**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, December 3rd, 2021 9:00AM – 11:00AM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Bitters, Breitenberger, Cody, Coleman, Fletcher, Hilty, Hsu, Jenkins, Kogan, Lam, Martin, Nathanson, Panero, Putikka, Samuels, Steele, Steinmetz, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Wilson

1. Approval of 11/19/2021 Minutes
   * Samuels, Steinmetz, **unanimously approved**
2. Panel Updates
   * Arts and Humanities
     + AAAS 1112 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + ASC 1137.xx First Year Seminar “Ancient Dream Interpretation” – A. Harrill – approved with recommendations
     + German 3689 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + NELC 3689 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + Spanish 3689 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + Did not hold meeting.
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + Sociology 4629 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + Did not hold meeting.
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + Classics 3205 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + HDFS 3440 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + Sociology 2309 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
   * Themes
     + Communication 2850 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + History 3712 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
     + NELC 3700 – approved with contingencies and recommendations
   * Assessment
     + Did not hold meeting.
3. B.A. vs. B.S. Degree Requirements
   * According to the Ohio Department of Higher Education, General education requirements reflect the degree designation (e.g., Bachelor of Arts vs. Bachelor of Science). However, the upcoming new General Education program at The Ohio State University does not inherently distinguish between the B.A. and B.S. and therefore it now falls upon the College of Arts and Sciences to make a decision on the matter. Under the current, legacy General Education program, the distinguishing factor is students are required to take Calculus I and B.S.-designated Natural Science courses (with one lab for the biological science and one lab for the physical science). Last spring, the Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel of the ASCC decided that due to the revised goals and ELOs for the Natural Science GE Foundation, they would no longer review proposals for that new GE category based on whether the courses are for BA students only or for both BS and BA students.
   * Committee Member Comment: It appears that it is fairly common for other institutions to have their B.A. students take additional Arts and Humanities courses in their GE while their B.S. students take additional Natural and Mathematical Sciences courses for their GE. However, the issue for us here is that this would assist us with ODHE’s rule, but it would violate our clear, initial statement of the new General Education program.
     + Committee Member Committee: To add onto this, it would be very difficult for us to make a change at this point, given departmental planning for Autumn 2022 has already taken place. This would be a huge curveball to departments and units to have to change their implementation process at this stage.
   * Committee Member Comment: Particular departments and programs currently differentiate their B.A. and B.S. degrees internally by requiring B.S. students to take additional requirements, such as requiring additional science courses in the major prerequisites. Would it be possible for the Committee to allow departments to regulate this internally, as some have been doing?
     + Committee Member Comment: The problem with this is that the B.A. and B.S. degrees are both awarded by the College of Arts and Sciences and not individual departments and units within the College. Additionally, the statement from ODHE is that it is a requirement for the General Education to distinguish between the B.A. and B.S., and therefore making this a departmental/unit decision would not solve the issue.
   * Committee Member Comment: Essentially, what we need to do is decide whether we want to affirm the Calculus I requirement to distinguish the B.A. and B.S., and if this is enough or if we want to provide additional ways to distinguish the two degree types.
     + Committee Member Comment: Could we potentially make the B.A. programs distinguishable in their own right?
     + Committee Member Comment: Yes, that could be something that we do. However, in order for departments/units to generate their advising sheets in time to meet the deadline, we need to make a decision quickly, or at least provide temporary measures and guidance. To that end, affirming the Calculus I distinction would be the fastest, albeit conservative, approach to meet this goal.
     + Committee Member Comment: Ultimately, this is not an ideal solution but one that should work in the short term until the Committee has had the time to fully contemplate the consequences of creating a B.A. distinction.
   * Motion: To preserve the Calculus I requirement for B.S. degrees and to abandon the expectation that B.S. students take a B.S.-designated Natural Science course,. The Committee would also like to note that this is to be a temporary measure and that they strongly wish to revisit the issue at a later date.
   * Samuels, Coleman, **unanimously approved**
4. First bookend review/approval
   * The Committee reviewed the updated materials provided by M. Daly in response to the Committee’s requests after her visit during the last meeting. M. Daly provided an updated syllabus within the CarmenCanvas course shell for review.
   * Committee Member Comment: It appears that one of our concerns, that individual instructors would unintentionally offer different versions of the course due to a vague syllabus, has been alleviated. It appears that there is not a lot of room for individual instructor decisions and that they simply administer this course.
   * Committee Member Comment: What stands out is that, while the program director is still to be hired, the content of the course seems to be divided between informing students what the General Education program is, familiarizing them with it, and then familiarizing them with the ePortfolio system. There does not seem to be a lot for the Committee to review on a pedagogical level as this course seems incredibly pragmatic.
   * Committee Member Question: Regarding the faculty-faces videos, how are the faculty chosen for these videos? Additionally, how is the content created and how does this relate to the on-the-ground teaching of the General Education? Are these faculty that record the video teaching General Education courses?
   * Committee Member Comment: When reviewing this course, it was surprising that there was no introduction to any of the new General Education categories. Why is there no explanation about what Citizenship means, for example, for the GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World? The course appears to want to inform students why the General Education is important but does not ground students in any of the GE categories. Perhaps this is something that could be suggested in our review?
     + Committee Member Comment: That is true. However, what has been described by grounding students in the various GE Foundations and GE Themes is not something laid out in the Bookend ELOs. This course appears to meet the ELOs as written.
     + Committee Member Comment: This course should be attempting to do this work, however, and be pedagogically brave. For example, the first lecture could be about how The Ohio State University was founded as a Land Grant institution, what this means, and then using this background information to explain why categories, such as Citizenship, are important for students to ground themselves in during their time here at Ohio State and why it should matter to them, regardless of their major program.
     + Committee Member Comment: It is striking that this course appears very much instructional in what the new General Education program is but does not ask students to reflect on themselves or how they can use the General Education to their benefit in their program-of-study.
   * Committee Member Comment: M. Daly mentioned that this course was intended to be taken within the first three semesters of a student’s career, with a recommendation of the 2nd semester, but perhaps it would be more beneficial to ask students to take it during their 3rd semester? This would allow for students to reflect on their entire 1st-year at the University and would allow them to utilize the ePortfolio to reflect on their experience more holistically.
   * Committee Member Question: How does this compete or compliment with the University Survey course already taken by new first-year students?
     + Committee Member Comment: University Survey, generally, covers the more pragmatic elements of the General Education. For example, in order to fulfill a Literature course, you must take one of these courses or in order to fulfill your Natural Sciences requirement, you must take one of those courses. Additionally, advisors, typically, will hold one lesson on the idea of a Liberal Arts education and what this means for students enrolled in a Liberal Arts institution such as The Ohio State University.
     + Committee Member Comment: When the bookend courses were first proposed early on within the General Education revision process, advisors were very excited to learn that people other than them would be talking with students about the importance of the General Education on a regular basis. The thought was that this course would complement University Survey, and it appears that the version we got is incredibly watered-down and not at all what we were initially told.
   * Committee Member Comment: Would it be possible to gain further clarity on what happened to the initial implementation plan of utilizing live faculty lectures? That seems like a much better idea than the faculty-faces videos that we received in this version of the course and seems significantly more engaging for the students and faculty alike. If the intention was not to overburden faculty with additional work, why were faculty not consulted before this decision was made?