**ASCC SBS Panel**

Approved Minutes

Friday, November 8, 2019 9:30 -11:00 AM

110 Denney Hall

ATTENDEES: Coleman, Guada, Haddad, Harrod, Kline, Valle, Vankeerbergen, Vasey

1. Approval of 10-25-19 minutes
	* Vasey, Coleman, **unanimously approved**
2. Food, Culture, and Society Certificate (new)
	* The panel appreciates the clear connection to ELOs and the portfolio model.
	* *Upload the request for concurrence that was initially sent to the Dept of Food Science and Technology & add a note that no response was received within two weeks.*
	* *ASC advising sheet on pp. 14-15: Under “Food, Culture, and Society Certificate guidelines”*
		+ *Delete “Required for certificate: Yes”*
		+ *Instead of “Max 50% overlap with major program courses” write “Max 50% overlap with courses in a degree program (i.e. major, minor, other certificate, or GE)”*
		+ *Top of p. 15: Replace “college/school counselor” with “college/school advisor.”*
	* *P. 18: Add “send” in the following sentence: “Upon completion of the classes, students will in portfolio to FCS-CRT advisor to demonstrate . . . “*
	* Coleman, Guada, **unanimously approved** *with comments (in italics above)*
3. Psychology 6880 (new course)
	* *The course is able to count as a 3-credit hour course if desired. Indeed, the contact hours posted on the syllabus correspond to a 3-credit hour course. Clarify the intention of the department.*
	* **Clarify if there is a final project paper. A final project paper is mentioned at the end of the syllabus but not in the course grade break down.**
	* **Include the list of readings or clarify whether the presenters will assign the readings. Preferably, supply at least examples, types of readings.**
	* **Remove D- in the grading scale as D- is not a grade at OSU.**
	* **The disability statement is outdated. Use the most recent disability statement with the correct address** <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/asc-syllabus-elements>
	* Coleman, Guada, **unanimously approved** **with four contingencies (in bold above)** *and one question (in italics above)*
4. Psychology 8860 (new course; return to panel)
	* **The course should be 1 hour 50 minutes instead of 1 hour 30 minutes to fit the 2-credit hour contact hour requirement.**
	* *P. 3: Remove the D- grade since there is no D- at Ohio State.*
	* *Include readings on how to make effective presentations.*
	* Coleman, Guada, **unanimously approved with one contingency (in bold above)** *and two recommendations (in italics above)*
5. Anthropology 7005 (new course; return)
	* *Differentiate the speakers for the graduate level course on the syllabus, especially in the early weeks of the course.*
	* Vasey, Coleman, **unanimously approved** with *one recommendation (above in italics)*
6. ELO Discussion
	* Version sent by Adam Andrews does not have the proposed change from Ryan King – King’s version focuses more on types of systems in analysis.
	* Haddad: Make sure it is clear what constitutes the social and behavioral sciences in ELOs. When outside courses try to count as social and behavioral sciences, we need to have a clear outline in order to definitively say whether other courses can count.
		+ Natural sciences also need to be defined
	* Pushback against courses needing to meet every ELO:
		+ Maybe too many ELOs now?
		+ Harder to keep track of courses and if they are meeting ELO requirements when there are many ELOs. Assessment plans will be longer. Currently, we have just 2 or 3 ELOs.
		+ However, the current ELOs are very large, so now they are just more broken up and clearly defined.
		+ Do we need to further streamline the ELOs?
	* We need to remember that first-year students will not be meeting all of the ELOs.
	* Vasey: The ways ELOs are worded have assessment implications:
		+ “Recognize and describe” cannot just be assessed using multiple-choice now.
		+ It is more difficult to write multiple-choice questions addressing these types of prompts.
	* Verbs in the ELOs need to correspond to assessment qualities, so we need to be aware of the number of verbs used.
	* Coleman: Draft ELO wording would still not be completely legible to students.
	* “Demonstrate an understanding” could be better phrasing than simply saying “understand” in an ELO.
	* The succession of the Goals should move from Know (Goal 1) 🡪 Apply (Goal 2) 🡪 Refine/revise knowledge based on new knowledge (Goal 3).
	* Comments on ELO 1.1:
		+ Change the phrasing of 1.1 to “explain and use.”
		+ 1.1 lines up well with Goal 1. (Coleman)
	* Comments on ELO 1.2:
		+ 1.2 does not line up well with Goal 1; it would fit better with Goal 2 because an institution is not theoretical. (Coleman)
		+ This ELO is not written well, and it would be hard to design a course to fit this ELO. (Coleman)
		+ Some discussion of completely removing this ELO.
		+ Change the phrasing of 1.2 to “Apply social scientific theory to understand institutions, organizations, cultures, societies, and/or individuals.”
	* Comments on ELO 2.1:
		+ 2.1 focuses on only social and no behavior. (Vasey)
		+ Simplify 2.1 because social structures, policies and decisions are all social factors.
		+ “Factors” is an unclear word. Suggest changing it to “social influences.”
		+ Eliminate “values.”
		+ This ELO is not written well, and it would be hard to design a course to fit this ELO. (Coleman)
	* Comments on ELO 2.2:
		+ 2.2 could be switched to Goal 1 (Coleman)
	* Comments on ELO 2.3:
		+ “use information about” is unclear – remove this phrase altogether.
		+ ELOs that talk about critically evaluating and responsibly using should be in Goal 1
		+ Move 2.3 to Goal 1