

## Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

### Approved Minutes

Friday, May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025

9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 156

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

### Agenda:

- New AI Ethics and Society Certificate (Guest: Tristram McPherson)
  - Arts and Humanities Subcommittee I Letter of Motion: The Arts and Humanities Subcommittee I reviewed and unanimously approved a proposal from the Department of Philosophy to establish a new AI Ethics and Society Certificate. The certificate offers a non-technical yet comprehensive, interdisciplinary study of artificial intelligence, with a strong foundation in the humanities. The proposal highlights a gap in current university offerings, which rarely incorporate such humanities-centered approaches to AI.

The Subcommittee forwards this proposal to the ASCC with a motion to approve.

- Nagar: How many students do you anticipate and how do you plan on advertising this certificate?
  - McPherson: We are aiming for 25-40 students.
  - Martin: I suspect there will be a fair amount of advertising, especially since this is the first of three certificates we are developing in AI. The others will be “AI Language and Mind,” which is nearly ready, and “AI, Arts and Design”. Central marketing will be involved, and the Provost is already very interested in pursuing this area. At the Dean’s Advisory Committee meeting with alumni, we highlighted AI and got a very enthusiastic response about the research happening across our disciplines.
  - McPherson: Since this could attract people to come to the university specifically for the certificate, we do need to think intentionally about advertising. We are trying to make sure we reach those prospective students effectively.
- Committee member question: Since the AI certificates are going to be in-person, how do you plan to connect with people beyond the university community?
  - McPherson: My sense is that we are trying to piggyback on existing course offerings and package them into something that feels cohesive. As we move forward, we want to make sure there is a critical mass of courses

that are accessible to people who are not full-time students. That is not something that will happen right away but will need to be built over time.

- Committee member question: This looks like it could be one of the university's larger certificate programs, especially when all three certificates are offered. How is advising being handled?
  - McPherson: The current plan is that Comparative Studies will be the first stop for advising. There is language in the proposal that if demand overwhelms their capacities, then advising support will be extended through ASC advising.
    - Jenkins: We will need to have a conversation about that as the certificate grows.
- Martin: The college is interested in using this certificate to appeal to prospective students who are considering majors like English or Comparative Studies. They can do these certificates and gain this knowledge in a way that aligns with the humanities and helps them think about what they might do next. It is not meant to be technical in the way that Computer Science, as an example, is technical.
- Committee member question: It seems like there needs to be an Arts leadership focus with the AI, Arts and Design Certificate. Is the Department of Design taking the lead on that?
  - Martin: Amy Youngs from the Department of Art and Kris Paulsen from the Department of History of Art are involved. Chris Coleman from the Advanced Computing Center for the Arts and Design is developing the arts-focused component similar to what Linguistics did. It is more about how AI works in a conceptual or creative sense, not from a computer science perspective.
- Arts and Humanities Subcommittee I Letter of Motion, Podalsky; unanimously approved.
- Revision to the Master of Arts and PhD in Anthropology (Guest: Mark Moritz)
  - Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter of Motion: On April 14, 2025, the Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee reviewed and unanimously approved a proposal from the Department of Anthropology to revise its graduate program, effective Autumn 2025.

The revision aims to reduce student workload and expand opportunities for specialization, in response to student feedback and a recent external review. Key changes include expanding options for fulfilling the theory requirement (including allowing 3 credit hours from outside the department), reducing required methods coursework from 14 to 6 credit hours, and restructuring the professional development component to offer greater flexibility and two complementary workshops.

The Subcommittee forwards the proposal to the ASCC with a motion to approve.

- Nagar: What was the driving force behind this change?
  - Moritz: We redesigned the graduate program a couple of years ago and we were a bit too ambitious. The main issue was that the workload ended up being too high. Our initial vision was for integrated training across anthropology, but in practice, students need to focus on their specific sub-fields. We heard that from our graduate students, from faculty, and in the external review. The main changes we have made are to reduce the workload and increase flexibility so students can take more targeted courses that support the dissertation work.
- Committee member question: When your graduate students take courses outside of the Department of Anthropology, what areas do they tend to be interested in?
  - Moritz: The research interests of our students are very diverse. Some lean more towards the natural sciences, some the humanities, and others the social sciences. Their coursework could be across the university. Areas like WGSS, Comparative Studies, Sociology, and even the Medical College often come up.
- Committee member question: For students coming straight from an undergraduate program, they are typically looking at candidacy at the end of their third year. What does the time to degree look like for those students?
  - Moritz: Right now, our average time to degree is six years, which is below the national average. We hope to keep it between five and six years.
- Committee member question: How often do your students pursue postdoctoral paths? Programs without postdoctoral stages tend to be longer because there is more training involved.
  - Moritz: In reality, most of our graduate students are not going into academic careers. In the last 10 years, 15% of our graduate students went into tenure-track positions at R1 or R2 institutions. Many work in academia, but often in staff roles or they move into industry. What slows students down is the fieldwork. For example, accessing collections held by other universities or museums can be a challenge.
- Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee Letter of Motion, Dwyer; unanimously approved.
- SB1 Update (Guest: Dean David Horn)
  - Committee member question: Should we consider having some of us on emergency duty for Subcommittees over the summer given that we are trying to get courses on the books in response to Ohio Senate Bill 1?
    - Martin: We could consider doing that virtually or through e-voting. I think that is a good idea. I also want to clarify that, based on a conversation with

