

## Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee

### Approved Minutes

Friday, October 24<sup>th</sup>, 2025

9:00AM – 11:00AM

University 156

**Attendees:** Acuff, Bitters, Dwyer, Gilbo, Heckler, Hedgecoth, Jenkins, Lee, Martin, Nagar, Romero, Sims, Søland, Staley, Steele, Tuxbury-Gleissner, Xiao, Vankeerbergen

### Agenda

- Approval of 10-03-2025 minutes
  - Hedgecoth, Søland; approved with three abstentions.
- Revision to the Greek and Latin MA/PhD (Guests: Alan Ross and Leah Bauer)
  - On Tuesday, September 30, 2025, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 2 reviewed a proposal from the Department of Classics to revise the PhD and Master of Arts programs in Greek and Latin, effective Autumn 2026. Classics proposes to add two new core courses. One of which, Classics 6001: Proseminar, will become a core requirement for both Candidacy and the Terminal MA, and one of which, Classics 6002: Professionalization Seminar, to become a core requirement for Candidacy (but not the Terminal MA). The department also proposes to formalize previously approved reductions in credit-hour weighting for four core courses and to revise the 7000-level seminar distribution from 3 Greek + 3 Latin to 2 Greek + 2 Latin + 2 Classics. The Subcommittee voted unanimously to approve the proposal and forwards it to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
  - Committee Member: How does the addition of the two Classics courses better prepare students for a career?
    - Ross: We are looking specifically at preparation for the tenure-track job market. Classics 6002 trains students in grant-writing, conference proposal development, and interviewing. The Society for Classical Studies conference is where first-round interviews often happen, so we include interview practice. The course was inspired in part by successful professionalization efforts in History and other humanities departments.
  - Committee Member: What do your job placements look like? What percentage of graduates ultimately go into tenure-track positions?
    - Ross: Like many humanities fields, many students go first into lectureships or postdocs. Tenure-track placements often occur four to five years after graduation. The overall job market in Classics has remained relatively steady compared with other humanities disciplines.

The major retrenchment occurred in the 1960s–70s when high-school Latin declined, which affected visibility and undergraduate enrollment, but the field has been stable since. We are a small department, but Classics programs nationwide also produce relatively few PhDs each year, so the ratio of graduates to available positions is fairly stable.

- Nagar: How many students will be affected by the change?
  - Ross: The change will not be applied retroactively; current students will not be affected. We recently adjusted our terms of offer and cohort size. We aim to admit three students per year, with some fluctuation, so we generally have around eighteen students enrolled at any given time.
- Letter of Motion, Dwyer; unanimously approved.
- Revision to the Computer Information Science BA and BS (Guests: Jeremy Morris and Nikki Strader)
  - On Thursday, October 9, 2025, the Natural and Mathematical Sciences Subcommittee reviewed a revised program request for the Computer and Information Science (CIS) BA and BS majors. The College of Engineering recently shifted to direct admission for incoming first-year CSE students, eliminating the previous pre-major model. This change prompted CSE to update its probation and dismissal policies for students who struggle in key courses. Because these updated procedures were not previously aligned with the CIS major in ASC, the revised CIS program request includes changes to synchronize the probationary and dismissal policies across the CSE and CIS majors.

The Subcommittee approved the proposal with the request that the department submit a follow-up report to ASC within the next one to two years on how the new policies are affecting CIS majors. The proposal is now advanced to the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee with a motion to approve.
  - Committee member: What prompted the shift from a pre-major model to direct admission?
    - Morris: We have wanted direct admission for a long time. Most peer institutions no longer use a pre-major system. Only a few engineering programs still do, usually due to capacity restrictions. Because of recent enrollment shifts, we were able to admit all current pre-majors and incoming students at once, giving us room to move to direct admission for both Engineering and Arts and Sciences students. Removing the pre-major also means we needed updated probation tools, since pre-major status was often where students self-selected out or were moved due to performance.
  - Committee member: Will the pre-major courses still be required?

