

Dear Steve,

After receiving your addendum revisions to the Spanish Major Revision proposal on 5/9, the Humanities College Curriculum Committee (HUM CCC) discussed the proposal at their very next meeting which took place this past Friday (5/30). The proposal documents and history can be seen at: <http://artsandsciences.osu.edu/currofc/tracking.cfm?TrackingID=1138>

The committee felt that creating tracks was a good idea and that the proposal in general was a good one. They did, however, have several questions and suggestions intended to strengthen the proposal before it goes to the next approval level (CCI Subcommittee B). While they felt they could not approve it at the meeting, all agreed that they would like to approve it, if possible, before summer so that it can go on the Sub B agenda first thing in the fall. Below is their feedback. If you can send a response to me, I will forward it out to the committee for an e-mail vote. They were hopeful for a fast turnaround so they could approve the proposal. Please let me know if this might be possible for you to do and/or if you have any questions. I have copied Julia Watson and Chris Highley, the chair of the HUM CCC as well.

1. Revisions to Spanish Major vote postponed -- if received quickly, HUM CCC would like to electronically consider for approval before summer break
  1. Are there provisions in place if students wish to switch tracks? How would this be facilitated? Please clarify. **THIS IS NOW DETAILED IN THE PROPOSAL.**
2. Immersion requirement includes 689 Spanish in Ohio : Committee wondered if the rigor or 698 was comparable to other immersion courses is 100 field contact hours enough? Committee recognized that it does provide an important opportunity for students who choose not to leave the state for whatever reason. Please expand on rigor/content of 689 vis a vis other immersion options. **PLEASE REFER TO FOOTNOTE 1, WHERE THIS IS ANSWERED. NOTE AS WELL THAT STUDENTS CANNOT BE FORCED TO STUDY ABROAD, AND 689 WAS CREATED AS A "BEST ALTERNATIVE" FOR SUCH STUDENTS.**
3. All were impressed with 80% study abroad statistic (15-25 credit hours) **WE HAVE REMOVED THE NUMBERS SINCE WE CANNOT CONFIRM THEM, BUT THE FIGURE IS MOST LIKELY CLOSER TO 90%, GIVEN THE ENROLLMENTS IN 689.**
4. Committee discussed at length whether the proposed addition of 5 credit hours had a strong enough justification. They provided several questions and suggestions that may help strengthen justification: **ALL OF THESE POINTS ARE NOW MOOT: THE ADDITION OF 5 CREDIT HOURS IS NO LONGER BEING PROPOSED. RATHER, THE MAJOR WILL REMAIN AT 50 CREDIT HOURS, AS BEFORE.**

~~\_\_\_\_\_ i. In comparison to semester-based university requirements as listed in proposal addendum, most do not reach 50. (Response Document, section A.e.) Do the benchmark programs include intro language course credits? This might put OSU program more in line with upper credit limit of benchmarks since OSU Spanish major does not include 20 hours of intro language and could make being on the high end of benchmark credit hour requirements more justifiable.~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ ii. Does a higher number of credit hours necessarily mean a better quality program? The logic of this argument was not readily apparent. Are other language programs at OSU at 50? Is this an upward trend among OSU language major requirements?~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ iii. Does addition of 5 credit hours have to do with an increase in incoming student AP credit beyond the 100-level?~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ iv. Does department see the need to further increase level of student language proficiency and if so, why?~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ v. Due to AP and study abroad credit totals, is department trying to ensure a certain base-line amount of time in OSU for purposes of quality?~~

~~\_\_\_\_\_ vi. Are there additional reasons in recent self study that could be used toward the rationale?~~

1. Clarification on sample student 4-year plan: 103.66 is listed can students still enter with 103? Was this just one example? (see Response Document A.d.) If this is just an example, please make sure this is not compulsory or ambiguous on advising sheets. Consider stating something like, 103.66 (or equivalent) **IT WAS ALREADY STATED THERE THAT THE STUDENT MAY PLACE INTO A HIGHER OR LOWER LEVEL. ADVISING SHEETS ALREADY TAKE THIS INTO ACCOUNT.**

2. Course Change Spanish 650 looked good

3. Course Change Spanish 660

**THIS SYLLABUS HAS BEEN CHANGED TO REFLECT A DIFFERENT COURSE.**