university legal, anything that we offer for credit is protected. Even for the certificate on DEI, there is no issue from their perspective.

- Committee member question: Are diversity committees in departments being disbanded?
  - Martin: I do not know of any disbanding. The University Senate still has a diversity committee, and it is not changing as far as I know. The Chair did not report any changes at the last cabinet meeting.
- Committee member comment: Randy Smith said at our last meeting that the civics course as required by SB1 will not be a single course, but a small set of courses that meet the legislative criteria. He said that the College of Arts and Sciences, John Glenn College, and the Chase Center will be the three entities involved. There is concern that certain entities—especially the Chase Center—are taking the lead on developing courses without going through the university’s established curricular approval process. It is unclear whether these courses meet university requirements, and legislative criteria alone are not sufficient. Only approved academic units should determine course content and whether it counts for credit.
  - Martin: Those three entities [ASC, John Glenn, and Chase] were mentioned because Randy asked who at the university wanted to be involved with the civics requirement. Those are the three that responded. Arts and Sciences should be a leader.
  - Committee member comment: If the State budget passes as it stands, Chase should no longer be involved with the civics requirement. That is because, if the budget passes, it will allow them to operate without any accountability tied to the university. They would effectively exist beyond the Board of Trustees. We should not cede academic authority to a unit that is not accountable the way that academic departments are. If we give Chase too much leeway, it will set a precedent.
    - Martin: I agree with you. If it were up to me, things would have been different from the start. However, at this point, ASC needs to stay involved so we can ensure quality.
  - Committee member comment: What if ASC is not involved? Then Chase teaches these courses on their own, and they will likely be poor-quality checkbox courses that undermine the entire requirement.
    - Martin: If Chase wants to offer GE courses, they will need to go through the regular process like any other unit.
    - Committee member comment: We know that the state budget will make it so that they do *not* have to go through the process, though.
    - Horn: The state budget not requiring Chase to go through us does not mean they will stop communicating with us.

- Committee member comment: The budget *demand*s that they approve their own courses.
- Horn: I would be surprised if they did not continue to consult with us on curriculum. The culture of collaboration has been strong. We are watching SB1 and the challenges it poses very closely, but we have not had conflicts with the Chase Center yet.
- Horn: I want to share a few updates. A memo went out yesterday to Department Chairs announcing a new university-level committee that has been established to implement SB1. I do not know the full membership yet, but it has several subcommittees. I am on the subcommittee focusing on peer evaluation, SEIs, and annual review. I know that some divisional deans are also involved. The committees are working on what we will need to implement by the end of June, which will be 90 days from the bill's signing. Other elements (like publicizing syllabi) will not apply for another year. We will hear more from the subcommittees over the next few months.

At the same time, I have created an ad-hoc committee in the college to look not just at SB1, but at broader state and federal developments including the revocations of visas and budget cuts. We are looking at impacts on research, promotion and tenure, and graduate education. We have been asked not to duplicate the university committee's efforts, but there are areas where we can proceed independently (for example, helping faculty prepare for Autumn semester teaching). Many faculty are concerned with how to approach "controversial" topics. I want to emphasize that we are not changing what we teach, though the classroom dynamics might shift. We are going to continue discussing race, gender, sexuality, climate change—SB1 does not prohibit that.

- Committee member question: Are our most vulnerable faculty, especially the non-tenure track folks who are doing so much of our teaching, represented on these committees?
  - Horn: I do not know the membership of the university-level committees yet, but I can look at our college-level committee. We did make sure to include international graduate students because that is a voice that needs represented. It is a hard task to manage, especially since a lot of this work is taking place over the summer, but we are willing to compensate folks who are working on it with us.

