**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee**

Approved Minutes

Friday, March 22nd, 2024 9:10AM – 11:00AM

University 156

**Attendees**: Dugdale, Hamilton, Hedgecoth, Hewitt, Hilty, Holroyd, Jenkins, Lee, Martin, Nagar, Nathanson, Neff, Ottesen, Podalsky, Pradhan, Steele, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Wang, Xiao

1. Revision to the Music Minor (Guest: David Hedgecoth)
   * Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee Letter: The Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 2 reviewed a request from the School of Music to revise the Music minor through updates to three areas of study: ensembles, music theory, and musicology. Some of the proposed revisions were clerical in nature and involved adjustments to the Advising Sheet – e.g., to eliminate a typographical error; remove a course that is no longer taught; amend the credit hours for two courses to reflect changes that had been approved previously. Others involved adding courses to given areas of study to provide students with additional options to complete their coursework. A&H Subcommittee 2 voted unanimously to approve the request and the proposal is now advanced to the ASCC with a motion to approve.
   * Hedgecoth: Adding to this, shifts in ensemble availability and shifts in General Education courses that have previously been called music history (musicology) have necessitated these changes.
   * Committee Member question: Can you tell us more about the onboarding course, Music 1111?
     + Hedgecoth: Historically, there has been an assumption that one arrives at the institution with experience in western music notation and music literacy, but oftentimes students who may not play a particular instrument want to still be involved in music, so Music 1111 is a beginner course that sets students up for the sequential Theory I-IV courses.
   * Arts and Humanities 2 Subcommittee Letter, Hamilton; approved with one abstention.
2. New Certificate in Encountering Middle Eastern & South Asian Cultures (tabled from 03-01-2024) (Guest: Ila Nagar)
   * Arts and Humanities 1 Subcommittee Letter: The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee’s Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 1 reviewed and approved a proposal from the Department of Near Eastern and South Asian Languages and Cultures (NESA) to create a new undergraduate certificate in Encountering Middle Eastern and South Asian Cultures. NESA proposes a new, 12-credit hour, type 1B and 2 undergraduate certificate which aims to provide students with competency for working with people and communities of the Middle East and South Asia. This certificate program would target students in professions such as business, social work, energy, government, development, engineering, medicine, public health, finance, marketing, and others that might interact with people in or from the Middle East and South Asia. Students will gain familiarity with global human experiences, cultures, values, and belief systems and will be better equipped to interact with diverse international communities. The Arts and Humanities 1 Subcommittee advances the proposal to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
   * Nagar: This is the second step in evolving our curriculum since NESA’s renaming (previously the Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures). We are exploring ways in which different areas of the department can speak to each other, given the expanded nature of the department, and ways for our students to do the same. Another aspect of the creation of the certificate was that part of the faculty work in ancient studies and part of the faculty work in modern studies and, though we have solely focused on the modern here, in the future we hope to create an additional program for students interested in ancient topics.
   * Committee Member question: Would you be interested in making this certificate available to non-OSU students (as a type 1B is for current students and a type 2 is for post-bachelor’s students)?
     + Nagar: We would be open to that, yes.
     + Vankeerbergen: Right now, the certificate is 1B and 2 and you would need to add 1A at a later time to accomplish this. It is an easy process. Please reach out to me when the department is ready to consider this.
     + Committee Member question: Are there prerequisite courses for the certificate that would restrict opening up the certificate to post-high school diploma students?
     + Nagar: I would have to go through the proposal and look at the courses as I am unsure right now.
   * Arts and Humanities 1 Subcommittee Letter, Podalsky; approved with one abstention.
3. Informational Item - Video Arts Minor (J. Ottesen)
   * Ottesen: The Department of Theatre, Film, and Media Arts is making a few, small changes to the Video Arts minor, including: addition of five existing department course offerings in theatre and film; inclusion of department internship course numbers; and the removal of THEATRE 2100(H). These revisions respond to current and anticipated student enrollment patterns and better align the course offerings to the goals of the minor, while helping to alleviate enrollment challenges and creating a more robust course list for students interested in production who are not part of the Moving-Image Production major.
4. Information Item - Follow-up from Norman Jones (J. Ottesen)
   * Ottesen: Regarding the discussion at our last meeting about the new Religious Accommodations Statement and the question of including it in syllabi as a link versus including the full statement itself, Vice Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Education Norman Jones spoke with the Office of Legal Affairs and provided an update along with some history of the passing of this statement in Ohio legislation. Jones has informed us that the statement grew out of a collaboration between Representatives Gary Click and Jessica Miranda and Ohio Jewish Communities. On a more practical note, after a conversation with the Office of Legal Affairs, we are now going to recommend including the full Religious Accommodations Statement for legal compliance. Additionally, Legal Affairs was unpersuaded by the case made against the language and length of the statement as it contains standard, approved language that complies with the statute.
