ASCC 1/22/2021

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Anderson, Bitters, Coleman, Craigmile, Daly, Daniels, Hilty, Horn, Jenkins, Kline, Lam, Li, Miriti, Oldroyd, Panero, Putikka, Romero, Rush, Samuels, Steinmetz, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Vu, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 12-4-20 minutes

* Wilson, Steinmetz, **approved** with one abstention

1. Course submission documents for Foundations, Themes, and Integrative Practices (developed by ULAC) (Meg Daly)

* ASC Senate and ULAC are discussing delaying the rollout of the new GE to Autumn 2023.
  + Daly: ULAC will continue discussing what is appropriate in terms of staging the rollout as the workload for faculty remains high and unpredictable. As we’ve talked with units, it has become clear that there’s a need for relief, but different solutions have different consequences. A delay is something we all need, but pausing the rollout may not be uniformly advantageous. We need to have conversations about where the pinch points are and where the levers are. We can have conversations about modularizing work (e.g., rolling out Themes in AU23 instead of AU22, etc.), compensating work different, etc.
  + This would not mean that the implementation process stops. It has more to do with the pace of moving forward, especially with the development of Themes. In ASC, we are ahead of the game in terms of Themes and Themes development. Other colleges are still adjusting to the process. There are many variables contributing to this conversation. We just need to be aware that this is occurring.
  + Committee member question: The downsides to delaying may not be as acute for ASC. What are the consequences?
    - Other colleges have plans under way for curricular revision that depend on integrating the new GE. Others have accreditation review that involves sharing curriculum in advance. Delaying the GE would mean that they would no longer be in compliance with the accreditation material. In addition, there is the rollout of Workday Student. This work will fall on advisors.
    - Committee member comment: These consequences are reproduced at the department level in ASC. Some departments would be frustrated by a delay. There would be a mixed response even within the college.
* Documents for Themes, Foundations, and Integrative Practices:
* The documents are essentially cover sheets. Faculty can fill out boxes explaining how courses fulfill ELOs, etc. These documents replace the GE rationale and assessment plan that is usually submitted when the course is created. It will make it very clear what aspects of the course are relevant to the GE. This is something departments want. It clarifies what the expectations are.
* Committee member comment: The Integrative Practices are more nebulous. Will these courses be in a particular theme or are the Integrative Practices separate?
  + The Integrative Practices can be an addition to GE status. For example, if there is a new Theme course in Sustainability that is also Education Away, the course would be submitted for GE approval with the syllabus, Theme document, and Education Away Integrative Practices document.
* Daly: Committee members can take time to review documents and send feedback. Faculty will be the ones using the documents, so faculty feedback is needed. Members should look for anything that is unclear, repetitive, unnecessary, etc. There is some urgency because departments want to submit courses now.
* Committee member question: Is there a plan to circulate the documents to Chairs for feedback?
  + The documents were drafted by ULAC and will be approved by ASCC. They can be shared with chairs, but there is no plan for this additional level of review.
  + Committee member comment: It might be better to get more feedback to expedite the review.
    - It is more likely that more feedback would delay the process. We can approve the documents now and adjust them in the future based on feedback.
* Committee member comment: A one page “cheat sheet’ that explains how courses can meet certain criteria (e.g., for Integrative Practices, High Impact 4 credit courses, etc.) would be helpful to clarify what these forms are for.
  + Supportive documents are being made now.
* Committee member comment: There are courses in the current GE that can be grandfathered into the new GE but possibly do not meet the ELOs. This is a particular concern in the Natural Sciences.
  + FAES has a lot of 3+1 courses in the Natural Sciences with separate call numbers. We will need to create a separate lane for dealing with these types of courses. It’s a good strategy to separate the experiential learning component, but we can’t automatically approve them. The registrar is trying to move courses as quickly as possible, which is easier with existing labs. We need to build a different strategy to move other courses and to make it clear that GE status only happens with the credit course and the additional 1 credit experiential learning.
* Committee member question: Sociology is asking to change a course number and fast track the course to the Race, Gender and Ethnic Diversity Foundation.
  + We will not fast track courses and change them simultaneously. With this particular category, there is interest in having very clear, high, and explicit standards. Fast tracking doesn’t seem to support that interest. For this course, they could move over to the new GE in Social Science and then change the number over the summer. We should wait until there are multiple courses in this situation (i.e., existing GE, requesting Race, Gender and Ethnic Diversity Foundation) to review and possibly determine a way to expedite them.
  + There is an assumption with courses that are moving over in the bulk approval process that there are no substantial changes to the course.
* Committee member question: Statistics developed a list of specific things a GE Data Analysis course should cover. Should we still have this list?
  + We could run the cover sheets by the respective panels to make sure they meet the criteria for existing standards of review.

