**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, March 4th, 2022 9:00AM – 11:00AM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Bitters, Cody, Coleman, Craigmile, Ettlinger, Fletcher, Fredal, Grandey, Hilty, Hsu, Jenkins, Lam, Nathanson, Panero, Putikka, Romero, Samuels, Smith, Staley, Steele, Vankeerbergen, Vasey, Vu, Xiao, Wilson

1. Master of Geographic Information Science and Technology (new) (guest: Ningchaun Xiao)
   * The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel has voted to approve a new Master program in Geographic Information Science and Technology. This new Master program differs from the existing GIS-focused graduate-level M.A. program as it will cater, specifically, to public and private sector working professionals rather than those looking to conduct research. The MGIST program will require 33 credit hours, with four required courses, three intermediate electives and three advanced electives. It will culminate with a three credit hour capstone where students demonstrate acquired skills and knowledge during the coursework. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel advance the program to the ASCC with a motion to approve.
   * Xiao: A market analysis was done two years ago by ODEE in order to establish a need for this program and it was determined that this would be beneficial to future students and professionals in working in the discipline. In order to enter into a managerial or systems administrative level position, a Master degree is typically required and so this would help working professionals with career mobility. Additionally, the program will allow professionals to substitute higher education for work experience.
   * Committee Member question: What type of demand does the department expect for the course? What is the target enrollment?
     + Xiao: We expect 5 students per semester to enroll within the program. This is based on our in-person program. For the online version, we are unsure how many students will enroll but expect it to be popular as it allows working professionals to take the program at their own pace, as it is an asynchronous program.
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter, Fredal, **unanimously approved**
2. Approval of 02/18/2022 Minutes
   * Craigmile, Romero, **unanimously approved**
3. Panel Updates
   * Arts and Humanities 1
     + Arts and Sciences 1137.xx “More than Just Recipes: Exploring American Cookbooks” – J. Braun – approved
     + Comparative Studies 4420 – approved
     + EALL 1231 – approved with contingency
     + EDUTL 3368 – approved
     + Music 2244 – approved
     + Slavic 3320 – approved
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + Art Education 5688 – approved with contingency
     + English 3264 – approved
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + Consumer Sci: Fashion and Retail 2375 – approved
     + Economics 4002.02 – approved
     + French & Italian 3301 – approved
     + Political Science 2120 – approved
     + Political Science 3160 – approved with contingency
     + Psychology 3900 – approved with contingency
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + Did not meet
   * Assessment
     + Did not meet
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + Comparative Studies 2350 – approved with contingency
     + EDUTL 3368 – approved
     + English 2270 – approved with contingency
     + Public Affairs 2170 – approved with contingency
     + SASIA 2230 – approved
   * Themes
     + AAAS 3310 – approved with contingency
     + Anthropology 3623 – approved
     + EDUTL 3101 – approved with contingency
     + HCS 2204 – approved with contingency
     + History 3040 – approved with contingency
     + Philosophy 2342 – approved
4. Direct instruction in DL courses (Mat Coleman)
   * Coleman: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel had a course up for distance-learning approval that was an adaptation of an existing course that was historically taught utilizing open-access materials from Kansas State. The in-person component, to supplement these materials, hadmini field work assignments that had students engaging with Ohio State faculty and had an explicit direct instruction component. The distance-learning proposal, however, kept this skeleton but the contact between Ohio State faculty and staff was severely limited, and this brought up a question of whether or not this could still be considered an Ohio State course if there was no or minimal direct instruction from an instructor at this university. The Panel did decide to approve the course in order to not hold it up, in case this discussion took a significant amount of time, but I could not find any clear benchmarks for what is and is not considered direct instruction and thus wanted to bring this discussion to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee.
   * Committee Member question: Is this an issue surrounding utilizing videos in online courses or is the issue surrounding the fact that there appears to limited instruction by an Ohio State instructor?