5. Course Review Reminders (B. Vankeerbergen)
   * Vankeerbergen: As we discuss specific syllabus elements and are reviewing required statements and other standardized elements, it has struck me that there has been more focus on syllabus review, rather than course review, from the subcommittees as of late. Historically, this has been reversed and the focus of the review has been on course review, rather than syllabus review. What I mean by course review is that you are reviewing a course as a whole, rather than a specific iteration of a course. The syllabus template for ASC courses (which can be found in the ASC Operations Manual and on the Syllabus Elements page of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website) lays out the minimum requirements of syllabi. More generally, I believe this philosophy of course review should carry over in all the work in the curriculum Subcommittees— it can be important to remember the larger picture of the work we do as we consider what feedback is being sent to our colleagues across the university. That said, it is true that in the context of distance learning requests, we should focus more on syllabus review, as we noticed during the pandemic that if certain information was not in the syllabus, such as if the course has synchronous meetings, then students oftentimes did not realize the course requirements. This is why we do a little more syllabus review with distance learning requests. It is true that there is grey area when reviewing curriculum, but I hope this is a helpful reminder to everyone to remember what we are doing and for whom. Your colleagues will, of course, refine their syllabi before they teach the course.
     + Committee Member comment: This is a great reminder; I will add that I have heard frustration from colleagues that the process is not fast enough, and I think it would be prudent to put the statistics out there that demonstrate just how quickly and hard we all work to push requests through the system. The scope of the process is often misunderstood, causing our colleagues to believe that this process is a closed system when that is not the case at all. It is so important to be better communicators of what goes on here and in the Subcommittees because of this frustration, and to think about how we can be better liaisons.
     + Committee Member comment: We have had some tension in terms of our roles in review. It is simple to check if the required syllabus elements are within the proposals we review. We also need to remember that while it is our job to make sure that courses are appropriately rigorous, this does not inherently mean dotting every “i” or crossing every “t” in the document because what we are reviewing is not the syllabus that will be distributed to students. It is important to keep in mind the differences between contingencies, recommendations, and comments as we give feedback to our units.
     + Committee Member comment: At the same time, it is also important to communicate that these documents become the documents-of-record going forward. We are not questioning the expertise of the instructor proposing the course, but we do have to look a little more closely than the most basic requirements.
6. Informational Item - Contents of the ASCCAS Website (R. Steele)
   * Rachel Steele, ASC Curriculum Program Manager, briefly reviewed the content available on the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website (asccas.osu.edu) for the committee, which includes approved Themes and REGD courses, submission guidelines, sample proposals, Embedded Literacy information, and more.
   * Committee Member question: This information is incredibly helpful. An argument could be made, however, that the Themes submission form could be improved by becoming more succinct. The examples on the form take up significant space. Is there a way to communicate this concern to the appropriate body?
     + Committee Member comment: There has been an ongoing discussion at ULAC regarding transparency, communication gaps, and identifying the scopes of the concerns with course review, so that could be a question to bring to that conversation.
   * Committee Member question: The information on ascnet.osu.edu, archival site, is accessible to the public, correct?
     + Vankeerbergen: Yes, the site is completely public, and an email with a link to the site goes out to the unit’s curricular contact when a request is initiated. Any one can track a request and see the feedback.
7. Approval of the 02/16/2024 & 03/01/2024 minutes
   * 02/16/2024: Podalsky, Pradhan; approved with one abstention.
   * 03/01/2024: Vaessin, Hamilton; approved with four abstentions.
8. Subcommittee Updates
   * Arts and Humanities 1
     + ASC 1137.xx (Wiggins) – approved with contingency
     + ASC 1138.xx (Hawkins) – approved with contingency
     + Comparative Studies 2345 – approved with contingency
     + English 3000 – approved with contingency
     + Music 3354 – approved with contingency
     + Slavic 2345.20 – approved with contingency
     + Slavic 3711 – approved with contingency
     + Theatre 3711 – approved with contingency
   * Arts and Humanities 2
     + ASL 3650 – approved with contingency
     + ASL 3750 – approved with contingency
     + ASL 4104 – approved with contingency
     + Religious Studies 4370 – approved with contingency
   * Natural and Mathematical Sciences
