**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, November 3rd, 2023 9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 156

**Attendees:** Abells, Bielefeld, Bitters, Chamberlain, Dugdale, Fredal, Hedgecoth, Hewitt, Hilty, Holroyd, Jenkins, Lee, Lisbon, Martin, Nagar, Neff, Ottesen, Podalsky, Pradhan, Staley, Steele, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Xiao, Wang

1. Revision Doctor of Audiology (guest: E. Bielefeld)
	* Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee reviewed a request to revise the Doctor of Audiology program. The revisions include a change to course requirements within the program, which follow an update that occurred in 2022. The department determined that these changes were needed based on data collected from programmatic assessments and exit interviews. There will now be the following changes: 1) a required course in vestibular diagnostics and management, 2) the strengthening of a student’s foundation in cochlear implants by expanding an existing course and moving it to the first year of the program, and 3) increasing the effectiveness of statistical instruction by moving delivery from a required first-year course to an expanded Research to Practice course during the third year. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee unanimously approved the revision and advance the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Committee member question: How large is your program?
		+ Bielefeld: We enroll approximately ten students per cohort.
	* Committee member question: How will the program be increasing the effectiveness of its statistics instruction?
		+ Bielefeld: We were requiring students to enroll in a course during their first year within the program that provided them with the necessary content they would need later. However, our faculty have discovered that since the students do not utilize this material until their third year, there were often gaps and they had to re-review materials that ate up valuable instructional time. Therefore, we opted to move this content to the third year, allowing students to utilize the material as they learn about it.
	* Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter, Fredal, **unanimously approved**
2. Animation Minor (new) (Guests: L. Lisbon & D. Abells)
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Letter: The Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee reviewed a request to create a new undergraduate minor in Animation, housed within the Department of Art. This new 15-credit hour minor will require the following coursework: 1) one 3-credit Foundations course offering an introduction to time-based media, 2) two to three core courses (6-9-credit hours) focused on animation techniques, 3) one to two electives (3-6-credit hours) that allow students to develop their interest in particular subareas or to implement their own technical skills. The Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee unanimously approved the request and advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
	* Abells: This new minor is a result of hearing student feedback over the past several years. We are giving students an opportunity to formalize training via a pathway that they can showcase after they leave the institution, adding real value, quantifiable value to their coursework.
	* Committee member question: What students do you expect will be interested in completing the minor?
		+ Abells: We’ve seen interest from several different populations, including students majoring in Art, Design, Moving-Imagine Production, and Computer Science and Engineering.
		+ Lisbon: I will add that for years, our animation coursework has been rated as the number one in Ohio, but we have not had any formalized programming until now. The Department of Art has historically had a very unique and exciting relationship with Theatre, Film, and Media Arts, ACCAD, Moving-Image Production, and Design that allows us to reach several populations of students.
	* Committee member question: What interest exists outside the university? Has the department thought about creating a certificate program?
		+ Abells: Our approach was to begin with the minor, and should it prove successful, we would then transition into developing a certificate or even a major program if we believe we’d have the appropriate enrollments.
	* Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee Letter, Nagar, **unanimously approved**
3. Approval of Minutes
	* 10/06/2023
		+ Nagar, Hewitt, **approved** with **one abstention**
	* 10/20/2023
		+ Fredal, Dugdale, **approved** with **two abstentions**
4. Adding Sociology 1102 (new course) as an alternative prerequisite to the department’s undergraduate majors and as an elective in the DEI certificate (Informational item presented by Associate Dean A. Martin)
	* Martin: Sociology 1101 was recently approved for GEN Foundation: Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity. Sociology 1101 is a TAG course and, therefore, many students will transfer with credit with their Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity GEN Foundation completed. However, this course is not historically taught with a strong emphasis on race, gender, or ethnicity. Therefore, the Department of Sociology has created Sociology 1102, Social Foundations of Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Social Class, to cover the same substantive topics as 1101 but with a much more explicit focus on race, ethnic, gender, and social class diversity. The Department of Sociology is now allowing students to utilize this newly created Sociology 1102 as a prerequisite to the Criminology and Criminal Justice Studies BA, Sociology BA, and Sociology BS programs. They also will add this course as an option to fulfill an elective requirement within the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion certificate.