- Morris: The former pre-major course is essentially the first major course. Students who perform poorly in it still get a strong signal about whether the major is a good fit. Under the new policy, failing any required major course triggers a warning and a required meeting with advising.
    - Nagar: Is failing the course the benchmark?
    - Morris: Yes. We were advised to consider using a D or D+ as the threshold, since the Colleges differ (Engineering counts Ds as passing; ASC requires C– or higher). We may adjust this for consistency.
- Nagar: How will students be informed of this change?
  - Morris: Messaging is delivered through the first-year engineering survey course for Engineering students. ASC students will receive supplemental communication from advising because their survey course structure differs.
- Nagar: How many students do you expect to be impacted?
  - We have already implemented this for Engineering students. With about 1,200 majors, we see a few dozen probation cases per semester, which is intentional and meant to catch students early. We have very few dismissals, though some students leave the major on their own. Dismissal refers to removal from the major, not necessarily from the college.
- Committee member: What is the difference between the CIS and CSE programs?
  - Morris: We offer a BA and BS in Computer Science (CIS), plus the BS in Computer Science and Engineering (CSE). All share the same core Computer Science curriculum. The BA combines computer science with substantial coursework in another discipline. The BS is more similar to the Bachelor of Science in Engineering degree but without the required hardware/circuits coursework. ASC students have foreign language requirements; Engineering students have additional engineering coursework.
- Committee member: What are the enrollment numbers between the ASC and Engineering versions?
  - Morris: Engineering is larger, but trends are shifting. We are exploring adjustments to the BS so it could also function more like the BA but with additional coursework in the natural sciences.
- Committee member: Do CIS students feel that the foreign language requirement is necessary?

- Morris: Students largely self-select. Those who want the language requirement choose the CIS degree; those who don't typically choose CSE. Our honors CIS students often intentionally choose CIS for the language component.
  - Committee member: How often do students switch between CIS and CSE?
    - Morris: It happens, but not frequently. Students who switch usually do so early due to the additional engineering requirements in CSE. We see a few cases each year in both directions.
  - Committee member: The NMS Subcommittee discussed “missed opportunities” for collaboration. Has the department explored deeper engagement with Arts and Sciences on advising or curriculum?
    - Morris: Yes. Our advisors work closely with Arts and Sciences advisors, and some ASC advisors are embedded in our department specifically for CIS students. Because the department sits outside ASC, we are disconnected from many ASC conversations, but we want to be more involved. We have been overwhelmed with demand and often had to limit enrollment—sometimes no one below a 3.3 GPA could get in due to space. Now that enrollment has shifted, we hope to accept all students who want the major and to broaden outreach rather than restrict access.
  - Committee member: How do you plan to address the contingency from the NMS Subcommittee regarding the benchmark grade?
    - Morris: We will discuss it in our Undergraduate Studies meeting.
  - Letter of Motion, Hedgecoth; unanimously approved.
- English major informational item (I. Nagar)
  - Nagar: The Department of English requested approval for minor changes to the Creative Writing specialization requirements. Advisors reported ongoing issues with the degree audit system misassigning Creative Writing workshops across requirement categories labeled “2000-level or higher” and “3000-level or higher.” Because workshops may count in multiple places, the system frequently places upper-level workshops into lower-level categories, leaving lower-level workshops uncouned. This has caused confusion for students and advisors tracking progress toward graduation. To resolve this problem and to better reflect the intended curricular structure, advisors recommended clarifying each category with fixed course levels. The revision removes the “or higher” language at the 2000- and 3000-level workshop requirements to ensure appropriate course sequencing and resolve recurring degree audit issues.
- Concurrence (I. Nagar)

