**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, October21st, 2022 9:00AM – 11:00AM

385 Bricker Hall

**Attendees:** Bitters, Cody, Fredal, Gold, Jenkins, Kogan, Martin, Ottesen, Podalsky, Price-Spratlen, Putikka, Richard, Romero, Roup, Steele, Steinmetz

**Guests:** Janice Aski (CLLC), Monica Jacobs (CLLC), Timothy Leasure (School of Music), Robert Ward (School of Music)

1. Revision to the Doctor of Musical Arts in Conducting (guests: Tim Leasure and Robert Ward)
	1. Letter from the chair (written by David Staley, read by Laura Podalsky)

“The School of Music informs us that one of the reasons for the revision is that the curriculum sheets for this program have not been updated in over 20 years. The three advisors have kept the programs up to date in terms of coursework and practicums by using independent study courses or via course substitutions. With these revisions, the degree sheets are now congruent with what students accomplish over the course of their program. Furthermore, most of the DMA conductors will likely get their first jobs in schools smaller than the Ohio State University. Those schools seek new faculty who can teach conducting in multiple disciplines. The revised programs therefore allow DMA students to remain specialists while also developing skills that would serve the non-ensemble needs of a small music department. The changes do not negatively impact rigor or the focus of the program, and the revised program should easily pass the review of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accreditation body.”

* 1. Arts and Humanities 1 letter, Fredal; unanimously approved
1. Deactivation BA Mathematics & BA Actuarial Science
	1. Letter from the chair (Jennifer Ottesen)

With the adoption of the new General Education requirements (effective AU22), there is no longer any difference between the BA and BS programs in Mathematics, or between the BA and BS programs in Actuarial Sciences, since the degree differentiation was entirely centered in the GE-L requirements. The Department of Mathematics is therefore no longer accepting new students into the BA programs, but only into the BS programs. The planned SP27 deactivation date will allow the existing BA GE-Legacy Mathematics majors in the current pipeline to finish their programs. The department requests deactivation rather than withdrawal to support future discussion about policies that would differentiate the programs under the new GE system.”

* 1. Committee Member Question: How many students are currently in the programs?
		1. Jenkins – A very small number. Since the courses in the major are exactly the same for the BA and BS, the only functional difference on the old system was the slightly less rigorous GEL requirements for Natural Science.
	2. Committee Member Question – With this program deactivated, how will our programs compare with peer institutions?
		1. Ottesen – This information was not included in the proposal, but that data is not relevant at this time. With the advent of the new General Education, there will be no difference at all between the BA and BS.
	3. Committee Member Question – Is this going to affect recruitment into this unit or the rigor in the major?
		1. Ottesen – No, the vast majority of students choose the Bachelor of Science anyhow, and it will not affect the rigor in any way, as the BS was always seen as the slightly more rigorous of the two degrees.
	4. Steinmetz – It’s relevant to note that this kind of deactivation plays into the larger discussion that this committee has had surrounding a differentiation between the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science in the college.
	5. Natural and Mathematical Sciences Letter, Putikka; unanimously approved
1. World Languages 1101-1103--Placement Testing and EM credit (guests: Janice Aski and Monica Jacobs)
	1. Letter read by Eugenia Romero
		1. “The CLLC [seeks] to modify the current policy for World Language Placement testing which currently grants EM credit for the courses that they place out of through these placement tests. The policy change is to no longer grant EM credit for the courses that students test out of through 1103. In other words, the placement test will only place a student into their appropriate World Language level. With this change, students will still be able to fulfill their World Language requirement through placement testing but will not get 4 EM credit hours for the prerequisite courses they “fulfilled” once they are placed into their corresponding World Language level.

Particularly, students in ASC who place out of 1103 will not be required to take any more world language courses if they choose not to, but those who contest their placement test score in departments that offer EM tests for lower levels and can, therefore, give an EM test for those levels, will be able to take those tests and move up levels if needed. Also, if a department’s placement test continues beyond placement in 2202, the student will be eligible for EM credit for any classes placed out of not including 1101-1103.

There are several reasons for this proposal. First, online placement tests cannot truly demonstrate the skills that should be attained through college courses; second, freeing up some credits can allow students to use those credit hours elsewhere to enhance their education (i.e., courses in the new GE and/or their majors/minors); and third, it will promote a more equitable system for all students since native speakers of languages not offered at OSU cannot get credit for their language skills. On the administrative side, the policy change will also provide relief since staff will not be having to manually complete all the EM credit forms.

We believe that the proposed policy change for World Language Placement, as stated in the proposal, will be parallel to other OSU testing that are used for placement only and do not grant credit. Likewise, this new policy will mirror other Big Ten institutions that do not offer credit for placement tests either.”