     + Coleman: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel did not have an issue about utilizing these videos, but rather we found it problematic that there appeared to be limited instruction by anyone employed by Ohio State.
   * Committee Member comment: Additionally, the professor from Kansas State is presented as a co-instructor of the course within the syllabus and the instructor at Ohio State is positioned as a course grader or TA.
     + Coleman: It must be said that the professor at Kansas State did intentionally design this course to be utilized by other institutions and as a public resource, so the discussion here is not about any sort of misuse or misconduct.
   * Committee Member comment: When students enroll in courses at Ohio State, they expect, and pay for, the Ohio State experience. If a student could utilize this resource online, or take a course at Columbus State, for example, then it dilutes the Ohio State experience. We need to be extremely cautious of diluting this experience otherwise we run the risk of devaluing our own education at the university.
   * Committee Member question: Who is receiving the teaching credit for this course? Is this addressed within the proposal?
     + Coleman: It is addressed within the proposal and the graduate teaching assistant is receiving the credit. I will add, I do not believe this was a nefarious design but rather a way to put a flipped classroom experience online and was not fully considered. I do not want to make this conversation about the particular department involved, but rather I am concerned about the lack of guidelines in this situation.
   * Committee Member question: Does the ASCC have the authority to set this policy?
     + Vankeerbergen: Given this is a university policy, not explicitly, but we certainly have the capabilities to begin a conversation.
     + Committee Member comment: At minimum, guidelines should be established for when this situation arises again and it most likely will given the new popularity of distance-learning courses being developed.
   * Committee Member comment: Additionally, it is important to note that outside funding agencies are supporting curriculum development in a way where people create a “unique” curricular experience to be publicly distributed. While I agree it is important to have this conversation and set guidelines, I also think it is important to know of and think about external motivations.
   * Committee Member comment: I believe it is important to consider this from the undergraduate perspective. Undergraduates are paying Ohio State for, essentially, something they can receive for free. Why would they do this if they are not receiving the quality of education they expect when they come to Ohio State?
   * Vu: There are other colleges and units at the university that do pay outside, third party organizations to deliver course content for them. It was considered within ASC as well but proved too logistically challenging to fully implement.
   * Wilson: Bernadette, myself, and Mat will meet to come up with language that can be used as a guideline and work to insert that within the ASC Operations Manual. We will bring this language before the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee at a later meeting date.
5. Revision to the Social Science Air Transportation BA (guests: Nancy Ettlinger and Ali Grandey)
   * The Social and Behavioral Sciences reviewed and approved a revision to the Social Science Air Transportation major program. This is the first major update of the program since 2012 and broadened the curricular opportunities of the program in consultation with advisors, assessment initiatives and graduation surveys. It was a two-fold revision, adding more curricular structure and a deeper engagement with physical and human geography to both the pilots and non-pilots tracks and instituting a pre-major requirement for students to move into the major with the highly sought-after Professional Pilot Certification (PPC). Students can also progress into the major from the pre-major without the PPC. The Social and Behavioral Sciences advances the proposal.
   * Ettlinger: Adding to the summary provided by the Social and Behavioral Sciences letter, the surveys we have administered indicated what students wanted and what they felt they needed beyond the organizational changes. We also have a number of substantive changes that speak directly to what students provided to meet their interests.
   * Committee Member comment: It is very heartening to see that making things less flexible, rather than expanding flexibility, which seems to be the norm and trend nowadays, better fits the need of your students.
   * Committee Member question: The proposal calls for moving 6 credits from Geography yet it suggests the need to increase physical and human geography coursework. Could you elaborate on this?
     + Ettlinger: The surveys we administered revealed several items of interest. To start, students in the SSAT major wanted additional coursework on weather and climate so we added a global climate change elective. Additionally, we noted that students wanted a broadening of elective options so we added another human geography course as an elective. We also added three credit hours to the non-pilot track of the program as a direct response to the survey which indicated that students wanted more electives to count towards their degree to better prepare them for the job market post-graduation.
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter, Staley, **unanimously approved**