**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, February 2nd, 2024 9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 156

**Attendees:** Appiah, Bitters, Chamberlain, Dugdale, Hamilton, Hewitt, Hilty, Holroyd, Jenkins, Kline, Lee, Marsch Vu, Martin, Nagar, Nathanson, Neff, Ottesen, Podalsky, Pradhan, Smith, Staley, Steele, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Xiao, Wang

1. New Certificate in Sports Communication (guests: S. Kline & O. Appiah)
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee reviewed a request to create a new type 1B certificate in Sports Communication. This new, 12-credit hour certificate is designed to provide a comprehensive education in sports communication and emphasizes both theory and skills. The certificate requires the completion of two courses from the School of Communication as well as choosing two additional courses from seven different departments or units across the university. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee unanimously approved the request and advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
   * Appiah: This certificate is the culmination of many years of work, beginning prior to the pandemic. We are very excited about the interdisciplinary nature of this certificate. It will give students an opportunity to gain a scientific and social perspective on the topic. We also hope to be a leader in this field, not only in Ohio, but across the country.
   * Committee Member question: How does the certificate train students in skills?
     + Appiah: To provide an example, some of our instructors are journalists that will be teaching students how to utilize technology such as social media to help them contextualize key issues when reporting in sports. Our instructors will also teach students ways to create a better sense of equity when they are reporting on sports news. There will also be a public speaking component that will allow students to practice and further this skill.
     + Kline: I will add that the class size for the required courses is approximately 32 students, and we intend to keep class size this small. We do not plan on increasing class size, even if there is demand for more students. Instead, we would look to that as an opportunity to hire additional, talented instructors.
   * Committee Member question: As you consider ways to grow, have you thought about connecting with the Sports Management program in Education and Human Ecology? They could potentially be interested in this program and could be a good connection between the two colleges.
     + Kline: We have thought about that possibility, but we are holding off given that we do not have the capacity to serve all of their students. We do see it as an opportunity to grow down the road, however.
   * Committee Member comment: There is a lot of growth, expansion, and interest in the field of sports data analytics. This is an area that I have found to excite students and so I would recommend that, as you teach these courses and expand the program, you consider exploring the quantitative aspect of this field.
     + Appiah: I agree, and our conversations with coaches, commentators, and other industry experts and stakeholders seem to think data analytics is an important field as well. There is such a greater emphasis on analytics now than there ever has been in the past.
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences Letter, Hewitt, **unanimously approved**
2. New Guidelines for Regular & Substantive Interaction in Online Courses (guests: E. Marsch Vu & J. Smith)
   * Marsch Vu: To give a quick summary of what we have previously discussed, we are considering a change that would have the faculty review subcommittees utilize a model of Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) instead of the model of direct versus indirect instruction. This change would put the college in alignment with changing accreditation standards, as well as best practices in the distance learning environment. It is our hope that this change will create efficiencies for you, as faculty reviewers, in the review process. My office would update the distance learning cover sheet and ASC distance learning syllabus template to reflect this change and we would also begin providing the appropriate guidance to instructors when they come to us to help in the design of distance learning courses.
   * Committee Member question: When instructors come to you for guidance, are they already utilizing this framework to think about instructor interaction in coursework?
     + Marsch Vu: Most of the instructors that we service are those who are already invested in teaching within the online space. However, they often have not thought about what they are doing in these terms, explicitly, and so we are hoping to be able to use this new guidance to help them better contextualize the work they are doing.
     + Smith: I have also found that instructors are really struggling with trying to show the faculty review subcommittees how they are quantifying their direct instruction with the current definitions. Unfortunately, the easiest way to showcase this would be, in a typical 3-credit hour course, having three hours of video lectures per week, and this really stifles excellent course design, especially in the asynchronous course environment.
   * Committee Member question: When determining how much RSI is enough in order to grant approval of a course, are we examining this from a student perspective or an instructor perspective? Should the hours be based on how much interaction a student has with the instructor, or how much interaction an instructor has, holistically, with their students?
     + Marsch Vu: Just as in our in-person courses, this should be based upon the student’s perspective and how much individual students are interacting with the course and the course instructor.
     + Smith: It is also important to note that RSI does not need to be individualized to each student in the course, which may be a concern in especially large online courses. For example, creating a CarmenCanvas announcement or an instructor interacting with an online discussion board by creating a response video to the students’ discussions would count towards this RSI requirement under this new model.