* 1. Jacobs – Across campus the CLLC is the only unit that offers credit for placement tests; The Department of Mathematics and the Department of Education Teaching and Learning (English as a Second Language) do not. Furthermore, the world language placement tests are not designed to be credit bearing, nor are they robust enough to assess speaking or listening skills, which are essential for college credit. This new policy will benefit students by allowing them to “spend” their credit hours elsewhere. Additionally, this plan allows for a universally fair policy with regard to heritage speakers (who do not receive credit for knowledge of world languages learned in non-academic settings), native speakers (students who graduate from a high school where the primary language of instruction is not English), and students who have studied a language that we do not offer at Ohio State.
	2. Committee Member Question: If students are no longer earning credit, I’m not sure how this is a benefit to students.
		1. Aski - This lets them spend credit hours elsewhere.
	3. Committee Member Question – I don’t see benefit to students who are already having trouble graduating in 4 years. Previously, if they earned this credit, that would go toward their 121 hours for graduation. Now they will need to take additional coursework
		1. Aski – We believe that this benefits students educationally, as they will receive more collegiate-level instruction, either in a world language or in another area. It is also a benefit to departments, who will likely see some uptick in enrollment.
	4. Committee Member Question – Does this affect programs outside of the world languages areas, and have they been informed?
		1. Aski – Yes, everyone has been informed, that is why we sought concurrence from so many departments. Most have found it quite simple to change the wording of pre-requisite requirements. Some world language departments did push back against the proposal, as they use our policy of awarding credit as a recruitment tool, but we saw that policy as educationally unsound and problematic.
	5. Committee Member Question – Is testing accessible to students who are not on site?
		1. Aski and Jacobs – For most languages, yes; all computerized placement tests are done online. The only exception for departments with a computerized test would be testing at very high levels, which must be done in person. Lesser-taught languages may not have a computerized test. Most departments, however, will work with students to do such testing over Zoom when necessary.
	6. Jenkins – In talking with other advising professionals and administrators from other Big Ten institutions, we find that they are stunned that we give credit for language placement tests. We are very much the outlier here.
	7. Committee Member Question: – I understand the decision and the reasoning behind it, but given the seat count economy that many view a discipline through, has there been discussion with world language units about outreach and recruitment?
		1. Aski – Yes, we have. When I took this position, I realized that faculty were overwhelmed with recruiting tasks, and I made it my goal to take over that task and help our units reach their goals. We have already had events this year that have had good recruiting responses, and plan to continue those events and build on them in the future.
	8. Arts and Humanities 2 letter, Fredal; unanimously approved
1. Approval of 10-7-22 minutes
	1. Roup, Fredal; approved with 3 abstentions
2. Panel updates
	1. Arts and Humanities 2
		1. Engineering 1300 – Approved with contingency
		2. Dance 3003 – Approved
		3. Dance 4003 – Approved
		4. Dance 5003 – Approved
		5. Dance 5004 – Approved
		6. English 3350 – Approved with contingency
		7. English 3020 – Approved
	2. Natural and Mathematical Sciences
		1. Mathematics 5637 – Approved
		2. Physics 5261 – Approved
		3. Earth Sciences 6101 – Approved
		4. Earth Sciences 8871 – Approved
	3. Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
		1. This Panel has not met since the last meeting of the ASCC.
	4. Social and Behavioral Sciences
		1. Psychology 1375 – Approved with contingency
			1. Roup - We would like to bring up the syllabus we reviewed for discussion. The syllabus had a highly unusual format and layout, which was clearly designed to engage students and encourage them to read the syllabus. However, we found it difficult to follow and read. We especially had concerns surrounding accessibility for students with disabilities.
			2. Committee Member - Could they submit a more traditional, accessible syllabus alongside the more creative one?
			3. Committee Member - I’m not sure that “separate but equal” syllabi are the solution here.
			4. Martin - Elizabeth Vu and her team in the Office of Distance Education are available to consult with faculty members about accessibility issues. Panels are welcome to refer faculty to that office for assistance
			5. Committee Member – Perhaps referring them to the ODEE template syllabus just to confirm that all required elements are there would be helpful.
			6. Committee Member – It’s true that syllabi are getting very long, and faculty members often complain that students don’t read the syllabi. Frequently, we treat the syllabus as kind of a “legal” document and require that lots of things be covered there that really don’t have to do with the substance of the course. We require so many things, but don’t think about the unintended consequences.
			7. Committee Member – From student perspective, the option of a “short form” or “traditional form” syllabus in addition to this would be helpful. I think that students get fatigued trying to read through 14 pages.
			8. Committee Member – I think the issue is that syllabi at this point are trying to do multiple things. For me, having a standard format allows students and review panels to find content that they’re looking for. The required “boilerplate” information that has to be on every syllabus seems like it’s doing different kinds of work and is for a different purpose than course-specific information. There are opposing forces here for documents seeking approval
			9. Committee Member – We complain that students don’t read it, and many admit that they ignore it and simply go to the Carmen site. How do we recognize the shift in how people are writing syllabi and designing courses?
			10. Committee Member – This has been a problem with numerous syllabi submitted for review – they say “See Carmen for a list of readings” or “See Carmen for a course calendar.” It makes the review process difficult when we can’t see everything on one document or in one place. How could we do course review if we had to have access to everyone’s Carmen site?
			11. Committee Member – Again, from a student perspective, it is sometimes helpful to have a static document as a “quick reference.” Professors often change things on Carmen throughout the course of the semester, and it becomes difficult to find the information we need.
			12. Martin – We are talking with the Carmen folks about having some of the “boilerplate” policies moved to Carmen, where they would be active and present for all classes.
			13. Committee Member – It would also be useful to have a short URL static link to this information so it could be printed on paper syllabi as well.
	5. Themes 1
		1. Linguistics 3803 – Approved with contingency
		2. Music 3352 – Approved
		3. History of Art/International Studies 3905 – Approved
		4. Public Affairs 3210 – Approved contingency re-submission
		5. Communication 2331 – Approved with contingency
		6. Geography 2500 – Approved with contingency
	6. Themes 2
		1. Civil Engineering/Earth Sciences 3530 – Approved
		2. Nursing 3798 – Approved with contingency
		3. History 3227 – Approved with contingency
		4. History 3070 – Approved with contingency
		5. Music 3360 – Approved with contingency
		6. History 2401 – Approved with contingency
	7. Arts and Humanities 1
		1. EALL 7706 – Approved with contingency
		2. Linguistics 3606 – Approved
		3. Uzbek 2101 – Approved
		4. Theatre 2211 - Approved