ASCC 6/26/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

# ATTENDEES: Crocetta, Folden, Giusti, Hawkins, Heysel, Horn, Kline, Lam, Miriti, Oldroyd, Otter, Rush, Steinmetz, Taleghani-Nikazm, Vaessin, Vasey, Wilson

AGENDA:

1. Approval 5-8-2020 minutes
* Unanimously approved
1. Review of distance learning course requests
* Working Group 2:
* Economics 8721: No vote
	+ The distance learning syllabus should specify an instructor and office hours.
	+ The distance learning syllabus needs a weekly topical outline, including readings and homework. It is also recommended that the outline include assignment deadlines.
	+ It appears that the syllabus has not been fully converted for an online course (e.g. there are mentions of using a “blue book” in the syllabus).
	+ The Committee expressed concerns about the rationale for making this offering a permanent DL course. The provided rationale indicated the DL offering is due to COVID. It may be more appropriate for this course to have temporary DL status under the assurance process.
* Economics 8731: approved with four recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The official title of the course is “Econometrics 1”, but the title on the syllabus is “General Linear Regression Analysis.” The Committee recommends using the official title on the syllabus to avoid confusion. A more focused title can also be included.*
	+ *Include specific office hours and method of contact (e.g. Zoom, phone, email, etc.).*
	+ *The weekly schedule could specify the dates for each week and specify deadlines for all homework assignments. Exam dates can also be specified in the schedule.*
	+ *The delivery mode could be clearer by stating how instructional content will be conveyed on the first page of the syllabus.*
* English 2150: multiple recommendations (in italics below) and one contingency (in bold below)
	+ **For most weeks, it is implied that the instructor is discussing material with the class. However, it is unclear how this will occur. How will direct instructional content be conveyed? How will content be delivered? How will discussions occur?**
	+ *To help students understand how the weekly modules operate, the instructor might state the weekly deadline for work and indicate when the next module will open.*
	+ *The title of the course is “Career Preparation for English and Related Majors”, but the syllabus uses the title “Career Preparation.” Given that there are other career preparation courses in the College, the department should use the official course title.*
	+ *For several weeks there are speakers or panel discussions (e.g. weeks 5, 8, 13, 15), such as with an Undergraduate Studies Representative, Career Services Representative, Odyssey opportunities workshop, and OSU alums. It would be useful to include links to presentations and workshops in the syllabus.*
	+ *Include a more thorough description of the weekly writing assignments to separate them from the more highly-valued assignments.*
	+ *Many weeks there are class discussions described, but online participation is only worth 5% of the grade. The expectations for the class discussions should be clarified.*
	+ *Include a list of all readings. Some are already included, while others are simply links or brief citations.*
* English 2201: approved with several recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Assignment descriptions:*
		- *It may be helpful to move the assignment descriptions up on the syllabus to page 4 or 5.*
		- *Students may benefit from examples of writing assignments.*
		- *Are the weekly discussion questions posted and discussed in the recitation or are they answered in writing assignments? Clarify the discussion requirements.*
		- *On page 6 there is some ambiguity about substituting attendance at recitations with discussion posts. There’s a colon that may be taken to suggest that you can either attend the recitation or the discussion. This should be clarified.*
	+ *The Committee recommends including a reading list for each week and a brief indication of the written assignment with more details remaining on Carmen.*
* English 4520: approved with one recommendation (in italics below)
	+ *The Committee recommends adding the course dates in the calendar.*
* Sociology 2202: several recommendations (in italics below) and contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **The first syllabus uses the title “Social Problems and Social Policy.” The official course title is “Social Problems and Public Policy.”**
	+ **According to Ohio State policy, students should expect a certain number of hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week please indicate how direct instructional content will be conveyed (e.g., videos, discussion boards, lectures, etc.). The syllabus needs to indicate the nature, frequency, and means of delivery of instructional content. Beyond discussion responses, how will students actually hear from the instructor?**
	+ **To help students understand their weekly topics and work load, the syllabus should indicate page numbers for the textbook chapters, provide full citations to other readings, and the date and titles for the podcasts. It is also useful to have the full list of readings on the syllabus, since the syllabus is the official record of the course.**
	+ *Following best practices for distance learning courses, the weekly modules could be elaborated more for students by specifying what the learning objectives are for the week, and what the discussion post topics will be about.*