   * Committee Member question: How would creating a course announcement be considered a substantive interaction? When I think about this, for example, it would be just a weekly announcement instructing students on how to complete their coursework for the week and could even be pre-programmed before the course even begins.
     + Marsch Vu: The idea here would be if the course announcement, or similar interaction, is in response to the students and the work that the students are completing. If this is the case, then yes, this would count towards RSI requirements.
     + Committee Member question: I think the issue I am having is that, as a faculty reviewer, I may be hard pressed to determine what would count towards the RSI requirement. While I do not personally use the program, I know PackBack is incredibly popular among instructors for assessing discussion board posts. Students would be receiving feedback from PackBack for their discussion board posts, but it would not be from the instructor. Would this, and other similar forms of interaction, count towards the RSI requirement?
       - Committee Member comment: I agree that this is a difficult question because, if it does not count towards the RSI requirement, then would we effectively be placing an unspoken ban on these forms of helpful technologies in online courses, especially the larger online courses?
       - Marsch Vu: I think these questions do bring up an excellent point. There will still be a subjective element to the review of courses, and it will be your job to still determine if they are equivalent to their in-person version, or what you would imagine the in-person course to be. The RSI model is obviously not perfect, but we do hope that it will be an improvement on the current way to evaluating online courses.
   * Committee Member question: Would it be possible to change the distance learning cover sheet to include multiple areas where instructors could describe how they will be meeting this RSI requirement?
     + Committee Member question: What changes can be made to the submission materials to help instructors feel as if they are not repeatedly stating the same information? I worry that, with this change, the cover sheet could be seen as redundant, confusing, and even frustrating for our colleagues.
     + Committee Member comment: While it would be redundant, I also do not think it would necessarily solve the biggest problem. Ultimately, the point of the review process is not to create perfect courses, but courses that are clear and easily able to be adapted by future instructors and in future iterations.
     + Smith: When I talk with instructors who ask for help in designing their distance courses, I urge them to view the cover sheet as a reflective tool. In my experience, those that take this recommendation oftentimes preempt the concerns from the faculty review subcommittees and have created stronger courses. It also allows me to showcase to the instructors that this process provides them a benefit and is not purely bureaucratic.
   * Committee Member question: Would it be helpful to add examples to the cover sheet?
     + Committee Member comment: I would caution against adding examples. Our colleagues will find this to be potentially prescriptive and unhelpful, and may feel as if they must follow the examples exactly.
   * The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee will begin to review distance learning course submissions utilizing the Regular & Substantive Interaction (RSI) model beginning 02/02/2024. Additionally, changes were made to the distance learning cover sheet and ASC distance learning syllabus template as a result of feedback from the committee. Namely, the language within the submission materials now reflects the use of RSI instead of direct versus indirect instruction.
   * Vaessin, Hamilton, **unanimously approved**
3. Presentation on the Ohio Prison Education Exchange Project (guests: M. Thomas & T. Morris)
   * Morris: The Ohio Prison Education Exchange Project, or OPEEP for short, is a program that is co-directed by me and Dr. Mary Thomas. Additionally, we have a staff that includes three program coordinators. This is a project that has the support of the Office of Academic Affairs and, specifically, Senior Vice Provost of Inclusive Excellence, Dr. Wendy Smooth, with additional funding from the Mellon Foundation and Student Academic Success. Our mission, broadly speaking, is to increase access to higher education for our prison population and build high quality, post-secondary, in-prison educational opportunities for both incarcerated students and non-incarcerated students. We are committed to underscoring and foregrounding the need to bring marginalized voices to the center of these conversations.
   * Thomas: The FAFSA Simplification Act that was recently passed has reinstated Pell Grants for incarcerated students for the first time since the Clinton Administration in 1996. When the Act goes into effect, there will be 760,000+ incarcerated individuals who will be eligible for Pell Grants. Our new degree program that we will be starting at the women’s prison in Maryville will start the unofficial seventh campus of Ohio State. The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation & Correction (ODRC) currently operates the Ohio Central School System (OCSS), which was established back in 1973 and currently is led by Superintendent Jennifer Sanders. The purpose of OCSS is to provide educational programs to incarcerated individuals that will allow them to complete adult education courses, earn Ohio certificates of high school equivalence, or to pursue vocational training. Ohio State will be the first non-vocational higher education institution in Ohio’s prison system.
   * Morris: OPEEP has several core activities, including campus initiatives, our combined-enrollment courses, and the embedded degree at the Ohio Reformatory for Women (ORW). The new embedded degree program is our current project and the reason for our visit to this committee. Students that successfully complete the degree program will earn a Bachelor of Arts in Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. A task force has been developed to work on this initiative and assist in the development of infrastructure, student services, curriculum, and university policy. We will begin to offer this program in Autumn 2024.
