ASCC 8/7/2020

CarmenZoom meeting 9:00-11:00am

Approved Minutes

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

AGENDA:

1. Approval of 7-17-20 minutes
* Vasey, Rush, **unanimously approved**
1. Courses
* Art 2000 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ Excellent syllabus. We suggest this be kept as a "best practices" example?
	+ *A final exam is mentioned on the syllabus on pages 8 and 18. However, it is not included in the grading scheme on page 6. Please clarify.*
	+ *It is not clear whether the readings on page 18 "Course Readings: A Bibliography" are required. Please provide information about the nature of these readings.*
	+ *For Autumn 2020, the attendance policy should show sensitivity to COVID-19.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* Comparative Studies 2099 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ *Attendance policy refers to COVID-19. The request is to teach the course online permanently. In the long run/during normal times, please remember to delete that reference and replace it with something relevant. The same comment applies to the discussion about personal well-being during COVID-19 on page 8.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *one recommendation* (in italics above)
* Comparative Studies 2301 (existing course with GE Literature and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **It is not clear whether the course will have any lectures. If so, are they going to be pre-recorded or live (synchronous)? If recorded, where will they be available? Please add explicit information about instructor-student interactions.**
	+ *Consider adding synchronous meetings with the instructor or providing other direct student-instructor interaction.*
	+ *P. 5: Statement under Teaching Philosophy: “Like many of you, I would prefer to be learning together in person, but I am committed to maximizing the possibilities of this online format.”  It is unexpected that a permanent DL course states that they would rather meet in person. This language may work well in the short term with COVID but should be removed in the long run.*
	+ *GE Assessment plan:*
		- *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75% of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is not relevant in this context. Second, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.*
		- *The direct method of assessment is based on analysis of the weekly assignments, final paper, and final exam. A sample rubric shows how to produce a score from analyzing an essay. That is not a rubric for GE assessment. Indeed, measures unrelated to the ELOs are used in calculating the score -- see the first four criteria of the rubric. Second, the rubric simply states the ELOs are graded on a 10-point scale. A true rubric describes the characteristics the performance must exhibit in order to receive a certain score.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *four recommendations* (in italics above)
* Comparative Studies 2367.08 (existing course with GE Writing and Communication-Level 2, GE Cultures & Ideas, and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.; request for 100% DL)
	+ *There is some confusion in course delivery, which is stated to be asynchronous. Later in the pacing section, there is a presentation of pausing during class periods to promote "discussion"/ note cards... This needs to be corrected for DL mode of delivery.*
	+ *It seems that the course will be offered in discrete modules, but the structure could be presented more clearly.*
	+ *2367 is a writing course and there should be clearer evidence that writing/communication pedagogy is at the heart of this course. The in-person syllabus seems to have more opportunities to receive feedback on & revise the writing. We ask the instructor to consider adding opportunities for students to write and receive feedback from the instructor.*
	+ *The course description and topic do not align with the in-person syllabus and the generic description of the course. The DL syllabus focuses on “disability identity and culture in the U.S. and beyond” which is much more specific than the generic description of the course. The description also mentions “beyond” the US, whereas the catalog says the focus will be on the US. The department may want to consider reconfiguring this course as a topics course.*
	+ *GE Assessment plan:*
		- *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75% of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is irrelevant in this context. Second, the course is qualified for three GE categories (not two) and all three need to be addressed. Third, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.*
		- *The direct method is based on analysis of weekly discussion posts and the final paper. A sample rubric is provided to produce a score from the analysis of the final paper --which is good. However, one important shortcoming is that the assessment addresses all seven ELOs together by computing one overall score. The seven ELOs should be assessed separately using seven rubrics. Also, there should be a rubric for analyzing weekly discussion posts.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *five recommendations* (in italics above)
* Comparative Studies 3686 (existing course with GE VPA and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.; request for 100% DL)
	+ *The course has only three synchronous sessions (first day, mid term, and last day). The instructor may want to consider adding more synchronous live interactions or other direct student-instructor interaction.*
	+ *There is no indication that the instructor will post lectures on Carmen for students to view.*
