

From: [James Fredal](#)
To: [Petty, Richard](#)
Cc: [Mumy, Gene](#); [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#); [James Fredal](#)
Subject: Semester Conversion Psychology Proposal
Date: Friday, December 03, 2010 12:50:50 AM

Richard:

The Sciences subcommittee of the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction has reviewed the conversion proposal for the BA and BS majors. We had a number of questions about the proposal.

1. The first few concerns have to do with the learning goals
 - a. The program learning goals on the first page of PACER and the learning outcomes mentioned in the actual proposal (at the end of the document “List of semester courses in the program) are not, but should be, the same.
 - b. Program learning goal #1 (“Students obtain knowledge across a broad spectrum of content domains”) as well as learning outcomes #1 (“foundation in the discipline”) and #3 (“advanced knowledge in the discipline”) following the course listing appear very broad, largely content independent, and difficult to measure. Learning outcomes should be more specifically tied to course content and course offerings.
 - c. Most courses satisfy learning outcomes 1 & 3. The other learning outcomes are not much represented. Will there be a problem providing courses that address the other learning outcomes to students on a regular basis? If semester courses are taught less frequently, as may happen, there is a concern that not all learning outcomes will be represented sufficiently through coursework to ensure that each student receives instruction in all learning outcomes.
2. More generally, will faculty be able to deliver all their courses on a regular rotation if the program is converting all quarter courses to semester versions? Are they going to add more faculty to be able to offer all those courses? Will students be able to graduate in a timely manner? The department could, for example, provide a preliminary model schedule for the first few semesters and years.
3. The assessment plan reference (on p. 2 of PACER form) does not give information on how they are assessing the majors. Will the changes, for example in the number of core area requirements, require any revisions to the assessment plan to ensure that all learning outcomes are addressed?
4. The transition policy is quite general; more specific information concerning especially any expected rise in demand for advising during the transition would be welcome.
5. Finally, the question (p. 2 of Pacer): “Does this program have a pre-major?” is answered in the negative. Is this accurate? Isn’t there currently a pre-major for Psychology. If indeed the pre-major is being removed, is there a rationale for this?

We invite you to respond with revisions to the proposal and/or additional explanation in

response to these questions.

If you have any questions about our deliberations or our questions, I'd be happy to talk further with you about the proposal.

Thanks very much.

--

James Fredal
Assoc. Professor, English
Adviser, Speech and Debate Team
The Ohio State University