5. Subcommittee Updates
	* Arts and Humanities 1
		+ Art 3335 – approved with contingency
		+ FRIT 7600 – approved
		+ German 3797.02 – approved with contingency
		+ German 7600 – approved
		+ History 2105 – approved
		+ History 3231 – approved with contingency
		+ History 3245 – approved
		+ Slavic 3797.02 – approved with contingency
		+ Slavic 3995 – approved with contingency
	* Arts and Humanities 2
		+ Greek 1101 – approved with contingency
		+ Greek 1102 – approved with contingency
		+ History of Art 3625H – approved with contingency
		+ Latin 1101.01 – approved with contingency
		+ Latin 1102.01 – approved with contingency
		+ Music 5802 – approved with contingency
		+ Russian 2850 – approved
		+ Slavic 4595 – approved
	* Natural and Mathematical Sciences
		+ N/A
	* Social and Behavioral Sciences
		+ ASC 2001 – approved with contingency
		+ Political Science 2110 – approved with contingency
	* Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
		+ Pharmacy 2450 – approved with contingency
	* Themes 1
		+ Pharmacy 3440 – approved
		+ Psychology 2303 – approved
	* Themes 2
		+ Yiddish 3399 – approved
6. Discussion of S/U in certificates (categories 1a, 1b, 2, 3a, & 3b)
	* Vankeerbergen: In the ASC Operations Manual appendices, there is a table that the university created to explain to faculty developing certificates the various types and their requirements. When this document was created, it was written that courses should be assigned letter grades in order to be counted within certificates. However, not including S/U grades was an oversight by the faculty who developed the guidelines surrounding certificates and now CAA is taking up the conversation of how to handle courses graded S/U. CAA has asked for input from Arts and Sciences and, therefore, this body has been tasked with discussing how many, if any, S/U courses should be able to count within a certificate program. As a point of reference, undergraduate minors can have 3 credit hours count within the program.
	* Committee member comment: Three credit hours sounds like an appropriate number of S/U coursework that should be able to count within a certificate program.
	* Committee member comment: I agree, 3 credit hours sounds appropriate here. If there is a need for an individual certificate program to have more than 3 credit hours of S/U coursework, this can be explained within the proposal and determined on an as-needed basis.
	* Committee member question: Do independent studies count within graduate certificates? Three credit hours may not be appropriate for graduate certificates if they can fit within those programs.
		+ Vankeerbergen: According to the certificate program guidelines, no independent study courses can count on a certificate program.
	* After holding discussion, the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee recommends that 3 credit hours of S/U coursework is the appropriate number of credit hours that should be able to count within certificate programs.
7. Discussion about prerequisites for Themes courses (I. Nagar & J. Fredal)
	* Fredal: When my Themes Subcommittee reviews courses, there are many factors that are taken into account when determining if a course is considered advanced and fulfilling GEN Theme ELO 1.2, which states that success students are able to engage in advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the Theme. Prerequisites are one of a number of factors taken into consideration. As part of the new General Education, we were told that courses were to have no or few prerequisites and be open to a broad audience of students. Our general guidelines that we’ve developed so far have been to say that if a course has one prerequisite that it’s usually acceptable, two prerequisites will need to be explained, and three prerequisites are likely too many. However, recently, we have been reviewing course proposals that have had multiple prerequisites, but were accessible to a very large number of students. We have also received feedback from departments and units that they are struggling to develop courses that are simultaneously advanced and open to a majority of students.
	* Committee member question: Would it be more appropriate to review Themes courses through the lens of accessibility from the standpoint of disciplines?
		+ Fredal: We believe it depends on the knowledge that students are required to have access to prior to students enrolling within the course.
		+ Nagar: From our perspective, it also depends on which Theme is requested. For example, if a course is applying for the Origins and Evolution Theme, which has a scientific knowledge expectation, then it would make sense for a course to require students have at least a basic understanding of a scientific topics. Again, this is all course proposal specific.
	* Committee member comment: As a member of the Themes Subcommittee and a faculty member that conducts these reviews, I have noticed that we oftentimes are asking ourselves the question of what is considered broad enough to be included within the General Education. For example, the prerequisites for molecular genetic coursework is simply the pre-medicine curriculum, which encompasses a very large number of our undergraduate students at the university and across all disciplines. We currently lack any real guidance on what this idea of “broad enough” truly is and, therefore, have struggled to give our course proposers the guidance they continue to ask for.
	* Committee member comment: As the undergraduate representative, I believe it’s important to consider the general sentiment of the undergraduate student population. I have heard from my peers that they simply would like to complete their General Education requirements as quickly as possible and, while they may have an interest in a particular Theme category, they will take what is available and fits best within their schedules. If courses have many prerequisites that are viewed as barriers, this will further disincentivize students from enrolling in Themes courses, regardless of interest level in the course or the Theme altogether.
