**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, March 24th, 2023 9:00AM – 11:00AM

Bricker 385

**Attendees:** Bitters, Campbell, Fredal, Fletcher, Gold, Hilty, Jenkins, Kaizar, Lenz, Nathanson, Ottesen, Podalsky, Pradhan, Richard, Romero, Roup, Steele, Steinmetz, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

1. Neuroscience BS Revisions (guests: Kathryn Lenz and Charlie Campbell)
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel reviewed and approved a revision to the Neuroscience BS program. The two proposed changes include an establishment of a 33-credit hour major (which incorporates the Embedded Literacies for the program) and an implementation of a minimum letter grade requirement of a B for the Neuroscience Honors Survey course (Neuroscience 1100H). The current Neuroscience program is 36 credit hours of coursework across five categories and the new curriculum will reduce this to 33 credit hours. The rationale to create a minimum letter grade of B in the Survey course is to, in part, set the expectation that strong performance in this course is necessary for success in the major. Students may retake this course if necessary. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
   * Committee Member question: It was very interesting to see the minimum letter grade of B added to the required Survey course. Can you speak to the relationship building aspect of the course, specifically the connection between student and advisor?
     + Campbell: Neuroscience is a joint venture between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Medicine, with the degree being award by the College of Arts and Sciences. In our survey, we teach our students how to utilize courses that they take to make themselves competitive in applications for medical school or how to explore career options post-graduation. We also allow them to begin building a foundational relationship that we see beneficial to everyone involved, as the students are able to provide us with feedback we can use to enhance our program.
   * Committee Member question: Is this course only for honors students?
     + Campbell: Currently, this is an honor’s course but we do enroll our non-honors students directly. We are working with the College of Medicine to create a non-honors version of the course.
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter, Vaessin, **unanimously approved**
2. Approval of 03/03/2023 Minutes
   * Kaizar, Fredal, **approved** with **two abstentions**
3. Reflection Seminar (General Education 4001)
   * Committee Member comment: At our last meeting, we discussed whether students could control what they shared publicly and were told that they could. However, one of the aspects that this seminar appears to focus on is the curation of the ePortfolio without instructing students, explicitly, how to curate their portfolios to the General Education. It leaves the process of collecting artifacts until the end of a student’s time and I have a concern that this will not allow students to focus on reflection with the allotted time for this 1-credit hour course. Additionally, when I was looking at the provided materials, I noticed that the PebblePad software does not meet accessibility standards. It states that users who use screen-readers or other assistive technology will have difficulty accessing this site, and I find this to be very problematic for a course that is required for graduation by every student at the university.
   * Committee Member comment: PebblePad not being accessible software is something that I would like for the Bookend team to talk about within the course syllabus. It is important for students to know that this site is not accessible. I’d also be in favor of asking them to show us their plan for students who do have access issues.
   * Committee Member comment: Circling back to the discussion surrounding how this course does not seem to be instructing students how to curate their portfolios to the General Education, I believe I disagree with this. If I remember correctly, the framework of the new General Education was constructed to have this reflection seminar at the end and to have them reflect on their times here holistically, and not just their General Education. Reflection certainly should have an emphasis on the General Education, but should not solely be on a student’s experience completing their General Education.
   * Committee Member comment: I agree with this. The flip-side to curation is that the course is teaching students how to organize their undergraduate experience and allowing them an opportunity to process that experience. The ePortfolio software is something that students have the opportunity to utilize throughout their entire time at the university. It may be helpful to recommend to the Bookend team that they should emphasize this element of artifact collection during the Launch seminar and, perhaps, provide the syllabus for Reflection as students complete Launch. This would allow students, if they choose, to begin artifact collection prior to the end of their time at the university.
   * Committee Member comment: I have another concern that I’d like to raise. It appears to me that the seminar is placing too much emphasis on academic goals, especially as it has students looking forward to their next steps after graduation. I wonder if it would be helpful to ask them to keep in mind, as they further develop the rubrics for the seminar assignments, that students will be reflecting upon (and applying the lessons they learn from that reflection) to their personal, professional and civic lives.
     + Comment Member comment: I agree that this should be included. However, I also would like to mention that I do not think it is a problem that a seminar, situated in an academic institution, focuses on academic goals and reflection.
   * After holding a robust and rigorous discussion surrounding the Reflection Bookend seminar, the Committee held an e-vote to determine the feedback they wished to provide to the Bookend team. Ultimately, the proposal was approved with two contingencies, one comment, and three recommendations:
   * **Contingency:**The Committee asks that the course syllabus provide a brief rationale, underneath the ELOs located on page 2, that explains to students how this course will fulfill its ELOs. This rationale should be in the same style as is required from all General Education course syllabi discussed on the ASC Syllabus Template (see the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements> ).
   * **Contingency:**The Committee noticed that PebblePad, the ePortfolio software being utilized in this course, is not an entirely accessible program. Specifically, on the Ohio State Teaching & Learning Resource Center (see here for further information: <https://teaching.resources.osu.edu/toolsets/pebblepad/guides/accessibility-pebblepad> ), it states, “Users who are reliant on a screen reader or other assistive technology will encounter issues using PebblePad”. The Committee is very concerned about the lack of accessibility features in this program, given that this course is a requirement for all students at the University and there is a required showcase assignment. They ask that the course development team show and/or develop a plan to ensure equitable access to the site for those who may struggle with access. Additionally, they ask that a note be provided within the course syllabus acknowledging that this program is not an accessible program to allow students to know up-front any potential issues with the technology.
   * **Comment:**The Committee asks that, as course assignments are finalized, it is clear in the rubrics and prompts that students can reflect not only on ideas that are academic in nature, but also ideas that may be personal, professional, civic, etc.
   * **Recommendation:**The Committee would like to underscore the value of two points from the GEN implementation plan: introducing the ePortfolio at Launch as well as providing reflection prompts throughout GEN courses. The Committee also recommends sharing the syllabus for Reflection with students in Launch to give them an idea of the types of work and materials that will be involved.
   * **Recommendation:**The Committee recommends that the Exploration assignments be renamed. They worry that the wording of “exploration” may confuse students with other official ways the word “exploration” is used at the university, such as the Exploration program.
   * **Recommendation:**The Committee recommends including an assignment within Reflection that asks students to determine what courses they used to fulfill each of their General Education requirements. This could prove useful, especially for students who took the option to overlap any of their GEN Theme courses with a major requirement.
   * **Approved with the above feedback**
4. Panel Updates
   * Arts and Humanities 1
     + ACCAD 5150 – approved with contingency
     + Art 4115 – approved
     + Art 4205 – approved
     + Arts and Sciences 1138.xx – M. Rudoff – approved
     + English 3000 – approved
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + Design 3505 – approved with contingency
     + History 3561 – approved
     + History 3575 – approved
     + History 3620 – approved
     + Theatre 6815 – approved
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + N/A
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + Arts and Sciences 1137.xx – T. E. Parece – approved
     + Speech and Hearing Science 3340 – approved with contingency
     + Speech and Hearing Science 4440 – approved
     + Sociology 7770 – approved with contingency
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + French 2804 – approved with contingency
   * Themes 1
     + Engineering 2301 – approved
     + Geography 2400.01 – approved with contingency
     + Geography 2400.02 – approved
   * Themes 2
     + N/A