1. Entertainment Design and Technology Minor (new) (Brad Steinmetz)

* The Arts and Humanities Panel 2 reviewed and approved a proposal to create a new undergraduate minor in Entertainment Design and Technology from the Department of Theatre. The minor is designed to attract students whose major programs offer training in disciplinary adjacent areas and who are interested in careers in theatre in live entertainment, such students in Engineering, Architecture, Industrial Design, Fashion and Retail Studies, and Moving-Image Production. The minor requires a minimum of 12 credit hours, 9 of which must be chosen from a list of courses already existing in the Department of Theatre. The additional 3 credit hours must be chosen from one of four practicum courses in Theatre. Students can electively focus on several areas of specialization: lighting, media, sound, scenery, costume, event design, fabrications, and rigging.
* Committee member question: Will the Department add more program goals, as the Panel suggested?
  + The minor is designed to appeal to a diverse group of students. It was difficult to come up with goals that reflected the flexibility and breadth of the program. Some of the learning goals from the Art: Engineering Structure Minor are fantastic and reflect what Theatre is trying to do (i.e., provide opportunities for interdisciplinary learning and making). It is a good idea to add learning goals that reflect this.
* Committee member comment: There should be some sort of information sharing of how to mobilize departments to develop these types of programs. Other departments are interested in these types of programs, but they are difficult to design.
* A&H2 Letter, Samuels, **unanimously approved**

1. Art: Engineering Structure Minor (new) (George Rush)

* The Arts and Humanities Panel 2 reviewed and approved a proposal from the Department of Art to create a new undergraduate minor named Art: Engineering Structure. The minor was designed collaboratively between Art and Engineering and will offer Engineering students the ability to connect their major coursework to hands-on experience in a studio setting. The minor consists of 12-credit hours, including one foundational course (Art 2400: 3-Dimensional Art) and three electives across or withing three areas of specialization (Sculpture, Glass, and Ceramics). Students will not be permitted to minor in both Studio Art and Art: Engineering Structure.
* Rush: Faculty in sculpture and ceramics designed this minor in collaboration with Engineering. Engineering students want hands-on exploration of what they’re learning, designing, and theorizing in Engineering.
* Committee member comment: This minor is a creative way to provide Engineering students with tactile familiarity with the materials they are designing.
* Committee member question: Are there any Engineering student currently pursing courses?
  + Department of Art already has a lot of students. They are the second-largest pool of students outside the arts, especially in courses that are about sculpture and ceramics. It seems that there’s already a population for the minor.
* Committee member comment: Engineering permits some courses outside the College as technical electives. Theatre had one course approved for this option. This may also be an option for the Department of Art. Engineering students have very tight schedules and little room for electives.
* Committee member question: Since this minor and the Entertainment Design and Technology Minor are very hands-on, why did the Departments decide on minors rather than certificates?
  + Rush: Minors have a long history, but certificates are brand new. The Department intuitively went to the minor option. Certificates seem to be geared toward students outside the university. On an ethical standpoint, the Department wants to consider how it will serve students if they’re doing something extra and paying extra. If the Department designs a certificate, it will probably be in something like animation.
  + Steinmetz: The minor might be valuable to develop as a certificate as well. There are existing professionals who would find this valuable.
* A&H2 letter, Kline, **approved** with one abstention