- Nagar: There are two items for which Meg Daly, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education, is requesting feedback for ULAC, the University-Level Advisory Committee. We are not making decisions today—just providing input. The first topic is concurrence. The OAA Handbook outlines concurrence policies, but there are questions about how they should function. If two units offer similar courses, they should talk and try to work out concurrence. If they cannot, the issue goes to the college dean, and then to OAA. Dr. Daly's question is: What should it mean when a unit says *no* to concurrence? For example, what should happen when two courses covering very similar content have not granted each other concurrence?
  - Committee member: Is this question what criteria departments should use to grant or deny concurrence? Or what ASCC subcommittees should do when a proposal reaches us without concurrence?
  - Nagar: The question is: What should ASCC do when a concurrence request is denied and what criteria should units use?
  - Committee member: If the answer is no, does the proposal get stopped before it reaches us?
    - Vankeerbergen: If a proposal comes in with a denial of concurrence, the preferred approach is not to put that on a subcommittee. It would go back to the units and Andrew to resolve. We try to keep the negotiation at the unit/administrative level.
- Committee member: We have seen cases like the Leadership major, where some units did not give concurrence, but the proposal went forward anyway. That makes concurrence feel more like a courtesy that builds understanding, rather than a firm rule. If the answer is no, I tend to think the unit should revise and clarify the proposal so it can come back and hopefully get to yes.
  - Vankeerbergen: To me, concurrence is a blend of courtesy and policy. It is more than a simple FYI, but not an automatic veto. I have seen rare cases where a course stopped entirely because another unit said no, but most often it is a mechanism to encourage conversation and differentiation.
- Committee member: Are we being asked whether we would support strengthening the concurrence policy? Because without a stronger policy, it can feel like units are compelled to grant concurrence without any real ability to stop a course. However, if the policy is strengthened, it could be used against everyone, including ASC, especially as we see more encroachment on Arts and Sciences units.

- Vankeerbergen: Interdisciplinarity and the GEN Themes have made boundaries fuzzier because the structure of the Themes pushes overlap by design.
- Nagar: ULAC's policy group is seeking input on concurrence across the colleges.
- Committee member: This is also about the university's commitment to faculty governance. If we develop rules with real consequences, will they actually be observed and applied consistently? We have seen situations where a discipline lacked the rigor to teach the subject. If a unit denies concurrence, would that be respected up the chain? Likewise, who protects ASC when other units deny our proposals?

I do not think concurrence should be purely informational. It should have enough force to derail some proposals where disciplinary boundaries really matter. But it should not function as an automatic veto that allows a unit to sit indefinitely on a topic that another unit might teach from a different perspective. ASCC could be an appropriate place to interpret concurrence disputes within ASC, with a higher-level body doing so when cross-college issues arise.

- Committee member: We also have to acknowledge that enrollment-based budgeting fuels these conflicts, especially in social sciences, history, philosophy, and related fields that feel particularly encroached upon.
- Nagar: The last concurrence question is whether courses that shift from non-GE to GE, or from Foundations to Themes, should go back out for concurrence again.
  - Vankeerbergen: In theory, that would reflect new breadth and potential enrollment shifts, but in practice it would dramatically increase the volume of concurrence requests. Many ASC courses have already moved into Themes without re-requested concurrence. Often the concern is that when a course was conceived in Unit A, Unit B granted concurrence because the course would be strictly aimed at students in Unit A's major. However, when Unit A subtly alters that existing course in order to add it to the General Education, Unit B might now be concerned that it would appeal to more students and draw enrollments away from their GE course in the same/similar category.
  - Committee member: This is idealistic, but concurrence should be based on curricular overlap, not concerns about funding.
  - Committee member: Practically, though, we need to understand that this is going to have an outsized effect on some units.