* Sociology 2300: several recommendations (in italics below) and contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **The official title of this course is “Sociology of Culture and Popular Culture”, but the syllabus says the title is “Pop Culture”. To avoid confusion the syllabus should use the office title of the course.**
	+ **How will the instructor’s direct instructional content be conveyed (e.g. lecture videos, Zoom meetings, etc.)?The first page of the syllabus says that the meeting days/time is online, but later in the syllabus it says that weekly Zoom lectures will be required, and that there will be live sessions (attendance optional). It should be clarified if the lectures are synchronous or asynchronous and if attendance is required.**
	+ **Throughout this course there are a series of weekly assignments worth 10% of the final grade, but there are no specific descriptions of these assignments or expectations about them on the syllabus. Given that the syllabus is an official description, more should be provided generally about these assignments, and specific topics for each placed on the weekly schedule.**
	+ **The syllabus says that there are required course readings on Carmen, but all of the reading citations are not indicated on the syllabus. Since the syllabus is the official record of the course, and so interested students can learn what the course is about, the reading list should be included on the syllabus.**
	+ *The visual appearance of the syllabus could be improved by using the Carmen Distance Learning “Master Course” template developed by ODEE and available in Canvas Commons. Ian Anderson also suggested using the template.*
	+ *The discussion board and posts could be explained further. For instance, if everyone is responding to two peers, then who starts the discussion on a particular topic? Can you just make your own case, or would one lose points?*
	+ *Best practices for online course design include elaborating a weekly schedule in ways that students can determine precisely what they will read, view, and do each week. While the basic framework is present, each element needs greater specificity. Each week could have the session dates, the topics, aim, and/or learning outcomes of the week could be indicated, titles for the video clips could be provided,  discussion topics or questions could be provided, and assignments could be briefly described, with their rubrics and details left on Carmen.*
* Sociology 2309: several recommendations (in italics below) and contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **According to Ohio State policy, students should expect a certain number of hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week it would be helpful to know how the instructor’s direct instructional content will be conveyed (e.g., lecture videos on what topics?). There is no mention of how instructor content is to be supplied; it appears there’s no synchronous component, but that’s not directly stated.**
	+ **The course uses exams as the primary means for evaluating student performance (75%). What will be your exam security procedures? For instance, since you are using objective items for some portion of each exam, will you be using Proctorio?**
	+ **The schedule is sparse on details, especially on reading assignments. The syllabus says that there are required supplemental course readings on Carmen, but the reading citations are not indicated on the distance learning syllabus. The syllabus should include a list of the readings.**
	+ *The distance learning course description differs from the official course description. The official catalog description could also be on the syllabus.*
	+ *More detail on assignments could improve clarity for students. For example, a short example of weekly course activities could help students understand the weekly work load. Further elaboration on the research paper, extra credit opportunities, and participation activities would also be helpful for students.*
	+ *Under assignment information, the word “papers” is used twice to describe the research papers. The assignment breakdown only includes one paper. This should be clarified.*
	+ *Under the academic integrity policy, you say “The course includes many opportunities for formal collaboration with your classmates.” When will these opportunities occur on the class schedule, and what will they consist of? The sentence could be confusing for students.*
	+ *The course schedule could be more elaborate by specifying what the weekly assignment activity will generally be about.*
* Sociology 3200: three recommendations (in italics below) and two contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **According to Ohio State policy, students should expect a certain number of hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week the syllabus could specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g., lecture videos on what topics?). The delivery mode of the lectures (live/recorded) is not explained.**
	+ **A description should be provided for each type of assignment (e.g. reading summary, discussion post, essay, quiz, etc.) What are general expectations for these assignments?**
	+ *Revise the dates on the schedule to fit the Autumn semester calendar.*
	+ *The syllabus should indicate that the course is 100% online.*