There are definitely areas where SB1 intersects with revocation of visas. Many departments are thinking carefully about who they put in classrooms that are likely to generate friction. Some are assigning those courses to tenured faculty, and in some cases some departments

are trying to keep international students out of those classrooms altogether. We can offer guidance in some cases, but in others, departments and individuals are assessing their own risk. We are not telling anyone to change their content, but people might choose not to assign certain texts just to avoid the potential trouble. I hope that does not happen a lot, but we understand that people are weighing the personal and professional risks.

- Martin: My understanding is that people can still propose and teach the courses they want. That process has not changed.
- Horn: That is correct. We have had no interventions from the university in terms of curriculum. We had a meeting with Legal and HR related to DEI, and they are reviewing every college's DEI offices and programs, but *not* curriculum. That boundary can be a bit fuzzy sometimes, and when it is, we push back. For example, they asked about our DEI certificate, and we told them it is curricular. They dropped it immediately because that is not in their purview. We may eventually be told that departments cannot have something explicitly called a 'DEI committee' anymore, but so far, we have not been told that those committees have to stop their work. It is all about optics.
- Committee member comment: As Chair of the Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity Subcommittee, I want to raise something that was discussed at an open meeting we held. Faculty brought up a range of questions, and the meeting coincided with the release of the budget, which raised even more concerns. The general sense is that we should continue this work within General Education, which is great. However, we could be doing more to proactively support the GE given the proposed shift toward "citizenship-centered" framing and the budget implications.

We need to put more intentional commitment and resources toward this area [REGD] of the curriculum because it intersects with broader issues. REGD courses are a foundational capstone for the idea of citizenship in the GE Themes, and are courses taught by departments and faculty that are in precarious positions. We could continue with what we are doing because nothing has changed yet, or we start preparing for a time when this part of the curriculum is challenged. We could start collecting data about how the REGD requirement benefits students so that we have evidence when we are forced to defend it. Forming a small ad hoc group that tracks how curriculum intersects with the attacks on DEI could be a meaningful step. The framework of our GE was built around REGD and citizenship, and by thinking about offering civics courses that are in line with

legislature as a means of staying involved, we are folding into a narrative that sidelines our core GE values.

- Horn: We do not have to abandon one approach to pursue the other. Many departments genuinely want to be a part of the conversation around what civics education can mean. Of course, there are constraints imposed by the mandated curriculum, but there is still room for shaping its direction. It is reasonable to anticipate that legislators might eventually target curriculum as we have seen happen in other states. I want to be careful about how we manage our focus so that we prioritize the problems that exist right now and not stir alarm over things that have not yet happened. REGD has had profound impact on certain departments, and we do need to think about how to support these departments ideologically and financially if there is a shift. This could be something that the university ad hoc committee could take up. I am confident that this issue will get the attention it needs.
- Committee member comment: We should also look at the enrollment data in REGD courses.
  - Horn: We are facing challenges with GE enrollments more broadly. The Provost recently pointed out that 30% of the GE at OSU is being delivered through asynchronous courses. It is clear he is not enthusiastic about that number.
  - Martin: This is mostly happening outside of Arts and Sciences.
- Horn: If this committee wanted to express that in-person instruction is especially valuable for GE courses, that case could be made on the basis of protecting our curricular integrity and economic interest.
  - Committee member comment: There are serious concerns about asynchronous courses upholding academic integrity. There is a strong intersection between our educational values and the unchecked scale of online instruction.
  - Horn: There is also conversation to have about when asynchronous courses serve student populations we might not reach otherwise. However, delivering them at this scale starts to look like a budget solution rather than a pedagogical one. We should not be afraid to argue that in-person learning in the context of the GE is fundamental.
- Committee member comment: I want to come back to the civics requirement, because there is an important question around how many students will actually need to take it since the legislation allows it to be satisfied through College Credit Plus (CCP) and Advanced Placement (AP) courses. Do we know what proportion of incoming students already meet this requirement in one of these ways?

- Martin: A conservative estimate is around 5,000 students in an incoming class would need to take it, and around 3,000 students would already come in with the requirement fulfilled through CCP or a 3 on the AP U.S. History or Government exam.
- Horn: There is confusion in the law itself. On one hand, it specifies that students must read certain texts; on the other, it allows credit through generic U.S. history or government courses. It is not carefully written, so it matters how the university interprets that messiness.

There was concern that only Chase would teach these civics courses or that everyone has to teach the same thing in these courses, but we do not seem to be going that route. A main concern of mine is the impact these courses will have on the GE. It is one thing if the course doubles in the Historical and Cultural Studies Foundation, but it would be devastating if it replaced the category.