- S/U Transfer Courses (I. Nagar)
  - Nagar: The second topic is whether pass/fail or S/U transfer courses should be allowed to count toward the GE. Right now, nonstandard grades are eligible for transfer evaluation, but the question is whether they should be permitted to count toward GE requirements.
    - Vankeerbergen: Is this S/U only, or also pass/fail?
    - Jenkins: Both. Institutions use different systems, so we see both.
  - Nagar: I am not in favor of allowing pass/fail courses to count toward the GE. First, it affects credit-hour generation for ASC units and others. Second, it lowers rigor; a pass could mean a D+, and that's not appropriate for GE outcomes.
  - Committee member: What are we currently doing?
    - Jenkins: Currently, students here cannot use pass/fail for GE courses, but transfer students arrive with P/N or S/U grades from institutions that encourage or require it. If we refuse that credit, we force students to retake courses even though they were encouraged to take it S/U at their home institution. According to the Registrar, we have no way to tell whether a student chose S/U or was required to take it that way.
  - Nagar: Is there a way to treat the GEN Foundations and Themes differently? For example, maybe S/U could be allowed for Foundations in limited circumstances but not for Themes because they are more advanced.
    - Committee member: I can see a case for allowing S/U for certain Foundations—especially English 1110, since many institutions use S/U as a transition tool for first-year writing.
  - Nagar: Thank you all for your feedback. I will take this forward and share updates when available.
- ASL major informational item (A. Martin)
  - Martin: The ASL major we approved, originally titled “American Sign Language Access, Equity, Inclusion”, was flagged by ODHE for the title. There seems to be a growing distinction between how existing curriculum is treated versus new curriculum. Existing programs continue to operate as usual, but new ones are encountering closer scrutiny. I met with Randy Smith and our government affairs liaison to go through the concerns. We emphasized issues of access and the fact that the Deaf community faces structural barriers to participation, so the curriculum's focus is appropriate. Nonetheless, ODHE raised concerns about terminology, so we made minor adjustments. The revised title is “American Sign Language Applied Communication and Community Studies”. A few course titles were also modified.

- Vankeerbergen: None of these changes alter the actual curriculum. It is essentially the same major with some wording adjustments to address ODHE's concerns.
  - Martin: Looking ahead, upcoming majors are unlikely to raise similar issues, but this one sits directly in areas the state is watching closely. We will need to monitor how ODHE staff respond.
- Recording in Classes (A. Martin)
  - Martin: In a previous ASCC meeting, we mistakenly said instructors could ban recording in the classroom because it was in the Ohio Revised Code, but that language applied to one college that has a carveout for this. Every public institution in Ohio has its own section of the Revised Code, and this college included a provision stating that recording in the classroom is not permitted. According to Legal Affairs. Ohio is a one-party consent state, which means a person can record without the other party's consent. We would prefer to have the option to prohibit recording unless required for accessibility, and we are hoping OSU Legal can help us determine what is possible. The legal advice for now is that we cannot create a blanket policy banning recording. I have raised these concerns with Randy Smith, particularly scenarios where a student records class content, posts it online, or even sells it. We want tools to maintain control of classroom content.
    - Committee member: I worry about students recording lectures or using AI to manipulate recordings. I also have heard concerns from students who feel unable to speak freely in class if they believe they are being recorded.
- Subcommittee Updates
  - Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 1
    - English 1110.03 – approved
    - English 3380 – approved with contingency
    - AAAS 2050 – approved
    - Music 2050 – approved
    - English 3260 – approved
    - AAAS 3460 – approved with contingency
    - Music 3460 – approved with contingency
  - Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 2
    - WGSS 3660 – approved
    - Near Eastern Languages and Cultures 3535 – approved with contingency
    - AAAS 4343 – approved
    - Religious Studies 4343 – approved
  - Natural and Mathematical Sciences Subcommittee



- Geodetic Sciences 5652 – approved with contingency
- Social and Behavioral Sciences Subcommittee
  - Psychology 2303 – approved
  - Civics, Law, and Leadership 2110 – approved with contingency
- Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity Subcommittee
  - N/A
- Themes Subcommittee 1
  - Chinese 4409 – approved with contingency
- Themes Subcommittee 2
  - Comparative Studies 4444 – approved with contingency
  - Classics 4401 – approved with contingency
  - ASL 4189S – approved with contingency