	+ *The assessment plan provides a direct method of assessment for each expected learning outcome (ELO), but does not indicate the type of answer for each question that would reach an acceptable level to satisfy each ELO. The Committee recommends using a rubric to evaluate the ELOs.*
* Sociology 3467: several recommendations and three contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **The syllabus says that there are other course readings on Carmen, but the reading citations are not included on the proposed DL syllabus. Since the syllabus is the official course document, a list of readings should be included on the syllabus.**
	+ **An ASC syllabus is also expected to communicate “about the length and format of all papers, homework....and examinations.” There are assignments described on the syllabus, but the descriptions extending from pages 3-6 are confusing: (1) the grade breakdown lists 100 points per week for many weeks, but in the prior paragraph it says that 200 points per week are “up for grabs”; (2)the syllabus indicates there are open book quizzes, but no indication of the number of quizzes, when they will occur, and how many points each quiz will be; (3) the syllabus mentions discussion posts, but does not describe the frequency of and aims and expectations for students’ posts; and (4) the syllabus mentions writing assignments, but no details about these assignments, such as frequency, aim, and length. Each type of assignment needs more description on the syllabus.**
	+ **ASC requests that syllabi contain a weekly schedule, “including topics to be covered, readings....and homework.” The current syllabus describes four modules, but does not provide a detailed weekly schedule. Best practices for online weekly schedules include indicating the topics, aim, and/or learning outcomes for the week, what students should read, what videos students should view, and what students should do, in terms of writing assignments or discussion posts.**
	+ **The syllabus should specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g, lecture videos on particular topics).**
	+ *The exact term, Autumn 2020, should be specified on the first page of the syllabus.*
	+ *The Committee agrees with Ian Anderson’s recommendations from the Tech Review:* “Remove personal email address. Student information is S3 data and should not be stored in personal email accounts. Office hours must be virtual, please note that at the top with method (Zoom). It should be noted that the method of delivery is 100% online in the course description. Add dates to the weekly schedule breakdown.”
* Comments from Working Group 2:
	+ Ian Anderson provides good suggestions that are sometimes not followed through on. His recommendations were included in the group’s feedback.
	+ Sometimes it was unclear which syllabus was for the in-person version and which was for the online version.
* Working Group 1:
* Linguistics 1100: approved with one contingency (in bold below) and one recommendation (in italics below)
	+ **Page 4 of the syllabus says lectures are divided into series of 8-10 minute videos and there are about 8 of them per week. This suggests that instructional time is about 80 minutes. In an in-person class of 3 credit hours, the instructional time would be approximately 165 minutes. This is likely supplemented by Carmen activities. Clarify how much direct instructional time students will receive.**
	+ *The Committee recommends increasing synchronous interactions between students and instructors through live office hours and Group Work Zoom meetings.*
* Linguistics 2051: approved with two recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The Committee recommends including an attendance policy. The policy should clarify whether attendance will be taken for synchronous sessions and what will happen if a student falls ill.*
	+ *The assessment plan is a bit ambiguous. The plan states that the “criteria for the more advanced level of attainment is set to the following: 70% of students correctly answer each of the 13 items.” It is later stated that students should “correctly answer each of the 13 items.”*
* Linguistics 2367.01: approved with multiple recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The Committee recommends increasing opportunities for synchronous interaction between the students and instructor.*
	+ *It is unclear how participation will be graded if students can earn credit through discussion posts or synchronous sessions or both. Clarify to students how this will be calculated.*
	+ *The syllabus mentions “in-class peer-editing” under weeks 7 and 13. How will this work in the online version of the course?*
	+ *Clarify how the final paper presentations in weeks 13 and 14 will work. Will these occur via Zoom or will they be recorded and uploaded?*
	+ *Update the Academic Misconduct statement with the most recent language, which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *The Assessment Plan states that at 75% of students should score at least a 17 on the rubric out of 20. This is for all four ELOs for two GE categories. This will make it difficult to determine if an individual ELO is not being met (e.g. students can receive all points for 3 ELOs and not meet expectations for one ELO but still receive a 17 overall). Set the goals for each ELO individually.*
* Linguistics 3801: approved with three recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The Committee was impressed with the clarity of the syllabus and with the content of the course.*