- Steele: If it double-counts, students will take the course that satisfies both requirements, so it *would* replace the category.
- Horn: I am expecting many of these courses' departments to make them GE courses, so I think everything will double count. We have to be careful about unintended consequences.
- Committee member question: If these courses become part of the GE, would this committee have curricular oversight?
  - Horn: I would think so, though the scope of this body's power over the GE has diminished over the years. There is concern from some about expanding the GE and from others about shrinking it. My personal view is that the GE is too small, and adding three credit hours is not a big deal.
    - Committee member comment: That impact could be serious for students who do not come in with CCP or AP credit.
- Committee member comment: When we are asked or encouraged by the state budget to review the GE to think about this focus on civics, we will say that we have recently reviewed our GE and citizenship is a huge part of it. Why then would the civics course not be housed within the Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World Theme? What the Chase Center and the legislation have offered so far are not courses, but discussion groups based on readings. Our robust curriculum requires more than that, and if we put the course into the Citizenship category where students do other substantial work, we can maintain our curricular integrity while responding to this outside initiative. We *already* have space in our GE to engage with civics, and we do it in a way that goes well beyond what the legislature is asking.



- Horn: We would have to consider what this would mean for the courses that are in the Citizenship category.
  - Committee member comment: That would constrain what Citizenship for Diverse and Just World means. It is broader than just a civics course. There are citizenship courses that do not focus on the U.S. at all.
  - Committee member comment: There are many places the civics requirement could fit but putting it into the Citizenship Theme would create a reductionist view of citizenship.
  - Nagar: Adding the civics courses to the GE would open it up to outside management.
- Committee member comment: What if we had a civics element embedded in the Citizenship Theme so that it aligns more clearly with the Foundations and builds on them? If this civics course becomes required at our university and thus is part of the GE, then we have to make sure it does not feel like it was simply inserted. What could *our* version of a civics course look like that aligns with the values of the GE?
- Martin: That is what departments are working on developing; they are just not incorporating them into the GE at this point. The question is, if we go to make the civics courses part of the GE, how do we do that in a way that reflects the robustness of the GE?
  - Committee member comment: Treating this course as outside the GE might serve us better. For one, this might not be a permanent requirement. Also, if students come in with AP or transfer credit for it, we do not want to lose revenue by having it take the place of something we teach. Most importantly, though, we lose intellectual authority in areas where AP dominates.
  - Committee member comment: We are not the only ones responding to this new civics requirement. Central Ohio Technical College (COTC) is already good at delivering a cookie-cutter course. They are going to run it in the summer, and we will see more and more students trying to get it done ahead of time. There is going to be pressure to get this done even in the K-12 space. The legislature has set this up for entities like CCP, AP, and COTC to take it over.
- Committee member comment: If we keep the civics course outside of the GE, students will start using the logic that they should take their *civics* course at the *Civics* Center, and that builds a different kind of authority. That is why we could rethink our GE framework to integrate the civics requirement broadly across academic units rather than being tied to a single center.
- Martin: I would be cautious about opening a path into the GE. Sure, we would get some control over the courses that way, but the reverse is true.

You open the door to outside influence and risk weakening the structure of the GE.

- Committee member comment: If we make it part of the GE and the Chase Center develops a course that genuinely meets the learning outcomes for Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World, then we would have to consider it.
- Committee member comment: I am thinking about the Launch courses, which have the exact same curriculum for every student and people are teaching several sections per term. I can see Chase running that same kind of cookie cutter course. If that happens, we will not have the chance to review or provide input on each of the sections. I would rather the people in this body who look at courses critically be involved in the development and management of the courses that are part of the civics requirement rather than having them be created by some other entity.
  - Martin: We can only have a say if it is a part of the GE. I have told Randy Smith that if there *is* going to be an approval process, then ASC needs to be at the table. We also need to think about how to message to students that they can take these courses through ASC and learn from disciplinary perspectives that align with their academic interests rather than taking a cookie-cutter course at the Chase Center.
- Martin: We need to take a long-term view of how we are going to deal with this shift over time. Again, I am on the committee that David put together, so I will take any thoughts to that body.
  - Committee member question: Do you have the sense that this university-level committee was configured top-down?
    - Martin: Randy Smith mentioned the Provost in relation to the committee being formed to look at SB1, so I am guessing it came from the top considering that David is on it and divisional deans are involved.
    - Committee member comment: It is encouraging that David and individual deans are on the committee, but I also wonder about the “on-the-ground” perspective that is missing, which is the perspective of the people who actually see how this all plays out in the classroom.
    - Martin: It is crucial to say that we need instructors involved. I told Randy that people are very concerned about this, and David is putting together this more diverse ad hoc group to provide useful discussion points.
  - Committee member question: Where do these new committees fit into the existing governance structure? How do they relate to the University or Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate?

