these courses will be fast-tracked?
  + The new GE does not require that courses move over with an existing assessment plan.
* Committee member question: Are there departments that are revamping their existing GE offerings?
  + It’s easier for some departments to do this work now and have the courses roll into the Foundations.
  + There are also some departments, particularly smaller departments, that benefit from enrollment in new or revamped GE courses.
* Committee member comment: We’re trying to remove unnecessary work for course changes, such as DL requests.
* Motion to remove assessment plan requirement for GE course change requests.
* Motion, Staley, unanimously approved

1. Structure of ASCC

* Lam: The workload of the Assessment Panel has decreased and is uncertain during the transition. The Panel would like to assist in the transition if they are needed in another capacity (e.g. approving courses).
  + What to do with the Assessment panel should be a consideration but will not be decided on now.
* ULAC updates:
  + Some practices for the GE transition have been formalized.
  + The first pathway for courses in the new GE is for courses that were approved under the old GE can be moved to the Foundations upon request from the department, which will be made through the college curricular dean. Courses approved in this way will incorporate new GE ELOs in AU22 at the earliest. It was also decided the assessment will be collaboratively developed.
  + The second pathway is for new GE courses, which will go from their college curricular body to ASCC for approval. All courses seeking to be part of the Race, Gender and Ethnic Diversity Foundation will be approved through this pathway.
  + Courses can be approved for multiple Foundations, but they must meet all ELOs.
  + There are discussions of whether or not the GE rationale should be removed from the syllabus in favor of a fillable form at submission. It would make review easier for faculty submitting proposals and for those reviewing. A subcommittee led by Bernadette is looking at this, and the issue will likely be approved by ASCC. There will be a coversheet that will be the same format for all courses, rather than embedded in the syllabus. There will be explicit questions rather than a request for a narrative.
    - This will hopefully result in a structure that will facilitate assessment later down the line. If faculty have thought through the ways the ELOs are met, it can facilitate assessment.
    - It will require that all the ELOs are delineated. The goal is to itemize and organize, so it is easier for faculty to develop and easier to review.
    - Committee member question: Will the GE language be removed form the syllabus?
      * The ELOs and goals will still be there, but the explanation of how these learning outcomes are being met will not necessarily need to be there.
      * Committee member comment: If we have the coversheet, it still should be explicit o the syllabus how the GE is met.
    - Some members of ASCC could be on this subcommittee. They have the experience reviewing and doing assessment. The other option is to review this as a body and approve it before it goes to ULAC.
      * ASCC members were supportive of approving the form before it goes to ULAC.
    - Committee member question: When would this form be distributed and completed? Departments are ready to submit courses now for the new GE.
      * This would come to ASCC in January for review and would be immediately distributed to departments. This would be for new Foundation courses only.
    - Committee member question: Is there still a goal of using Qualtrics for assessment? Is this separate from this form?
      * This form is only for submission. Assessment will be a collaborative process starting in Autumn 2023. Qualtrics will be part of the starting point for making assessment integral to operating a course. We want to make it more of an automated process.
    - Committee member question: Are we going to ask for departments to have both old and new GE language on their syllabi at some point?
      * There will be a period of time where different students will be completing different GEs.
      * It will probably be up to each college how this is handled. It will probably suffice to say which GE categories are met in the syllabus, which is what students are most concerned about.
* The Themes Panel will begin work next semester. Chuck Daniels will chair the Panel. The Panel follows the same model as the other ASCC Panels and has four ASC members and one member from another college. The Panel did a mock Theme course approval that went through the process, which is where the idea of a coversheet came from.
* The Race, Gender and Ethnic Diversity Foundation will be a separate panel. The suggestion is that the Panel should live in ASC because of the broad disciplinary expertise in the College. Stu Ludsin will raise this with the Senate Steering Committee to add another Panel.
  + There are many ways where we are not structurally in compliance with faculty rules. These were necessary changes, but the ASC Senate hasn’t changed the rules to conform with the functional needs of the Committee. There needs to be an update to the rules to make it more flexible for ASCC if we do need to add another Panel.
  + There were some conversations about having the Race, Gender, and Ethic Diversity Foundations courses approved outside, but there are others pushing for the expertise of ASC.
* Committee member comment: If we have on Panel for Themes in ASCC, it might increase the view that there is a political leaning to these courses.
  + Committee member comment: Faculty teach courses based on their discipline and pedagogy.
  + Committee member comment: Thinking about how other colleges participate is a good idea. They will want to participate in Themes Panel and on the Race, Gender and Ethnic Diversity Panel. Committee member comment: We should be as transparent and communicative as we can be. There is an argument that can be made that ASC has the disciplinary breadth to do the review for these courses. Being as transparent as possible will hopefully prevent pushback.
  + Committee member comment: There isn’t a rule that says we can only have one non-ASC member on Panels. We could add another member if it will make the Panels more palatable to other colleges.
    - Committee member comment: This also raises the issue of the Senate and Senate rules. We can’t force the Senate to take action.
    - Committee member comment: There are benefits to consistency of structure. It might appease some people outside ASC, but it will anger others within ASC. There is already a lot of concern about courses outside ASC or transferring courses through the OTM that do not meet ELOs.
    - Committee member comment: There is a strong argument for keeping these courses and approval of them in ASC because of intellectual and structural reasons. The Foundations are managed by ASC, and the expertise is in ASC. Moving this outside ASC would set a bad precedent. OAA wants ASC to manage these courses.
* Could a motion from ASCC help to manage the discussion about rules at the ASC Senate?
  + In the past, that’s how the work of ASCC and the ASC Senate happened. ASCC did curricular work and made a recommendation or motion to the ASC Senate. The past year or so have not worked this way, but it is still the most sensible way to proceed.
  + Committee member suggestion: Bring a PowerPoint presentation to the ASC Senate to outline the motions and the context surrounding them. Bringing it for discussion will likely result in it being tabled.
  + Language will be drafted and circulated among Senators on ASCC.