1. Panel updates

* NMS
  + Statistics 6450 – approved with two recommendations
  + Statistics 5301 – approved with two recommendations
  + Statistics 6201 – approved with two recommendations
  + Statistics 5302 – approved with two recommendations
  + The Panel had a lengthy discussion about the experiential component for Natural Science in the new GE. A Department is revising a course in the existing GE so it can be grandfather into the new GE. We need to have a conversation about experiential learning outside the context of individual courses. There will probably be additional examples that meet the letter but no the spirit of the new rule.
* A&H1
  + Hindi 1101 – approved with two contingencies and four recommendations
  + Hindi 1103 – approved with two contingencies and four recommendations
  + Philosophy 1332 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations and comments
  + Philosophy 2120 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations and comments
  + Philosophy 2465 – approved with one contingency and cone comment
  + History of Art 3901 – approved with two contingencies
  + Hebrew 1101.01 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
  + Hebrew 1103.01 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
* A&H2
  + Hebrew 5691 – approved with one question
* SBS
  + ASC 2120 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
  + Geography 2100 – approved with four contingencies
  + Geography 5210 – approved with one recommendation
  + Geography 5402 – approved with three contingencies and one recommendation
  + International Studies 2500 – approved with two contingencies
* Assessment
  + Have not met since last ASCC

1. ASC Distance Learning syllabus template (mandate its use?)

* Committee member comment: Requiring the template for DL courses would make the syllabi uniform, and reviewing would be smoother.
* Committee member comment: Panels are spending a lot of time giving feedback about a syllabus that provides inadequate information in the context of DL. If faculty used the template, it would save a lot of time and energy.
* Committee member comment: We have encountered a lot of situations where faculty have used the template, but it has not been adapted to the course (e.g., inclusion of irrelevant boilerplate language)
* Committee member question: We review DL requests for other colleges pertaining to the GE. Would we need to mandate the use of the ASC DL template or would we accept the ODEE template?
  + The ODEE template is fine to accept. It is similar to the ASC template.
* Committee member question: How would we mandate the use of the template? Where would it be available?
  + We can put the template on the DL pages of the ASCTech and ASCCAS websites.
* Committee member question: Why have both the ASCTech and ODEE templates?
  + From a technical standpoint, the templates are basically the same. Some of the other language is not the same (e.g., ASC includes a land acknowledgement).
* Committee member comment: The ASC template includes language that differs from the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual, and it only includes undergraduate advising information. This language should be adjusted.
* Committee member suggestion: Send this information to department chairs and directors of undergraduate studies.
* Committee member question: Is there any guidance on summer DL courses? Will there be an assurance process?
  + All indications are that any courses taught online will need to go through the assurance process but don’t need permanent DL approval.
* Motion to require ASC DL template for ASC courses or ODEE template for GE courses offered by other colleges.
  + Vasey, Romero, **unanimously approved**

1. Submitting & reviewing courses for HyFlex (post-pandemic)?

* HyFlex is a way of offering a course that is very flexible. The course can meet in-person, students can participate online, online activity can be synchronous or asynchronous.
* Pharmacy has a course that is currently in-person and online. They are trying to formalize a HyFlex option. They want to make it so students don’t have to sign up for one or the other and can move in and out of in-person and online options. We don’t have this option now (either in submission requirements or at the registrar). If we want these requests to be allowed, what kind of submission guidelines do we want to see? If we don’t make this formal, we will probably start seeing these informally as we did with DL at the start.
* There are a lot of questions on how to handle HyFlex: Do we evaluate the course as a DL course because some students are totally online? Students in the same course will have a different pedagogical experience. How do we evaluate the course? Tuition and fees are also unclear.
* Committee member comment: HyFlex can be a way to expand enrollment. It opens up classes to more students.
* Committee member suggestion: We could create a “DL+ review.” For now, there could be a DL section and an in-person section, but we should think differently in the future if there are students moving between the sections.