**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, April 7th, 2023 9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 154

Attendees: Bitters, Brunner-Sung, Fletcher, Fredal, Gold, Hewitt, Hilty, Jenkins, Kaizar, Martin, Ottesen, Podalsky, Richard, Romero, Roup, Smith, Staley, Steele, Steinmetz, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Vu, Yuasa

1. English BA Revision (guest: Beth Hewitt)
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel reviewed a revision to the English BA program. The revision includes reducing the credit hours from 39 to 36 to bring the program more in-line with comparable programs at peer institutions and was prompted by an external review. This reduction will take place by reducing the number of lower-level literary history survey courses from three (or 9 credit hours) to two (or 6 credit hours). Additionally, the revision removes the Folklore specialization as an option for students and incorporating its curriculum into the Literature, Film, and Popular Culture specialization while renaming the specialization to be Literature, Film, Folklore, and Popular Culture. The proposal will also reduce the number of honors seminars required for honors students from three to two due to the number of honors students in the BA program declining and the department being unable to offer more than one honors seminar each semester. The revision will also adjust the Pre-Education specialization’s requirements, adding the completion of English 2269 or 4569 and English 4572 and removing EDUTL 3356 from the specialization and adding it to the prerequisite list for the M.Ed. program that students may elect to take. Finally, the revision eliminates the application process to the Creative Writing specialization, which will allow wider access to the specialization. The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Committee Member question: It appears that the Department of English had an aim to streamline their major program with this revision. Can you speak about that process and whether this assumption is correct?
		+ Hewitt: Streamlining the program has been our mandate. This is my second year as Director of Undergraduate Studies, but I have been at the university for twenty-three years. When I became Director of Undergraduate Studies, it was the first time I had truly looked at our curriculum, and streamlining and updating the curriculum to be more sensible to our students became a mission of mine. The creative writing change was prompted by our creative writing faculty. This appears to be a generational change, as some of our faculty retired and we were able to hire younger creative writing talent who wanted to provide more democratic access to the creative writing curriculum. This will allow these students to explore all avenues of creative writing, as most students who begin the program believe they’d like to write only fiction.
	* Committee Member question: Is this streamlining also what prompted the change to the Honors requirements?
		+ Hewitt: Yes, partly. It was also a necessity as the number of honors students within the BA program has significantly declined. Even about seven or eight years ago, we were able to offer two honors seminars a semester. Now, we only have the capacity to fill one. For a while, we were allowing non-honors students in to help fill the seats, but we found ourselves unable to fill them even with that change. Reducing the number of required seminars removes the pressure from students when choosing which seminars they will take.
	* Committee Member question: How many of your students choose the Pre-Education track?
		+ Hewitt: I would say it is our third largest specialization. The majority of our majors are Literature, Film, and Popular Cultures. I do not have the exact number, but I would estimate about seventy to one hundred.
	* Committee Member question: Assumably, reducing the credit hours of the English major will help students who choose to double major. What other majors do you see your students choosing?
		+ Hewitt: We typically see a lot of students double majoring with the programs in the Fisher College of Business and the Social Sciences, such as Psychology. I have also noticed we have a small population of students double majoring in some field of Engineering as well.
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**
2. English Minor Revision (guest: Beth Hewitt)
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel reviewed a revision to the English minor. The proposal will reduce the minor’s current 15 credit hour requirement to 12 credit hours and brings it in line with other humanities minors, such as Asian American Studies, Classical Humanities, History, and Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. The proposal will also add new courses developed for the new General Education program to the writing requirement portion of the minor. The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Committee Member question: Was this revision born out of student feedback?
		+ Hewitt: No, this revision was decided on because our Undergraduate Program Manager, Dr. Katie Stanutz, noticed we were out-of-step with comparable humanities minors as she was updating the program for the new General Education.
	* Committee Member question: Has the minor always been a general minor?
		+ Hewitt: Yes, that is correct. Students are required to take an advanced writing and literature course, but otherwise they are free to choose from a wide list of electives.
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter, Fredal, **unanimously approved**
3. Critical and Cultural Theory Minor Withdrawal (guest: Beth Hewitt)
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel reviewed a proposal to withdraw the Critical and Cultural Theory Minor. Since its inception, the minor has only had four students successfully complete it, and the last student enrolled within the minor will be graduating at the end of Spring 2023. The Arts and Humanities 2 Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Committee Member question: Why do you believe this minor was not popular? The curriculum, to me, looks appliable to many degree fields.
		+ Hewitt: I agree, the curriculum of the program is excellent. However, it is geared towards a population of students who are interesting in pursuing a humanities or English Ph.D., and that population has greatly declined in the past several years. This is why we believe this minor is not popular with students, especially today.