- Martin: The college-level committee does include people from different groups. For example, Kristi Williams (Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs) and Heather Tanner (University Senate) are both on it. I am not sure about the university-wide committee, but the college one at least has some representation from different groups.
- Committee member comment: If I heard Dean Horn correctly, he felt uncomfortable about asynchronous GE courses. I think the message has been that our Subcommittees can look at that in terms of how discussions are happening and how participation is verified, but at the same time, once a course is approved as online, it is approved. We are limited in what we can do.
  - Committee member comment: We need to add designations into course proposals specifying synchronous versus asynchronous, so it is clear what the course was approved as.
    - Martin: This is something we should discuss at our first meeting in the fall. There have been concerns before, and the Provost is worried about how the volume of online courses is negatively affecting us.
  - Vankeerbergen: To complicate it further, we still have some of our own units offering courses online that were never approved as such.
  - Committee member comment: I was happy to hear that this is a concern. Sure, some if it is internal, but the bigger issue is units outside of the college offering these courses for budgetary reasons. That is why we need a process to ensure quality and academic integrity. This group can develop criteria and push back where needed.
  - Committee member comment: How do we make progress if we are not also talking about the budget model? The Provost needs to be told that if you are going to deliver budget through enrollment, then these issues will exist unless there are rules. All the incentives are pushing towards online instruction even if units do not necessarily *want* to go there. Maybe we need to have a rule about the percentage of online courses a unit can offer. The key is also continuous review so there is less risk of drop in rigor over time.
  - Committee member comment: There is nothing we can do about this until we distinguish between synchronous and asynchronous online delivery. We know that synchronous delivery supports student engagement, and it affects scalability—you cannot have a 2,000-student course with synchronous discussion. Right now, you list a course as “DL” and leave off a meeting time, and it is categorized as asynchronous. There is no separate process; if a course is approved as online it can be delivered synchronously or asynchronously.

- Committee member comment: The issue is not that one mode is bad, it is that we need high-quality standards for each mode that we can assess. Some courses might look acceptable on paper, but the depth and quality just are not there. We have to define the process.
- Approval of 04-18-2025 minutes
  - Vaessin, Cravens-Brown; approved with two abstentions.
- Informational item: Update to the Teaching of East Asian Languages and Literatures graduate certificate (Ila Nagar)
  - Nagar: The Department of East Asian Languages and Literatures has requested a change to a requirement in their Teaching of East Asian Languages and Literatures Certificate program. They are replacing the DEI Pedagogy Workshop with a more general teaching-related workshop. Given the sunset of the university's Office of Diversity and Inclusion and the state's legislative restrictions on DEI, they believe that this change is important to maintain the continuity of the certificate program.
- Subcommittee Reports
  - Arts and Humanities I
    - English 3306 – approved with contingency
    - French 1198 – approved
    - Ukrainian 1101 – approved with contingency
    - Ukrainian 1102 – approved with contingency
    - Ukrainian 1103 – approved with contingency
    - Ukrainian 2104 – approved with contingency
    - Classics 2207 – approved
    - Classics 3701 – approved with contingency
  - Arts and Humanities II
    - History 3678 – approved
    - EDUTL 3300 – approved with contingency
    - English 3261 – approved with contingency
    - Art Education 5677 – approved with contingency
  - Natural and Mathematical Sciences
    - Math 5638 – approved with contingency
    - Physics 1125 – approved
    - Biology 3050 – approved
  - Social and Behavioral Sciences
    - N/A
  - Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity
    - Ethnic Studies 2625 – approved
  - Themes I

- WGSS 2326 – approved
- Linguistics 3501– approved with contingency
- Italian 3051 – approved
- Themes II
  - Sociology 3200.02 – approved
  - History 2642 – approved with contingency
  - History 3560 – approved with contingency
  - History 3025 – approved
- ASCC Chair 2025-2026 (Andrew Martin)
  - Martin: Ila Nagar has expressed interest in continuing to serve in her role as Chair of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee. Unless further discussion is requested, we will proceed and vote with the understanding that she will remain as Chair of the Committee.
  - Vaessin, Fletcher; unanimous.