

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

Approved Minutes

Friday, December 6th, 2024

9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 156

Attendees: Bielefeld, Bitters, Cole, Cravens-Brown, Crocetta, Dugdale, Dwyer, Fletcher, Hedgecoth, Hilty, Jenkins, Martin, Nagar, Nathanson, Neff, Podalsky, Smith, Steele, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen, Xiao

- 1) Speech and Hearing Science BA/AuD Combined Program (Guest: E. Bielefeld)
 - Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter: The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee reviewed a request from the Department of Speech and Hearing Sciences to approve a new combined Bachelor of Arts in Speech and Hearing Sciences and a Doctor of Audiology degree program that could be completed within seven years. This program would lessen the time-to-degree by one year, create efficiencies in the BA program by reducing redundant coursework, and retain highly qualified undergraduate students who wish to pursue graduate work by offering them this attractive, cost-effective option for graduate school. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee unanimously approved this request and advances the proposal to the full Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
 - Committee Member question: How many courses may overlap between the BA and the AuD?
 - Bielefeld: When developing this program, we were operating under the Ohio Department of Higher Education guidelines that 9 credit hours may overlap between the programs.
 - Committee Member question: Did you have discussions during the development of the program on how to limit implicit bias against current students within the program that are not successfully admitted into the AuD program during their first time applying for admission?
 - Bielefeld: While there was not explicit discussion of implicit bias against current students, students most often find our program after they are admitted to the university and have taken one or two years' worth of coursework. For students that enter this program as new first-year students, they will know that work within the field will require a higher degree and, therefore, we expect them to be successful during their first time applying. However, we certainly can ensure that individual faculty

reviewers will not review a student's second applications should they have reviewed it during the first cycle, if this becomes applicable.

- Committee Member question: The provided four-year plan has students completing one open elective during each summer semester in order to reach the required 121-credit hours required for graduation with the BA degree. Is there flexibility for students to complete an additional 1- or 2-credit hours in the other semesters to avoid taking coursework over the summer?
 - Bielefeld: Yes, there is flexibility for students who do not wish to pursue summer coursework.
- Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter, Vaessin, **unanimously approved**

2) Approval of 11/15/2024 Minutes

- Cravens-Brown, Podalsky, **unanimously approved**

3) Informational Item: Update to Philosophy BA and Minor (I. Nagar)

- Nagar: The Department of Philosophy will be slightly amending several of the requirements for their major and minor programs. These include the following:
 - Philosophy 2367 will now count towards both the major and the minor.
 - Philosophy 3260 will now count towards the history of philosophy requirement for the major.
 - Philosophy 3420 and 3440 will now count towards the topics in philosophy requirement for the major.

4) Informational Item: Update to the Bachelor of Music Education (I. Nagar)

- Nagar: The School of Music is making a small curricular change to the Bachelor of Music Education (BME). This change aligns the degree program with new changes set forth by the Ohio Department of Higher Education relative to the Science of Reading. The School of Music will be making the following changes:
 - Adding EDUTL 5442 "Teaching Reading Across the Curriculum", which has been aligned to new Science of Reading standards.
 - Reducing one class within each BME degree track to allow students additional time in their schedules to accommodate the new course as follows:
 - MUSIC 2263.01 "Keyboard Skills III" (Instrumental Track)
 - MUSIC 2200.11 "Piano Secondary" (Choral Track & General Track)

5) Discussion of Research and Creative Inquiry High-Impact Practice in Asynchronous, Online Coursework (L. Cravens-Brown)

- Cravens-Brown: At the previous meeting of this committee, we discussed the question asked by the Themes II Subcommittee surrounding the required public display of competence in the Research and Creative Inquiry High-Impact Practice. Specifically, as a subcommittee, we are unsure how to interpret this

mandate when instructors are proposing coursework in the asynchronous, online format. During the review process, one such course proposed having an online blog posting that was designed to function as an asynchronous poster session. However, there was no guaranteed interaction and no interaction with members outside the classroom. Is this sufficient to meet the required public display of competence?

