**ASCC SBS Panel**

Approved Minutes

Monday, February 20, 2017 9:45 -11:15 AM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Bitters, Givens, Haddad, Kline, Lam, Lenhart, Oldroyd, Roup, Vankeerbergen

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 2-6-17 minutes
* Roup, Givens, **approved with one abstention**
1. Political Science 3596.01 (return to panel; new course; requesting GE Cross-Disciplinary Seminar and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the US; both in-class and 100% distance learning request)
* Previously approved w/3 contingencies – then reworked (including content and title)
* **Contingency: The syllabi state on p. 2, “Final exam essays are due via Carmen by the beginning of the scheduled final exam time.” Change this to, “Final exams are due via Carmen by the end of the university-scheduled final exam time” for both the in-class and online offerings.**
* *Panel Questions:*
	+ *The course is listed as American Politics in the curriculum map, but email with department states that “less than 1/5 of the material is on the US.” Would the course be more appropriate as a Comparative Politics or International Relations course given the global perspective on crime and punishment?*
	+ *Are the midterms for the in-class course also available through Carmen?*
* **Given that the majority of the course content is not focused on the United States, the panel will not approve the course for Social Diversity in the US**
	+ *Recommendation: Resubmit with Diversity: Global Studies, which is a more appropriate GE category for the comparative examination of crime and punishment.*
* Roup, Givens, **unanimously approved (with GE Cross-Disciplinary Seminar but without GE Social Diversity in the US) with one contingency (in bold above)**, *one recommendation, and two questions (in italics above).*
1. First-year seminar – Mat Coleman
* *Recommendation: include class time on syllabus before offering course*
* Givens, Kline, **unanimously approved** *with one recommendation (in italics above)*
1. First-year seminar – Vladimir Kogan
* **Contingencies:**
	+ **Provide a description for the strategy memo assignment.**
	+ **Further develop the reading list and explain how readings will be provided.**
	+ **Clarify whether or not students should view the videos outside class. If so, explain how the students will access the HBO mini-series “Show Me a Hero.”**
	+ **Correct Weeks 12 and 13 on the syllabus, which currently have required readings listed as videos.**
* Roup, Givens, **unanimously approved** **with four contingencies (in bold above)**
1. Political Science 7781 (new course)
* *Recommendations:*
	+ *The panel recommends including a more precise prerequisite on curriculum.osu.edu form including course numbers for the methods sequence. The department can also add “permission of instructor” to the prerequisites.*
	+ *Recommend adding more detail on the requirements for the final project.*
	+ *Correct typo at bottom of page 3: “I have to baseline criteria…”*
* **Contingencies:**
	+ **Request a concurrence from Department of Linguistics**
	+ **Page 2 of the syllabus states that reading materials will be posted on Carmen, but no readings are listed in the syllabus. Please provide a reading list.**
* Roup, Lenhart, **unanimously approved with two contingencies (in bold above)** and *two recommendations (in italics above)*

1. Continue working on rubric for GE Social Science—Individuals and Groups
* Remove language previously developed for ELO 1, Capstone and adjust language for Benchmark, Milestone 1 and Milestone 2.
	+ ELO 1, Benchmark: Student can define and explain the key terms and concepts in the study of individuals and groups.
	+ ELO 1, Milestone 2: Student understands the methods of social scientific inquiry.
		- Milestone 2 will reflect ELO language since it is the minimum level of achievement.
	+ ELO 1, Milestone 3: Student can apply the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry to study of individuals and groups.
	+ ELO 1, Capstone: Student is able to analyze and evaluate the strengths and limitations of social scientific theories and methods, and use them to draw appropriate conclusions and inferences.
* ASCCAS will develop a draft with ELO 2 and 3 reflecting similar language
* This language assumes that students will at least meet Benchmark 1. If they achieve at a lower level, they should still be included as meeting Benchmark 1 since it is lower than the ELO standard of achievement. Additionally, students who exceed the Capstone expectations should be included as meeting Capstone achievement.