   * Thomas: We have had conversations with several individuals regarding the General Education, given that our students will not be allowed access to the internet. We are working to build a CarmenCanvas Learning Management System with no internet activity for our students and also develop a completely offline Bookend course. Amy Shuster from the Department of Philosophy is developing the Launch seminar for the program.
   * Morris: As we said, we also offer our combined-enrollment OPEEP courses. These are the courses most individuals associate with our program, as they bring incarcerated and campus students together in prison-based classrooms. Incarcerated students in prisons (other than ORW degree program we are launching) are admitted each semester as non-degree seeking students and fees are cancelled by Ohio State for the incarcerated students. We’ve been offering these courses for over a decade, and our students do earn letter grades for their coursework and can transfer this coursework after graduation, given it is credit-bearing. We offer these courses at the Ohio Reformatory for Women, the Southeastern Correctional Institution, the London Correctional Institution, the Allen Oakwood Correctional Institution, and the Richland Correctional Institution.
   * Committee Member question: What happens if a student is released prior to them completing a course? Do they drop the course?
     + Morris: As part of the application, we ask them their release date and they are only eligible for the program if they can finish the semester. Of course, situations can arise where they may be released earlier than expected, or other situations can occur, but we handle this on an individual basis and the Office of the University Registrar is an excellent partner.
   * Committee Member question: What access to materials do students have within the various programs you offer?
     + Thomas: For the degree program we are launching, students will have a Chromebook-equivalent that has no internet connectivity. For our other courses, they are conducted with paper-and-pen. Students have access to books and other materials that are screened when we bring them in and out of the facility.
   * Morris: Finally, as for our campus initiatives, we conduct significant outreach to student organizations, provide education on the impact of mass incarceration within Ohio’s communities, provide counseling initiatives for students impacted by incarceration, provide support for formerly incarcerated students, provide advocacy for policies at Ohio State that impact those affected by incarceration, are theme collaborators for the 2023-2024 Global Arts and Humanities Discovery Theme: Abolition and Freedom Dreams, are members of the Big Ten Consortium for Higher Education in Prison, and finally provide faculty and instructor trainings on conducting OPEEP combined-enrollment courses. Overall, we are incredibly excited to begin offering our degree program and appreciate the support of the College in this project.
4. Approval of Minutes
   * 12/01/2023: Podalsky, Dugdale, **unanimously approved**
   * 01/19/2024: Hewitt, Hamilton, **approved** with **one abstention**
5. Informational Item: Intercultural Competence for Global Citizenship Certificate Update (J. Ottesen)
   * Ottesen: As you all know, the university recently has decided to allow 100% overlap between a certificate and other degree programs (including major, minor, other certificate, or General Education programs). The Intercultural Competence for Global Citizenship Certificate will be taking advantage of this new rule and is updating the certificate to reflect this new ability to overlap, going from 50% to 100% total allowed overlap.
6. Informational Item: Resubmission of the University’s OT36 courses (A. Martin & B. Vankeerbergen)
   * Martin: The Ohio Department of Higher Education has asked that courses within the Ohio Transfer 36 module (OT36) be re-reviewed, as they recently have finished conducting an overhaul of the various learning outcomes for the categories of the program. They have given us two years to complete this review and this is now meant to be done every five years. Randy Smith is having a conversation to discuss how we can best streamline this process, as it is quite comprehensive and complicated, especially for a five-year cycle.
   * Vankeerbergen: As a reminder, OT36 is the automatic transfer of General Education courses within Ohio and applies to all 36 of Ohio’s public colleges and universities. We have hired a staff member that will be working in the college to submit these courses over the next two years.
7. Subcommittee Updates
   * Arts and Humanities 1
     + History of Art 7190 – approved with contingency
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + ARTEDUC 2222 – approved with contingency
     + English 2367.06 – approved with contingency
     + History 2046 – approved
     + History 3250 – approved with contingency
     + WGSS 2900 – approved
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + EEOB 5630 – approved
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + Political Science 3950 – approved
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + AAAS 2080 – approved with contingency
     + AAAS 2081 – approved with contingency
     + Comparative Studies 2321 – approved with contingency
     + Ethnic Studies 2321 – approved with contingency
     + History 2080 – approved with contingency
     + History 2081 – approved with contingency
   * Themes I
     + Geography 3702 – approved
   * Themes II
     + N/A