**ASCC A&H1 Panel**

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, March 29, 2017 1:30 -3:00 PM

352 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Aski, Bitters, Kaylor, Oldroyd, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vankeerbergen

No quorum: Two voting members present will vote on proposals and minutes will then be circulated electronically to obtain votes from Kay Bea Jones and Norah Zuniga-Shaw.

[Follow-up note: All votes were approved by Kay Bea Jones and Norah Zuniga-Shaw on 4/4/17 and 4/5/17, respectively. The votes of the Panel were thus made official.]

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 3-10-17 minutes

* Approved

1. NELC 2220.02 (new course; 100% DL version of existing course with GE Cultures and Ideas & GE Diversity-Global Studies)

* Online courses aren’t required to have the same amount of lecture hours, but should have equivalent contact hours (when one also considers online activity/participation).
* **The online version of the course does not seem to meet the same standards of the in-class version. There are 3 vehicles of assessment in the online version vs. 6 in the in-class version. The online course loses many of the assignments from the in-class course that could be adapted to the online version (i.e. presentations, mind maps, and editorials). The online version relies on discussion responses for 55% of the course grade. The panel would like to see assignments that match the standards set by the in-class course.**
* **The grade calculations summary on page 5 lists a movie quiz and the assessment plan for GE Cultures and Ideas also mentions a movie quiz. The description of quizzes on page 4 does not describe the quizzes as movie quizzes. Clarify what the assignment is.**
* **GE assessment plan:**
  + **The assessment plan provided is first and foremost a course assessment plan, not a GE assessment plan. Each GE expected learning outcome (ELO) should be linked to at least one direct method of assessment and preferably also an indirect method of assessment. Consider using the table provided in the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual p. 49** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/sites/asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC\_CurrAssess\_Operations\_Manual.pdf**](https://asccas.osu.edu/sites/asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC_CurrAssess_Operations_Manual.pdf) **Then, underneath that, for each ELO, provide one or more specific examples for each assessment method used. (In the information provided by the Dept of NELC, when an assignment question is provided, it is not quite clear what GE ELO it ties to—or for that matter, whether it ties to any specific ELO or more generally the whole GE category as it intersects with the thematic of the course.)**
  + **The expected level for student achievement is not well defined. How will the department measure “if 75% of the students can perform at 50% of the ideal student’s performance…”? Consider using a rubric specific for the expected learning outcomes of each GE category.**
  + **The description of the follow-up/feedback process also seems to tie more to course goals rather than GE expected learning outcomes. (What is APC?)**
  + **A sample GE assessment plan will be provided as an example.**
* **No vote**

1. NELC 3504 (new course; requesting GE Cultures and Ideas)

* **Grade breakdown and assignment descriptions are unclear. The description of the presentation states that the presentation has two components: a textual analysis handout and an in-class presentation. The assignment description then mentions an essay (that needs to be e-mailed) but does not explain if it is related to the presentation. Clarify if the presentation is a two or three-part assignment. Also, provide more information on the requirements for the Textual Analysis Handout, presentation, essay, and essay exams.**
* **Syllabus includes two sections on class participation, one on page 2 and one on page 3. Panel also wonders if the Woody Allen quote (“80% of success is showing up”) might suggest to students that attendance rather than active participation is sufficient for their participation grade.**
* **The assessment plan provided is essentially a course assessment plan, not a GE assessment plan. Provide one or two specific methods of assessment for each expected learning outcome (ELO) with specific examples of questions for each method. Do not use assignment grades for GE assessment since most often factors other than fulfillment of a GE ELO influence a grade for an assignment. Prefer a rubric tied to the GE ELOs. The rubric for evaluating essays does not address GE ELOs; it is a rubric that evaluates the quality of writing—not the fulfillment of GE ELOs. The description of the follow-up/feedback process also seems to tie more to course goals than to GE expected learning outcomes. A sample GE assessment plan will be provided as an example.**
* *Panel recommends including due dates for papers and presentations in the course schedule.*
* *The course policies section on page 3 says that readings will be available in a course packet. No course packet is mentioned under readings on page 2. Furthermore, the use of computers is forbidden in the classroom (see p. 3) but p. 2 states that all articles and primary readings are on the course website. Panel noticed a bit of disorganization in the syllabus. That is, for example, the case for the repetition of class participation sections. Additionally, the panel noticed numerous typos and an incomplete sentence at the top of page 3, which begins “Further instructions on class paper assignments can be found on the assignment handouts and course…”*
* *Disability statement used includes the previous location in Pomerene Hall. Update the disability statement to include the new location at 098 Baker Hall. See p. 15 of ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual for the correct disability statement* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/sites/asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC\_CurrAssess\_Operations\_Manual.pdf*](https://asccas.osu.edu/sites/asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC_CurrAssess_Operations_Manual.pdf)

*“Students with disabilities (including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions) that have been certified by the Office of Student Life Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office of Student Life Disability Services is located in 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Avenue; telephone 614-292-3307,* [*slds@osu.edu*](mailto:slds@osu.edu)*;* [*slds.osu.edu*](http://slds.osu.edu/#_blank)*.”*

* **No definite vote. Preliminary feedback compiled above and discussion will be continued at next panel meeting.**

1. Uzbek 2101 (course change; credit hour change from 3 to 4 cr)

* *Remove the line on page 2 that says “General Education: This course is a general elective course.” This course is not a General Education course, and students may find this line confusing.*
* *60% is repeated on the grading scale for both a D and an E. Clarify what grade students will receive with a 60%.*
* **Approved** *with two recommendations (in italics above)*

1. Philosophy 2340 (new course; requesting GE Cultures and Ideas)

* The panel is impressed with the GE assessment plan.
* *Syllabus needs to include the GE Cultures and Ideas goals in addition to the expected learning outcomes.* 
  + *“Goals: Students evaluate significant cultural phenomena and ideas in order to develop capacities for aesthetic and historical response and judgement; and interpretation and evaluation.”*
* **Approved** *with one recommendation*

1. Dual graduate degrees: MA WGSS & MA JGC / MA WGSS & MPA JGC

* Panel finds it odd that comparatively few required credits are from WGSS. They also noted that both units agreed to the configuration, and that the degrees adhere to Graduate School rules for dual degrees.
* Panel sees this proposal as more a GIS or graduate minor rather than MA in WGSS.
* **Where will students get advising to make sure the courses are coherently chosen in WGSS?**
* **Provide a rationale as to why most of the Dual Credit courses in section C are from JGC. What is the rationale for the unequal distribution of credits?**
* **Panel is assuming that units spoke with representatives of the Graduate School but would like clarification on how some decisions were made. For example, what is the rule that says the Dual Credit courses must equal 50% of the larger degree?**
* Panel will need answers to these questions in order to present proposal at ASCC.
* **Approved with three contingencies (in bold above)**