	+ *Consider moving the COVID statement prior to all of the rigid participation/attendance statements.*
	+ *GE Assessment plan:*
		- *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75% of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is not relevant in this context. Second, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.*
		- *The direct method is based on analysis of the assignments. A sample rubric is provided to produce a score from the analysis of the final project. The assessment addresses all four ELOs together by computing one overall score, and measures unrelated to ELOs are mixed into the calculation as well -- see the first five criteria of the rubric.  Each ELO should be assessed separately, and there should be a rubric for each ELO.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *four recommendations* (in italics above)
* French 1802 (existing course with GE VPA; request for 100% DL)
* **Provide more detailed description of why a DL mode of delivery would work well for this course rather than going the temporary assurances route. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **Changing the title of the course from “Cultures of the French-Speaking World” to "Comics and Culture" goes beyond the time-sensitive DL scope of the Summer ASCC meetings. (That is, the Summer ASCC is only reviewing DL requests for Autumn 2020.) The title change requested is accompanied by a change in the course description. Under its new description, the course specifically focuses on comics and culture. As you may know, the Dept of English offers a course on comics: English 2464 “Introduction to Comics Studies.” ASCC asks that the change of title/content be run by the Dept of English for their concurrence. This is all the more important since the proposed new title of French 1802 does not reflect that the focus of the course would be on comics in the French-speaking world. “Comics and Culture” could encompass a host of different traditions. Please separate the request for a change in title and content from the request for DL approval. Resubmit the current DL request without the title/content change & later this Fall, once you have obtained a concurrence from English, submit a separate request for change in title/content.**
	+ *P. 3: Consider removing the reference to a 7-week offering in the syllabus. This may distract students.*
	+ *The GE assessment plan uses two embedded questions on the final exam to assess the expected learning outcomes and expects at least 85% of students to score 85% or better. The plan does not say which question addresses which expected learning outcome. It is important that the two expected outcomes are assessed separately. (One can assume that the first question goes with the first ELO and the second question with the second ELO, but that is not clear.) Also, for each expected learning outcome, design a rubric to map the question answer into a score.*
	+ Unanimously approved for 100% DL with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* French 2801 (existing course with GE VPA; request for 100% DL)
* **Provide more detailed description of why a DL mode of delivery would work well for this course rather than going the temporary assurances route. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *Page 2 of the syllabus states that in the case of enrollment exceeding 60, some of the students will have weekly synchronous sessions with a GTA instead of the faculty. This is problematic, as the quality of instruction will likely differ between sessions led by faculty and those led by GTAs. Consider capping enrollment at 60.*
	+ *Page 6, typo in second line: "After 48 hours, a gentle nudge/resend is inappropriate if your question is time-sensitive."  This should read “appropriate.”*
	+ *The GE assessment plan uses two embedded questions on the final exam to assess the expected learning outcomes and expects at least 85% of students to score 85% or better. The plan does not say which question addresses which expected learning outcome. It is important that the two expected outcomes are assessed separately. (One can assume that the first question goes with the first ELO and the second question with the second ELO, but that is not clear.) Also, for each expected learning outcome, design a rubric to map the question answer into a score.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* Spanish 4567 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ *Although there appear to be strategies for student interactions, there does not seem to be any scheduled time with the instructor.  We recommend periodic instructor-student synchronous interactions.*
	+ *Language for late assignments should be relaxed in light of COVID.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* Spanish 4567H (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ *Although there appear to be strategies for student interactions, there does not seem to be any scheduled time with the instructor.  This is an honors course and, therefore, we particularly recommend that the instructor increase synchronous interactions with students.*
	+ *Language for late assignments should be relaxed in light of COVID.*
	+ Unanimously approved with *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* WGSS 2750 (existing course with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **GE Goals and ELOs language in the distance learning syllabus is either incorrect or outdated. The language used in the in-person syllabus is correct. Please consult** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/general-education-goals-and-expected-learning-outcomes**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/general-education-goals-and-expected-learning-outcomes)
