ASCC 2/19/2021

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

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

AGENDA:

1. Computational Analysis of Language certificate (new) (guests: Andrea Sims and Julie McGory)
* The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel reviewed and approved a new undergraduate certificate program in Computational Analysis of Language. The certificate consists of two tracks; Track A focuses on conceptual aspects of language analysis and prepares students for entry level positions in the field. Track B includes computer program and prepares students for graduate level study in Computational linguistics or Natural Language Processing. Both tracks consist of 12 credit hours.
* Sims: The certificate builds on expertise in the department and connects with Engineering and the Translational Data Analytics Institute (TDAI).
* Committee member question: One track prepares students for graduate study. Is it unusual for a certificate to fill this role instead of a major?
	+ Linguistics looked at requirements for graduate programs across the country. They are seeking students with a broad background, but they have suggestions for ways students fill gaps in knowledge in areas like Linguistics, Statistics, Data Analytics, etc.
* Committee member question: Is the department interested in introducing a graduate certificate?
	+ There are students interested in one, but this would have to be created by others in the department.
* A&H1 Letter, Lam, **unanimously approved**
* Administrative note on certificates: There has been a lot of confusion around the difference between 1A, 1B, etc. in terms of how it is recorded by the registrar. Students can take a stand-alone certificate as an embedded certificate, but this makes them ineligible for aid. The registrar is now saying that the certificates can be entered more than once in the system.
1. Approval of 1-22-21 minutes
* Wilson, Vasey, **unanimously approved**
1. Distance Approval Cover Sheet (Elizabeth Vu and Ian Anderson)
* Vu: The impetus for the cover sheet came from a number of sources. The QM rubric is pedagogically outdated. The new cover sheet includes parts of the QM rubric that were consistently used and valuable. Also identified what was useful and what questions kept coming up at Panel and added these questions. Many of the questions that Panels have are not available from syllabus review. We can move the process along and assure high-quality DL courses. An increased focus on accessibility is also reflected in the document.
* Question: Reviewing DL & DH (distance-enhanced, 75%+ online) would be a shift in policy. We’ve reviewed everything 50%+ in the past. Why shift this to 75%?
	+ It can be changed back to 50%.
	+ We’ve had discussions about whether or not to change the 50% in the past. The DH (75%) criteria is an external requirement, but it’s up to us if we want to approve things between 50 and 75%.
	+ Curriculum.osu.edu does not include a box for distance enhanced. Faculty will have to chose 50%, and we will have to interpret that as distance enhanced.
	+ With everyone having a year of distance experience, there likely will be elements of distance education in all classes going forward. The 75% threshold accounts for this shift.
* Committee member comment: This cover sheet would help review and push greater conformity. However, the document is longer than expected.
	+ It was shorted some, but the accessible format made it longer. If there are any cuts that can be made, that would be useful.
* Committee member comment: These are the kinds of questions that always come up in DL review.
* Committee member question: Are we asking the submitter to also fill out and submit this form for review?
	+ Yes, they would submit this document to Ian Anderson for DL review and then it would be advanced forward.
* Committee member question: Has this been vetted by people who have a few years of online teaching experience? How would they respond to the items?
	+ Yes, it was vetted by ODEE, a faculty fellow in ODEE, and a small handful of faculty teaching DL. The form aligns with DL standards.
* Committee member comment: This form will help faculty think about online pedagogy and the mechanics behind it. From the standpoint of having to vet online syllabi, it gives an indication of whether faculty have thought through the DL pedagogy. The length doesn’t appear to be an issue, since many of the options are check boxes.
* Committee member comment: It would better for Panels to be the ones filling out the form. We may have the case where faculty check that they have included something without actually including it. The form could be given to faculty in advance so they know what to include.
	+ Committee member comment: If they don’t have to go through the form and check things, they won’t go through the form at all. They’re making a commitment by filling out the form, and we can hold them to those standards.
* Committee member comment: Some pedagogy suggests that syllabi should be very short. These kinds of documents would have the same information that we’re requesting without including it on the syllabi.
* Committee member question: Is there supporting material that will explain some terms, such as transactional distance?
	+ There will be a website to explain terms starting in the summer.
* Committee member question: Will this change become effective immediately or should this be mandatory starting in the Summer of Fall?
	+ It could be optional for now and implemented in the Summer as a period to adjust.
* Committee member question: Is this the finalized form?
	+ Some links will change and there’s some questions about the accessibility of some features.
* Motion to accept the document with some expected, minimal changes
* Rush, Coleman, **unanimously approved**
1. GE updates (Meg Daly)