	+ *The course calendar refers to “Autumn Break.” The calendar for Autumn 2020 has been adjusted, and no longer includes an Autumn Break.*
	+ *There is a small typo for the time of the online lectures. The syllabus says they are scheduled for 2:20-3:30 Tues/Thurs, but this is likely meant to say “2:20-3:40.”*
* Russian 2250.99: approved with three recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Provide more details on lectures. Some indication of the length and frequency of the lectures should be given. It should be clarified if the lectures are live sessions and if they are mandatory.*
	+ *The Committee recommends softening the language on missed quizzes and/or exams, given the unpredictable nature of COVID-19. In emergency situations, students may not be able to provide documentation beforehand.*
	+ *Part b of Assessment Plan states, "In general, for exams, success means that students will answer 75% of the embedded GE questions correctly."  This could mean each of the students gets 75% on the embedded questions. This could mean, for each of embedded questions, 75% of the students answer the question correctly. This could also mean the average score of the students, on all embedded questions combined, is 75%. So the criterion is subject to interpretations. It would be useful to make it precise.*
* Russian 3480.99: approved with five recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Change references to CarmenConnect to CarmenZoom.*
	+ *The Committee encourages synchronous interactions between the instructor and students.*
	+ *Update the Academic Misconduct statement with the most recent language, which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *Provide details about office hours.*
	+ *Part b of Assessment Plan states, "In general, for exams, success means that students will answer 75% of the embedded GE questions correctly."  This could mean each of the students gets 75% on the embedded questions. This could mean, for each of embedded questions, 75% of the students answer the question correctly. This could also mean the average score of the students, on all embedded questions combined, is 75%. So the criterion is subject to interpretations. It would be useful to make it precise.*
* Russian 3490.99: approved with one contingency (in bold below) and multiple recommendations (in italics below)
	+ **GE ELOs are listed, but the GE Goals are missing from the syllabus.**
	+ *Clarify how students will interact with the instructor. Little interaction is included in this course as presented. Will there be synchronous sessions or discussion boards used?*
	+ *Update the Academic Misconduct statement with the most recent language, which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *Include more information on the presentation and discussion of individual projects mentioned on page 14. Will these occur via Zoom? Will they be recorded?*
	+ *Correct typos on page 2 (departmental film library) and page 7 (deadline for all weekly assignments: Friday midnight).*
	+ *Include more information on office hours.*
	+ *Part b of Assessment Plan states, "In general, for exams, success means that students will answer 75% of the embedded GE questions correctly."  This could mean each of the students gets 75% on the embedded questions. This could mean, for each of embedded questions, 75% of the students answer the question correctly. This could also mean the average score of the students, on all embedded questions combined, is 75%. So the criterion is subject to interpretations. It would be useful to make it precise.*
* Slavic 2230.99: approved with one contingency (in bold below) and two recommendations (in italics below)
	+ **GE ELOs are listed, but the GE Goals are missing from the syllabus.**
	+ **Clarify how students will interact with the instructor. There is limited interaction included in this course as presented. Will there be synchronous sessions or discussion boards used?**
	+ *Include information about office hours (e.g. will they be held via Zoom?)*
* Sociology 4507: approved with four recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Clarify how office hours will be conducted.*
	+ *The Committee recommends some form of live or synchronous engagement.*
	+ *Clarify in the syllabus how students are presenting their final presentation topics (e.g. via Zoom, recording presentations).*
	+ *Update the Academic Misconduct statement with the most recent language, which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
* SHS 5605: approved with five recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Include information on any penalties for late assignments.*
	+ *Update the Academic Misconduct statement with the most recent language, which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *The syllabus says “Each group will be expected to attend one 1/5 hours video chat session each week. These video chat sessions will normally be held on Mondays 11:00-12:30 (groups 1) and Wednesdays 11:00-12:30 (group 2).” Is this meant to say 1.5 hour video chat instead of 1/5 hour?*
	+ *Provide information on the syllabus on how to contact the instructor and when to expect a reply.*
* Working Group 3:
* HDFS 2410: approved without recommendations or contingencies
* HDFS 3440: **no vote**
	+ Grading scheme is unduly complex. The syllabus says there are 200 points up for grabs each week without much information on how they are broken up. It later says there are 100 points per week.
