

From: [Haddad, Deborah](#)
To: [James Fredal](#)
Cc: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
Subject: RE: Neurosciences BS Semester Conversion Proposal
Date: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 8:31:54 PM
Attachments: [Neuroscience Major Proposal.docx](#)

Hi, Jim,

Thanks so much for getting back with me on the CCI Sciences Subcommittee's review of the proposed Neuroscience major. We appreciate the opportunity to address the very positive and constructive remarks. The proposal is scheduled to be reviewed by the full CCI committee on May 13th and, as you know, will be re-entered into the PACER system before then.

John Bruno, the lead for the Neuroscience program development team, and I are able to address the concerns of the Subcommittee through this email message. Please find below in red the responses to the Subcommittee's contingencies. I have attached a revised version of the proposal that will be uploaded into PACER, as well.

Please let me know if you have questions or need clarification.

Deborah

Deborah Haddad, PhD
Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Affairs
Social and Behavioral Sciences
The Ohio State University
Office: 614.292.4435
FAX: 614.247.7498
Haddad.2@osu.edu

From: James Fredal [mailto:james.fredal@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, April 20, 2011 5:24 PM
To: Haddad, Deborah
Cc: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Subject: Neurosciences BS Semester Conversion Proposal

From: James Fredal, CCI Sciences Subcommittee Chair
To: Deborah Haddad, ASC Assistant Dean
Re: Neuroscience BS Semester Conversion Proposal

Date: April 11, 2011

Deborah:

The Social, Behavioral, Biological, Mathematical and Physical Sciences Subcommittee of the Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI) met on April 4th to discuss the Semester Conversion Proposal for the Neurosciences BS degree and approved it unanimously contingent upon a few corrections and queries. The proposal will now go forward to the full CCI for review. I've summarized and numbered the subcommittee's comments below.

1) On the PACER chart

- a. By our count, the credit hour explanation should be 36 rather than 48. Could this be checked?
✓ This will be corrected to 36 when re-entered into PACER.
- b. There appears to be a typographical error on Program Learning Goal number four (4) as well as on p. 4 of the actual proposal. It now reads "able to engage critical reading" but perhaps should read "engage in critical reading."

- ✓ This will be corrected in PACER. The correction has been made to page 4 in the attachment as well.
- 2) The list of courses for the Molecular/Cellular Track (Appendix A, p. 10 of the proposal) includes four courses at the graduate (7000) level. The committee wondered whether this presented course work too advanced for undergraduate majors.
 - ✓ The issue here is an important one that the development team had considered in the shaping of the program. I don't think it makes sense to address it in the proposal itself, but it is well worth an explanation during a presentation in the vetting process. John Bruno will point out, first, that this specialization's requirements still can be met without the graduate-level courses. Moreover, John also will point out that instructors of those courses have indicated that, given the strong core requirements of the proposed major, students can be successful in them.
- 3) On the sample Four-Year Plans
 - a. It isn't clear how many research hours can be included in the major. Does Research 4998 fulfill part of the requirement for a track, or is it used as an elective?
 - ✓ Again, we feel that this should not be part of the proposal as an historical document. We do agree, however, that this is an important point to be addressed during a presentation of the proposed major. The proposal is clear about the possibility of using research hours to satisfy one of the two required breadth requirement. The proposal also mentions in several places that faculty advisors will encourage students to add research to their programs where possible. The proposed major, despite its rigorous requirements, leaves plenty of room for students to choose research for their non-major electives. John Bruno intends to make this point during his presentation.
 - b. There appears to be a typographical error on the Molecular/Cellular Track (p. 14): EEOB 4450 should be 4550.
 - ✓ This has been corrected on page 14 of the attachment which will appear for the full Committee via PACER.
 - c. The first semester of the plan should include the Freshman Survey course (1 cr.). This will increase the total hours, semester hours, and yearly hours by one credit each.
 - ✓ This has been corrected in the attachment which will appear for the full Committee via PACER.
 - d. The Required Hours by Specialization chart lists the Core as 15 hours, but the courses on the advising sheet add up to 17 hours. Perhaps this should be checked? The chart as well as the advising sheet list Data Analysis as 5 credit hours. Should this be 3 credit hours?
 - ✓ Yes. This has been corrected in the attachment which will appear for the full Committee via PACER.
- 4) The proposal should probably clarify which courses in the major are new and which are pre-existing.
 - ✓ This will not appear in the proposal. In response to the Subcommittee's concern, however, all courses are in PACER as existing courses.

As you can see, these are all minor and non-substantial corrections and given that these points are addressed we will forward the proposal to the full CCI with a recommendation for approval.

If you have any questions about the sub-committees comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thanks very much

Jim F.

Cc: Bernadette Vankeerbergen

--

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