- Committee Member question: The main question we need to determine is how we are defining public and community in this particular case. If the instructor were to open this blog up to all faculty members within their department, would this be public enough?
 - Cravens-Brown: A significant part of the Themes II Subcommittee's conversation was centered around the feedback portion of the public communication. If students were to receive no feedback, we really were questioning whether this was truly public communication. During an in-person poster session, as an example, it would be very unusual for a student to have no one visit their poster and ask them questions.
- Committee Member question: For the assignment in question, is there a comment section on the blog post?
 - Cravens-Brown: It was unclear based upon the materials presented.
- Committee Member question: Circling back to faculty involvement, is there worry that this is asking for potentially significant, uncompensated faculty time during an extremely busy period in the semester? I worry that by asking for faculty members to provide input to students, this would be asking for significant labor from our peers.
 - Committee Member comment: There would need to be a firm commitment from the instructor's home department stating that they would be willing to provide support for these types of courses. This will help alleviate burdens on faculty time and any financial concerns that may arise. This does not need to be complex and could simply be a short letter in the course submission materials.
- Committee Member question: Is there an enrollment concern that also impacts faculty workload concerns? There could be a temptation to allow many students to enroll within the course due to its asynchronous nature.
 - Committee Member comment: While this is true, this is still one of the High-Impact Practice courses. These are not meant to be, nor designed to be, for large enrollment courses.
- Committee Member comment: While this certainly should not be a main determining factor for development and approval of these courses, it should be kept in mind that there is significant demand for these asynchronous format courses, typically for units outside of Arts and Sciences and within the health

sciences. These units teach fully virtual programs, and this would provide opportunities to obtain additional enrollments.

- Committee Member comment: Additionally, it should also be noted that you may approve a course as a synchronous, online course, but the department and instructor may convert the course to asynchronous during any given offering. When courses are approved for distance learning, they are not approved as a synchronous distance course or asynchronous distance course, but rather simply as a distance education course.
- Committee Member question: Would it be reasonable for us to ask how the course proposer is defining public in order to meet the requirements of the High-Impact Practice? The Themes II Subcommittee could provide the instructor with feedback that they should consider incorporating a way to provide students with external feedback and have this assignment happen earlier in the semester, to allow for more feedback to be collected and interacted with.
 - Cravens-Brown: This does seem to be the best solution and one that aligns with our discussion. It will allow the instructor to provide us with additional information to help us make our determination, while also providing them with guidance that may prove useful to them going forward.

6) Informational Item: Themes Approval Process (I. Nagar)

- Nagar: There is a proposal to update the approval process for the GEN Themes courses. This proposal is a result of a review, now that this process is three years old and, beginning in Autumn 2025, all currently admitted students will have started on the GEN program. This proposal aims to streamline the approval process. As it stands now, there are approximately 60 faculty members in the approval process of GEN Themes courses, including the Theme Advisory Groups and the Themes Subcommittees. In this proposal, the Themes Subcommittees would be larger and have faculty from across the university. However, the Theme Advisory Groups would be disbanded. The other reason for this change is due to the decreasing volume of coursework being submitted within the GEN Themes which, therefore, require less faculty time.
- Committee Member question: Regarding work of the subcommittees, the Arts and Humanities II Subcommittee seems to have significant work compared to the other disciplinary subcommittees. Is there a need to create a third Arts and Humanities Subcommittee?
 - Martin: We can examine end-of-year trends and determine if this is necessary. We did this with the Themes Subcommittee. There was originally only one, and we determined that the process would be best served if we created a second subcommittee. Additionally, there is less

urgency for courses to be included within the GEN program and, therefore, faculty are taking more time in developing GEN proposals. This means that the proposals you receive are usually of higher quality and require less revisions and, therefore, less work during the review process.

- Committee Member comment: On a separate note, I do find that we need additional classroom space to support our curriculum. There is a limited number of spaces that can support some of these inventive and innovative courses, especially should they need lab space.

7) Subcommittee Updates

- Arts and Humanities 1
 - Art Education 5222 – approved with contingency
 - CLLC 5104 – approved
 - Greek 6892 – approved with contingency
 - Latin 6891 – approved
 - Music 2233 – approved
 - Music 3355 – approved
 - Spanish 5104 – approved
- Arts and Humanities 2
 - History 2272 – approved with contingency
 - Art Education 7707 – approved with contingency
- Natural and Mathematical Sciences
 - Astronomy 4810 – approved with contingency
- Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - Geography 5900 – approved with contingency
- Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
 - Ethnic Studies 3311 – approved
 - History of Art 2007 – approved with contingency
- Themes I
 - Chemistry 3301 – approved with contingency
 - Communication 2985 – approved with contingency
 - French 3804 – approved
 - German 3434 – approved
 - History 3552 – approved with contingency
 - Pharmacy 3301 – approved with contingency
- Themes II
 - N/A