**ASCC SBS Panel**

Approved Minutes

Monday, March 6, 2017 9:45 -11:15 AM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Givens, Haddad, Kaylor, Lam, Lenhart, Oldroyd, Roup, Valle, Vankeerbergen

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 2-20-17 minutes

* Lenhart, Roup, unanimously approved

1. International Studies 3350 (existing course with GE Historical Study, GE Social Science--Human, Natural, and Economic Resources & GE Diversity-Global Studies; requesting 100% DL)

* **Syllabus:**
  + **Explain how online participation will be evaluated. Page 2 of the syllabus states that students “will receive credit for participating in this collective exercise to follow relevant political developments abroad,” but does not establish specific criteria for participation.**
  + **Students are instructed to “consult the schedule for exact dates” for mini-papers on page 2, but the due dates for mini-papers are not included in the course schedule. The panel would like to see the due dates for the mini-papers in the course schedule.**
  + **Pages 2 and 6 of the syllabus state, “This course can be applied to the three following General Education (GE) categories.…” Change this to “This course fulfills the requirements for the following General Education (GE) categories.…” Students cannot apply this course to all three categories simultaneously. (Only GE Diversity can overlap with another category). These statements also occur on pages 2 and 5 of in-class syllabus.**
  + **The panel would like to know how exam security will be guaranteed for this course. For instance, are exams timed?**
  + *Correct two typos on page 2. One states that there are “four mini-papers, one for each of the six blocks.” The second typo says “county-specific” instead of “country-specific.”*
* **Assessment plan:** 
  + **Page 2 of the assessment plan defines mastery on the pre- and post- tests as “improving by at least 75 percentage points on an assignment.” The panel would like to know how this will be calculated. Furthermore, panel would like to see examples of pre- and post- test questions.**
  + **Mini-paper writing assignments are also used as an assessment method, but no sample writing prompts were provided. Please provide sample prompts to show how these writing assignments will be tailored to the GE Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs).**
  + **Page 2 of the assessment plan mentions a rubric for scoring the writing assignments. Panel would like to clarify if this rubric is the scoring rubric on page 6 of the syllabus. If so, this rubric is not appropriate for GE assessment because it is not related to GE ELOs. The assessment plan also states, “Mastery will be defined as receiving at least 75% on an assignment.” Assignment grades are not usually appropriate measures for GE ELO success because factors other than pure fulfillment of ELOs factor in when giving grades on assignments. Rubrics are the preferred measure for determining GE ELO success.**
  + *Page 2 of the assessment plan states that “Only the first two assessment instruments are used to determine the percentage of students who master a particular ELO.” The panel recommends also using indirect assessment to calculate student mastery of ELOs.*
* Roup, Lenhart, **unanimously approved** **with seven contingencies (in bold above)** *and two recommendations (in italics above).*

1. Political Science 4200 (existing course; requesting 100% DL)

* **Students are instructed to “consult the schedule for exact dates” for the exams on page 3, but the exam dates are not included in the course schedule. The panel would like to see the exam dates in the course schedule. This is also an issue for the in-class syllabus.**
* **The panel would like to know how exam security will be guaranteed for this course. For instance, are exams timed?**
* **Explain how online participation will be evaluated. Page 2 of the syllabus states that students “will receive credit for participating in this collective exercise to follow relevant political developments abroad,” but does not establish specific criteria for participation. Additionally, the panel recommends correcting a mistake that states “county-specific” instead of “country-specific” in the participation criteria on page 2.**
* Givens, Roup, **unanimously approved with three contingencies (in bold above).**

1. Communication 3325 (existing course; requesting 100% DL)

* **Panel would like clarification on question types on the quizzes (for example: true and false, multiple choice, short answer). Depending on the quiz questions and course pedagogy, the School of Communication may want to consider making these quizzes timed to ensure exam safety.**
* *Panel wonders whether there are readings for weeks 10 and 11 of the online course. The panel also noticed that multiple weeks of the in-class syllabus are lacking in specific information on topics.*
* *The weeks in the course schedule starting with week 10 are improperly labelled. Week 10 has no label, week 11 is labelled as week 10, and week 12 is labelled as week 11.*
* Roup, Givens, **unanimously approved with one contingency (in bold above)** *and two recommendations (in italics above).*

1. Communication 1101 (existing course with GE Social Science—Individuals and Groups; requesting 100% DL)

* *In the Course Learning Outcomes section of both in-class and online syllabi, quarter-based GEC language is used. Remove the GEC language that says, “GEC course in Category 2, Breadth, B. Social Science, subcategory (1) Individuals and Groups.” Replace this with “GE Social Science – Individuals and Groups.”*
* *The table on page 6 includes a comment that says, “This instruction is different from the other syllabus>>>?” Panel recommends removing this comment.*
* *The information on C-REP participation on both syllabi refers to Communication 1100 instead of Communication 1101.*
* *Page 6 of the online syllabus mentions a 12-hour grace period for late assignments. Communication 3325 gives a 2-hour grace period for late assignments. Is the 12-hour grace period for Communication 1101 a typo? The 12-hour grace period is also in the in-class syllabus.*
* *Page one of the GE Rationale includes an incomplete sentence which starts off with “This also matches a key course objective of”*
* Roup, Givens, **unanimously approved** *with five recommendations/comments (in italics above).*

1. Political Science 1165 (existing course with GE Social Science—Organizations and Polities; requesting 100% DL)

* This course is typically taught on regional campuses and not on Columbus campus. Therefore, no in-class syllabus was provided for this course.
* *The statement on academic misconduct on page 2 of the syllabus includes an incorrect link. Correct this link to “http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/”*
* *Since this is a first-year level course, students may not be familiar with OSU standard grading scale. The panel recommends including the OSU standard grading scale in the syllabus.*
* Lenhart, Roup, **unanimously approved** *with two recommendations (in italics above)*

1. First-year seminar—Kevin Passino

* **Panel would like a better explanation of the course content. In particular, a better description of anti-poverty technology and the course outline is needed.**
* **Panel would like further explanation of assignment requirements and the weight of each assignment in the course.**
* Lenhart, Givens, **unanimously approved with two contingencies (in bold above)**.