	+ The guidelines for discussions are unclear, especially given the lack the of clarity around grading.
	+ There are four modules, but the week-by-week breakdown isn’t very detailed (e.g. 6 weeks are spent on one module).
	+ **Note: It was later discovered that there was some confusion about this course, and it will be returned to the working group for further review.**
* History 2204: approved with one recommendation (in italics below)
	+ *Include information on the final exam (e.g. format, proctoring, etc.)*
* History 3253: **no vote**
	+ **Provide in-person syllabus if at all possible**
	+ Syllabus and assessment plan include the goals and ELOs for GE Global Studies, but the course does not have approval for this category.
* History 3270: approved with two recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Include information on the final exam (e.g. format, proctoring, etc.)*
	+ *Syllabus includes the goals and ELOs for GE Global Studies, but the course does not have approval for this category.*
* History 3310: with two contingencies (in bold below) and four recommendations (in italics below)
	+ **Change “PC (Windows 7+) under necessary equipment section. Windows 7 is no longer supported.**
	+ **The format of the online discussions is not clear from the syllabus. Is it strictly a written response or is there an expectation to record or upload videos or presentations with audio narration, as is listed under necessary skills? It is also unclear if “collaborating in CarmenWiki” is used for the course as well.**
	+ *CarmenZoom should be listed as a necessary technical skill if it is used as a contact option.*
	+ *There is no suggestion or requirement for the formatting of papers (e.g. Word, PDF, etc.). Carmen sometimes alters formatting of documents that are not submitted as a PDF.*
	+ *There is a “?” in the citation style.*
	+ *It is not clear if the six required books are available only in print or if they are available electronically.*
* Statistics 1430.02: approved with multiple recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The last sentence in the course description appears to be out of place.*
	+ *Disability Statement should be in point 16 font.*
	+ *Include a mental health statement, an example of which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *Provide a grading scale on the final syllabus.*
	+ *Include a policy for missed or late assignments in the syllabus.*
	+ *The reference to BM2320 in the “Course Materials” section could be confusing to students who are not using this course in the sequence. If it is included, it may be advisable to use BusMgt 2320 or Business Management 2320 to make it clearer.*
	+ *Include the information on how the final grade will be calculated in a different section than the current “Weekly Recitation” section.*
* Stats 3450.02: approve with multiple recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *The syllabus says “Students are encouraged to work together…” but does not say when this is supposed to happen or how it is facilitated.*
	+ *TopHat is mentioned the first time under academic integrity policy. If it is used it should be mentioned earlier and indicated how it is used, and how/if participation counts towards final grade. If it is only used in the in-person version of the course, then any reference should be removed from the DL version syllabus.*
	+ *Include a policy for missed and late assignments*
	+ *Include a mental health statement, an example of which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
	+ *Provide a grade scale*
* Stats 3470.02: approve with two recommendations (in italics below)
	+ *Include a grade scale on the syllabus*
	+ *Include a mental health statement, an example of which can be found on page 14 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual.*
* Stats 5730: approved with two contingencies (in bold below)
	+ **There is no indication under “Assignment Information” as to whether the lectures are live or video-recordings. However, the statement that students are expected to “actively participant in class discussion” seems to imply they are live. If so, this needs to be clarified.**
	+ **The “Student participation requirements” section states that all live, scheduled events are optional. If so, how is a student expected to participate in class discussions? Does this mean that students must attend lectures live some or most of the time?**
1. Discussion about submission requirements and process for 100% distance learning & hybrid courses
* GE Assessment for distance learning courses
	+ Faculty are stressed by the demands of GE implementation and the response to COVID. Asking for GE assessment plans puts more stress on faculty during an already difficult time.