	* Committee member question: As I was listening to this conversation, I could not help but wonder if we could utilize the GEN Foundation categories as a benchmark to determining accessibility. Given that GEN Theme courses are meant to be advanced, and the Foundations are meant to be introductory, would it be sufficient to simply have prerequisites that are the completion of GEN Foundation courses?
		+ Committee member comment: Under the new General Education, students take significantly less science courses and, therefore, this significantly disadvantages the Natural and Mathematical Sciences discipline. It is difficult for our faculty to develop courses that are to be considered advanced, yet still require very little previous experience and coursework in the sciences.
		+ Fredal: When we are evaluating course proposals, we are not looking at if the course is advanced within the course’s home discipline, but rather if it is advanced in the topic of the Theme. For example, if the Department of History submits a course for the Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World Theme, we will evaluate whether the course covers Citizenship, Diversity, and Justice at an advanced level and not the discipline of History.
		+ Nagar: This is how my Subcommittee understands the advanced requirement as well.
	* Committee member comment: Coming from the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, I view the inclusion of the first semester of Organic Chemistry as a foundational requirement since it allows me to teach students a new language and way of thinking about the world. This new language foundation acts as a springboard to allow me to explore much more interesting concepts and this is where my unit views the GEN Themes as being the place to allow this exploration.
		+ Committee member comment: I think it’s important to remember what has already been said, and that these courses should be advanced in the idea of the Theme and not necessarily within the discipline. For example, I am currently teaching a Theme course and I do not consider this course to be advanced within my discipline. In fact, I had to adjust the level of work that I am doing with my students this semester based upon their needs, and I would actually consider this course to be remedial in my field. However, it is still an advanced study of the Theme that I am teaching. Would it be possible to develop a course that required less of a background in your department, specifically? This is what my department did when we proposed several of our Theme courses. We took existing courses and extensively modified them to be at the level expected for a General Education course.
		+ Committee member comment: Additionally, as a reviewing member of the Themes Subcommittee, I like to keep in mind the idea that this may be the only opportunity in, for example, an English major’s academic career to take a course in Origins and Evolution or Number, Nature, Mind, and allow them to explore a completely separate discipline from their major program. This is the value that I find within the General Education program because I see those students utilize this new knowledge within their coursework when they return to their major coursework.
		+ Committee member question: I’d also like to remind my colleagues that, as they and their units develop course proposals for the Theme categories, they should keep in mind when students are completing their General Education coursework. As we heard from our undergraduate representative, who has a good pulse on how the undergraduate population is completing the General Education, undergraduates often want to take their General Education coursework as quickly as possible. If a Theme course has a prerequisite of Organic Chemistry, for example, this means that a student may be unable to enroll within a particular Theme course until their second or third year, assuming a course is offered every semester, which I doubt is the actuality of the situation. This may cause a fabulously, well-designed course to never really take off because, while it has the potential to enroll a broad number of students, students have already completed all or most of their Theme requirements by the time they are eligible to enroll.
	* Committee member question: This conversation has been incredibly insightful. What can we do to help inform our colleagues surrounding what the Themes Subcommittee is looking for when they review courses for their advanced nature?
		+ Fredal: As mentioned before, the problem of prerequisites does not exist within a vacuum, and they are only one part of a very holistic review. I think getting the word out to our colleagues across the college and university that a Theme course should be advanced in the Theme category and not the discipline is key. Additionally, we have historically not approved courses that are clearly meant to cater to a specific major or small group of majors. GE courses should be broadly accessible.
		+ Nagar: I agree with everything said, but I would like to add that it’s important to note that we typically do not consider prerequisites that are for GEN Foundations categories, as Theme courses are meant to build upon the Foundations. We only really consider prerequisites that may go beyond the Foundations. It may be useful to provide a justification within the proposal if you have significant prerequisites outside the Foundations.
8. New form for HIP category: Research & Creative Inquiry
	* Vankeerbergen: The two Theme Subcommittees have recently reviewed a new form that they endorse replacing the currently required High-Impact Practice: Research & Creative Inquiry form when submitting courses for this category. This new form will both help the course proposer explain why the proposal fulfills the category and also the faculty reviewers see how the proposal is appropriate to fit within the category. If the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee agrees that this new form would be helpful, then we will advance the form to ULAC for a review at their next meeting on November 16th.
	* The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee conducted an e-vote to endorse the new form. The endorsement of the proposal was approved via e-vote.