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter, Roup, **unanimously approved**
4. New Graduate Certificate in Teaching East Asian Languages and Literatures (guest: Eysuyo Yuasa)
	* Arts and Humanities 1 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel reviewed a new type 3b certificate in the Teaching of East Asian Languages and Literatures. The goals of the program are to better prepare graduate students to be more effective and more inclusive teachers, expand the Department of East Asian Language and Literature’s current strength in language pedagogy to the pedagogies of culture, literature, and linguistics, to make their graduates stronger and more competitive candidates on the job market, and to enhance the department’s already strong reputation in pedagogical training by offering a structured program. The curriculum will be distributed across 12 credit hours, including a required pedagogy course (3 credit hours), a required practicum (3 credit hours and includes a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Pedagogy Workshop requirement), and 6 credit hours of Domain Electives. The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Yuasa: Our department is internationally known for strong East Asian Language programs, regardless of the field of East Asian study. In addition to a student’s research field, our students receive extensive training in pedagogy. When I became Graduate Studies Chair, I noticed that other institutions provide their students with a formalized certification in the pedagogy training they provide, and decided that our students should receive the same, especially given they are already completing the work. This program gives structure to something that the department is already doing and will serve only to help our graduates, especially as they enter the competitive workforce.
	* Committee Member question: Can students outside of your department’s programs take advantage of this certificate?
		+ Yuasa: Yes, we specifically allowed this to be taken by outside students because we recognize this is an interdisciplinary field. For example, a student conducting a Ph.D. in the History of Art may be focusing on Japanese art and want to learn more about how to teach Japanese culture. This certificate would be an ideal program for that student, even though they are not within our department.
	* Committee Member question: Given that only 50% of certificate coursework can overlap with another degree program, will this impact students?
		+ Yuasa: We do not believe so. We believe most students enrolled within this program will be Ph.D. students, as the Master degree is a very rigorous program already. We require our students to take the required pedagogy course, but it is not part of their Ph.D. degree. This will allow our students to receive credit for enrolling and successfully completing that course.
	* Arts and Humanities 1 Letter, Fletcher, **unanimously approved**
5. Moving Image Production BA Revision (guest: Vera Brunner-Sung)
	* Arts and Humanities 1 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel reviewed a revision to the Moving Image Production (MIP) BA. The proposal is changing the pre-major requirements for pre-major students by removing a required Art course and adding Film Studies 2270. The proposal also is removing the required Film Studies minor (which is 15 credit hours) and replacing the minor with targeted Film Studies courses as co-requisites within the major curriculum (for 9 credit hours). Finally, the proposal will reduce the Production Studio credit hours from 24 credits to 21 credits, a reduction of 3 credit hours. The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Brunner-Sung: This program has been active now for five years and I joined the faculty back in 2015, when the major was still in proposal format. Since its inception, there has been strong demand for the program because it allowed students to delve into film areas that were artist-centered even though we are not a dedicated film school. These changes allow students, especially those who do not discover the program until well into their undergraduate career, to more easily finish the program within four years.
	* Committee Member question: Why are the added courses considered co-requisites and not just part of the major?
		+ Brunner-Sung: To my knowledge, these are courses that can be taken alongside the major coursework. The main benefit to these courses is that they can overlap with the General Education so we can utilize these to not overburden students, especially given this is an intensive major program.
	* Committee Member question: The new requirement of Film Studies 2270, which is Film Studies for Non-Majors, interested me. Why was this chosen and not the version for Film Studies majors?
		+ Brunner-Sung: Film Studies 2271 has a prerequisite of a writing course, and that course is much more analysis and writing heavy. In 2270, the students do not have a final term paper and are able to focus a lot more on the elements of film-making, rather than the humanities aspects of film analysis.
	* Committee Member question: With the completion of the new space for Film, Theatre, and Media Arts, will any revisions be happening in the next several years to accommodate the new resources available to the program?
		+ Brunner-Sung: I predict that yes, in a few years, I will be back to this committee. This is an exciting moment of growth for us and we even have a new hire that specializes in documentaries.
	* Arts and Humanities 1 Letter, Kaizar, **unanimously approved**
6. Discussion of Direct Instruction in Asynchronous Online Courses – David Staley (guests: Elizabeth Vu and Jeremie Smith)
	* Staley: The Arts and Humanities 1 Panel has had several discussions when we review asynchronous online courses surrounding what constitutes direct instruction in these courses. We wanted to bring this question to the full committee to see what the experiences of the other Panels were and to see if any others were struggling in these evaluations. I do not believe we were looking to establish any policy or rule with this discussion, but hopefully find a sense of clarity to provide better feedback to the units that submit courses to us.
	* Committee Member question: To be clear, the question is surrounding when asynchronous courses are proposed, they are required to have approximately three hours of direct instruction a week, but we, as faculty reviewers, do not have a clear explanation or sense of what direct instruction should be?
	* Staley: That is correct. Do our colleagues in the Office of Distance Education have any thoughts?