     + Statistics 5731 – approved with contingency
     + Statistics 5732 – approved with contingency
   * Social and Behavioral Sciences
     + Economics 1101 – approved with contingency
   * Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
     + History 2001 – approved with contingency
     + History 3642 – approved with contingency
   * Themes I
     + N/A
   * Themes II
     + EDUTL 3995 – approved with contingency
     + History 3250 – approved with contingency
     + Political Science 2110 – approved with contingency
     + Slavic 3995 – approved with contingency
9. Discussion of the ASC College Requirements for the Bachelor of Science and the Bachelor of Arts (A. Martin)
   * Martin: There has been discussion regarding the requirements of the B.A. and B.S. in the college. The current distinction between the B.A. and the B.S. is the B.S. having a calculus requirement. David Horn, Dean of ASC, is interested in making the B.A. distinctive as well, which is an idea for this committee to consider. This distinction could be a course that focuses on how B.A. majors think about inquiry and data, as an example. B.S. majors have grown to encompass more of the Social Sciences and the question is, is calculus the most useful course for, say, a student pursuing a Sociology B.S., or would statistics make more sense? Calculus might not be the best use of every B.S. major’s time and there is an opportunity here to make the requirements more meaningful by opening requirements up to give majors more tailored options that are specific to their major rather than the college as a whole. Are people interested in pursuing these changes—adding a course for the B.A. and opening up the requirements of the B.S.?
     + Committee Member comment: Calculus is only offered by the Department of Mathematics. If this requirement changes, it may potentially cause problems with their enrollments. Math should be involved in this conversation if the calculus requirement may be changing.
     + Committee Member comment: There are even calculus courses that are geared towards majors in specific programs, such as MATH 1156 Calculus for the Biological Sciences. Personally, when thinking about the advantages of having this added to their degree—calculus is something that makes a great deal of sense and, despite students perhaps questioning the purpose of its requirement, the capacity to deal with math is not limited to the physical and natural sciences. These skills are useful in other areas, and we need to have conversations about not only what is needed for which students, but also the challenges of creating offerings that are better suited to specific fields. Then there is the question of whether courses that can accomplish this would satisfy a large enough population to make the effort worthwhile.
   * Committee Member question: A similar approach would be necessary in terms of the B.A as well. It is a great idea, but the logistics are difficult. I could picture a course that everyone should take as a B.A. student, but who would offer this course?
     + Martin: In theory, every department could have offerings that exist as options for specific groups of students, so the question of which units would offer these courses is certainly one of the challenges as we think about adding these requirements.
   * Committee Member comment: In terms of the original question, it seems that there is strong interesting in creating groups to discuss these possibilities and define the roles of these courses.
     + Committee Member comment: It is critical to involve regional campuses in this discussion.
     + Martin: Creating two separate groups for this discussion would make sense, as would including someone from the Math department.
     + Committee Member comment: Communication between groups is essential. There needs to be some commonality to ensure coherence and to prevent work from being done based on assumption.
     + Martin: So, there would be two separate groups for the sake of discussion productivity, but communication between the two would be critical, I agree. If anyone is interested or knows colleagues that would be interested in a college-wide conversation, reach out to me. We hope to begin this discussion in Autumn 2024.
     + Committee Member comment: We should also consider our science requirement for the B.S. What is the bigger picture takeaway from that conversation?
       - Vankeerbergen: I examined the GE requirements of other universities and the main difference for the B.A. is more foreign language requirements and more robust science requirements in natural science and math for the B.S. Additionally, there are some universities with no real GE difference; in such cases, the differences between the BA and the BS are much more major specific. Interestingly, in the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts at the University of Michigan, the GE requirements are identical, but the B.S. requires 60 credits comprised of any courses in physical or natural sciences or mathematics. If one fulfills this requirement, any major can be a B.S. For example, one could obtain a BS with a major in Philosophy.
       - Committee Member comment: Thinking about this is important. It would be helpful to be able to explain the rationale for the difference to students—lack of a math requirement is not a good enough reason. The rules of what these difference must look like are valid and must be fulfilled, but we simultaneously need a solid rationale we can give to students.
       - Committee Member comment: To many students, this difference is for their future career or academic goals. For example, in many Social Sciences, the B.S. is geared toward students who hope to pursue graduate school while the B.A. is geared towards students who will be entering their profession immediately following undergraduate graduation.