	+ We have been trying to make cultural improvements around GE assessment. We do not want faculty to feel overburdened by GE assessment, but we should also consider that it will be difficult to reintroduce GE assessment as a requirement if we do not enforce it now.
	+ We should be more relaxed about assessment than we typically are, since GE assessment may be significantly changing over the next few years. The risks are minimal to relaxing our standards, since a review will need to occur under the new GE. We don’t want people to feel like assessment does not matter, but pausing assessment may relieve anxiety for faculty.
	+ We can be understanding about assessment, but we can also use this moment to remind departments that while the GE is changing, assessment will not be going away.
	+ The burden of putting these courses permanently online does put stress on faculty, but why are they not choosing the assurance route without the permanent designation? It does not put as much stress on the faculty.
		- Some departments may not be thinking about the implications of asking for permanent DL status when they may not need it.
	+ We don’t need a mechanism that encourages departments to put forward more permanent DL requests this summer. We will put forward an assurance process for temporary DL requests, and we can continue to require assessment plans for GE courses requesting permanent DL status. We have been very consistent with messaging that departments should be using the assurance process if they do not intend to permanently offer the class online. We aren’t harming them to say that if they don’t have time to do the assessment plan, they should just put it through the assurance process.
	+ None of the GE courses lacked an assessment plan, but many could be improved. The issue is a practical efficiency of whether to go through the work on the part of all parties to correct the assessment plan when GE assessment will be changing.
	+ We shouldn’t drop the requirement for a GE assessment plan, but we should not go into the typical level of detail in feedback with on GE assessment plans. We should provide some feedback on how to approve without overburdening ourselves or making it a contingency for approval.
* Direct instructional content for Distance Learning courses
	+ The largest issue presented with many of these courses was how to evaluate direct instructional content.
	+ ODEE, UITL, and ASCTech are giving different advice on direct content, contact hours, how much time to spend with students, etc. It is confusing for faculty, and it is difficult to guide faculty during the review process.
	+ The Teaching Transition Committee is discussing this. We have to distinguish between online teaching in normal times and online teaching in COVID. The typical best practices for online teaching says that there should be limited synchronous time and content should be short and easily digestible. However, one of the things we heard from the student survey in the Spring was that students liked live classes and continuing a routine. Best practices for COVID DL courses may not be the same as best practices for normal DL courses.
	+ The guidelines for approving a course are unclear in this era if we have different expectations for DL courses now and permanent GE courses. There is a lot of ambiguity in these proposals about the amount of interaction that faculty will have with students. What standards should we hold them to?
		- So much of the response will depend on the course and the pedagogy of the professor.
		- There are varied ideas from ODEE and UITL on how to have quality engagement in DL courses.
	+ When we evaluate courses for DL, we should not be tallying up instruction time. Interaction with students and assignments work differently. We should be concerned when it looks like a course is identical to the in-person version without changing instruction approaches for the DL version. It’s not possible for the courses to be one-to-one. We should be concerned when the instructor’s only plan is to record an hour long lecture. We should be open to a variety of methods for DL.
		- DL will not have the same instructor-student interaction as an in-person course, but we should still be evaluating courses to make sure they meet credit hour requirements.