	* Vu: I do. It might be helpful if I share some background information on this idea of direct and indirect instruction. These terms and models are used by the Higher Learning Commission to set rules and policies for accreditation standards. However, these rules and policies have grown in parallel with in-person, traditional courses and not with courses in an online environment. Over the past several decades, how we teach and learn has drastically shifted but the accreditation standards have not. Additionally, this idea of direct or indirect instruction also may shift by discipline. What would be considered homework or indirect instruction may actually be direct instruction in another discipline. I predict that, once we reach a post-COVID era, a national conversation will take place surrounding these definitions. These are questions that your colleagues across the country are beginning to grapple with as well.
	* Committee Member comment: I am the only one who has developed a 4000-level course within my department to teach asynchronously. I begin by video lectures and then transition to quizzes surrounding the lectures and provide my students with discussion board posts. It was interesting to me because my students oftentimes complained about the amount of time they are spending on readings, videos, quizzes, and the discussion board, so I continuously changed how I presented my lectures. I now provide them in a software program that allows students to easily stop and pick up where they left off, and I’ve divided them into smaller video lectures.
	* Committee Member comment: I attended a workshop with the Drake center because this is my first semester teaching an asynchronous course. I found that it’s often really difficult to have students engage with lecture videos. I only have about 10% of students watching my lectures unless I assign homework that requires them.
	* Vu: These are all excellent points. It is true that students engage differently in the online environment than they do in an in-person course. Good online courses are strategic in what they develop in order to have long-term success. Do students need to read PDF files or do they need to watch videos and hold a peer discussion? All of these types of learning are content consumption and content consumption is linked to learning.
	* Committee Member comment: Last semester, I took an asynchronous course in the Department of Geography. There was a video lecture every week and it felt as if the professor really was not engaged with the course. However, my asynchronous course in Chemistry was much more engaging, as we had to watch videos which then stopped and we were quizzed in the middle.
	* Committee Member comment: I graduated from my undergraduate program in 2020, and I’ve been thinking a lot about the feedback element of online courses. I find it really important that the feedback component be factored into my classes, as feedback is how I best interacted with my professor in online courses. It is also helpful to acknowledge that there is a digital fatigue that people feel that a five or ten minute break might not be able to solve, and this acknowledgment can be useful.
	* Vu: As I mentioned earlier, there is starting to be a national conversation surrounding these issues. A term being used, RSI, or Regular Substantive Interaction, is gaining traction as a potential replacement for direct instruction. This could be helpful if we wanted to start pulling the vocabulary into that direction at this institution.
	* Smith: If it’s helpful, what my office can do is to create a website that helps to define the different terms of direct instruction. We can use this as a work-in-progress cheat sheet that will help faculty members, especially faculty members new to thinking about the language of direct or indirect instruction. However, my best advice to faculty struggling with this is to spend an hour and meet with an instructional designer. They can really help faculty develop their online asynchronous courses.
	* Committee Member comment: I agree with what Jeremie has said, and I think a webpage could be useful, especially as we think about new members to the reviewing Panels and this body.
7. Approval of 03/24/2023 Minutes
	* Staley, Roup, **unanimously approved**
8. Panel Updates
	* Arts and Humanities 1
		+ Design 4752 – approved with contingency
		+ History 2350 – approved
		+ Islamic Studies 2350 – approved
	* Arts and Humanities 2
		+ English 2202 – approved
		+ History 2353 – approved
		+ History 3500 – approved with contingency
		+ Philosophy 2332 – approved
	* Social and Behavioral Sciences
		+ Anthropology 3305 – approved with contingency
		+ Arts and Sciences 1137.xx – T.E. Parece – approved
		+ Sociology 2209 – approved with contingency
	* Natural and Mathematical Sciences
		+ Earth Sciences 5656 – approved
	* Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity
		+ International Studies 2200 – approved
		+ Italian 2056 – approved
		+ NELC 2200 – approved
		+ Portuguese 2331 – approved with contingency
	* Themes 1
		+ Astronomy 2141 – approved
		+ Astronomy 2142 – approved
		+ Health and Rehab Sciences 4590 – approved
		+ History 2710 – approved
	* Themes 2
		+ Classics 3223 – approved with contingency
		+ Food Science and Technology 3100 – approved with contingency
		+ German 3354 – approved with contingency
		+ History 2704 – approved with contingency
		+ History 3223 – approved with contingency
		+ History 3475 – approved
		+ Scandinavian 3354 – approved with contingency
		+ Slavic 2365.01 – approved with contingency
9. Update to General Education 4001 (Brad Steinmetz)
	* Steinmetz: I wanted to provide the quick update that, after our e-vote, our contingencies were sent to the Bookend team. Meg Daly has indicated that the revisions are in the works and should return to us before the end of the academic year.