* The Foundations coversheets have been sent to Meg Daly for feedback. The target date to share them with faculty is March 1.
* Daly: The coversheets will be vetted by OSAS for accessibility standards and will be given a final review by David Horn and Bernadette Vankeerbergen. We will start working on the coversheets for the Themes after the Foundations are finalized. We are recruiting people for the Themes Advisory Panels. We are still reaching out for more members, particularly faculty from the humanities and Knowlton for the Lived Environments theme. Some people, including people from ODEE and advisors, will start developing content for the bookends. The goal is to have a strong draft by the end of May. There is no Panel for bookends. The initial idea was to give periodic feedback to ULAC and ASCC. We will likely have ASCC as a whole approve the bookends in the Fall semester.
* Question: There have been conversations about first-year seminars possibly being a bookend option. Is this something that will be discussed by the bookend group? Does this need to be brought up by another group?
	+ The implementation report distinguishes between them. The bookend curriculum development committee will develop the necessary curriculum for the bookends. If ASC wants first-year seminars to be included, they need to have these conversations now.
1. Informational Item—Change to Arts Entrepreneurship minor
* The department made a relatively small change to the minor. One new required course was added, and there is now the option to take of two required courses. The change does not require a vote.
1. Panel updates
* A&H1
	+ Art 4006 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ Art 4056 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ Art 4014 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ AAAS 2367.04 – approved with two contingencies and five recommendations
	+ WGSS 2367.04 – approved with two contingencies and five recommendations
	+ WGSS 4560 – approved with one contingency and four recommendations
	+ WGSS 2260 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Design 3105 – approved with two recommendations
	+ WGSS 4520 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Design 3505 – approved with one contingency
	+ Design 3305 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Linguistics 3601 – approved with one contingency and four recommendations
	+ History of Art 2002 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ History of Art 2003 – approved with one contingency and three recommendations
	+ History of Art 4820 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
	+ History 1681 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
	+ History 2210 – approved with two contingencies and three recommendations
* A&H2
	+ NELC 33015 – approved with three contingencies and one recommendation
	+ WGSS 1110 – approved with six recommendations
	+ WGSS 2215 – approved with one contingency and seven recommendations
	+ WGSS 2317 – approved with one comment and two recommendations
	+ WGSS 2327 – approved with one comment and two recommendations
	+ History 1212 – approved with one comment
	+ Spanish 2320 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Spanish 1103 – approved with one recommendation
	+ The Panel provided feedback on the Foundations coversheets
* NMS
	+ Microbiology 5001 – approved with two contingencies and three recommendations
	+ Earth Science 1121 – approved with one contingency
	+ Earth Science 1200 – approved with one contingency and one recommendation
	+ The Panel discussed Foundation coversheets, particularly the Natural Science and Data Analysis forms. Two critical issues were discussed:
		- The current GE makes a distinction between the BA and BS requirements for science. There should be considerations of whether the level of a foundational science course are rigorous enough for BS students but not too much for BA students and meet the different needs of regional students.
		- Experiential learning is not clearly defined. The Panel decided to leave the proposed coversheets as they are, but we should keep in mind that we will have to look at some courses early in the process mindful of these conversations. We will need to be able to write guidance on what defines a foundational course in these categories. We’re already seeing proposals that are missing the mark.
* SBS
	+ Political Science 2345 – approved with two contingencies and four recommendations
	+ Political Science 3280 – approved with one comment and three recommendations
	+ Psychology 3310 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Psychology 3312 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Psychology 3513 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Psychology 5620 – approved with three recommendations
	+ Communication 3160 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Communication 4558 – approved
	+ Communication 3628 – approved with two contingencies and four recommendations
	+ Psychology 2220 – approved with one recommendation
	+ Psychology 3325 – approved with four recommendations
	+ Psychology 3375 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ First-year seminar (Lisa Cravens-Brown) – approved with one recommendation
	+ Speech and Hearing Science 6466 – approved with two recommendations
	+ Speech and Hearing Science 6762 – approved
	+ Anthropology 2201 – approved with five recommendations
* Assessment
	+ WGSS 2306 – approved with one contingency
	+ WGSS 2326 – approved with one recommendation
	+ WGSS 3200 – approved with three recommendations
	+ WGSS 3280 – approved with one contingency and two recommendations
	+ WGSS 3302 – approved with four recommendations
	+ WGSS 3370 – approved with five recommendations
	+ WGSS 4527.01 – approved with two contingencies and two recommendations
* Themes
	+ Themes Panel has not met.