	+ *It appears that the lectures are not live. Consider integrating more synchronous instructor-student interactions.*
	+ *According to the syllabus “All live, scheduled events for the course, including my office hours, are optional. For live presentations, I will provide a recording that you can watch later.” This seems  vague since it suggest that not watching the lectures at all is an option. It might be better to encourage live viewing of lectures but explain that they will be recorded, so, if missed, can be watched later.*
	+ *The GE assessment plan is from the old GEC used during quarters. An updated plan to address the current GE is needed. It is also a boilerplate plan without any specifics. It seems the plan is to use embedded questions to assess the expected learning outcomes -- direct method. Describe it explicitly. Use rubrics to interpret the results quantitatively and state your expected level of achievement.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* English 2265 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **ASC asks that reading and task assignment deadlines be specified for each class session. The course schedule does not have any dates specified or deadlines listed.**
	+ **Delivery mode: How long will each synchronous session be? Could you indicate how the instructor will interact with students in the synchronous sessions, particularly within the workshop space? There is simply not much detail about what the teacher-student dynamic will look like. Will the instructor lecture? How will the 100% synchronous online sessions be structured?**
	+ **Rationale: On the course application, provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *Readings: While a citation is provided for Writing Fiction, there are no citations for the short stories that students analyze. ASC asks that our syllabi list citations of the required texts for the course, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements*](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
	+ *The attendance section (p. 8) looks like it refers to in-person classes, even though zoom was mentioned as mode of delivery earlier. The syllabus should clarify that you are talking about synchronous zoom.*
	+ *Clarification: Under the “policies for this online course,” there are written discussion posts mentioned, but these are not identified as assignments elsewhere on the syllabus.*
	+ *Who will be the instructor and how can students contact the instructor?*
	+ *Assignments: Overall, more detail could be provided for assignments much like the in- person syllabus does. For instance, the syllabus could include an example of a weekly prompt to help students understand what will occur in weekly work; descriptions of what would count as a well-written short story, and a well-written critique also could be indicated.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *five recommendations* (in italics above)
* English 2266 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ The ASC working group discussed English 2266 and agreed that returning the proposed course syllabus for further work on the syllabus is appropriate. We recognize that many multi-section courses are taught from a basic syllabus that instructor adapt as they see fit. However, the DL approval process relies upon a fully developed syllabus from a faculty member. The proposed course should have the detail comparable to the in-person version and elaborate on how instruction will be accomplished in the online environment. We identified several issues that we believe can be addressed in a revision:
		- Clarity could be provided for students on the basic nature and structure of the course:
		- The curriculum.osu.edu application says that the course title is Introductory Poetry Writing, but the syllabus says the course title is Introduction to Poetry Writing.
		- What will be the day/meeting times for each weekly session?
		- Readings: ASC asks that our syllabi list citations of the required texts for the course on our syllabi, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus, on the schedule, or at the beginning https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements
		- Assignments: SC also asks that syllabi provide information about the length and format of papers and examinations. A description should be provided for each type of assignment (e.g., portfolio, written responses). What are general expectations for each of these types of assignments? Students could benefit from a sentence description of the workshopping activity that comprises such a primary aspect of the course. The syllabus says it is 100% synchronous with twice weekly meetings, but the assignments are not clearly delineated for twice weekly meetings.
		- Online teaching environment: The syllabus could outline exactly how the instructor will interact with students within the workshop space. There is not a sense of how materials will be collected / accepted by the teacher. What kind of feedback will the student receive? In general, how will the class actually be conducted online? The sample syllabus from the in-person class was clearer about these expectations.
		- Schedule: Unlike the schedule for the in-person syllabus, there are no reading or task assignment deadlines specified for each live class session.
		- Rationale: On the course application, provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.
		- Who will be the instructor and how can students contact the instructor?
	+ No vote
* English 2267 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **Schedule: ASC asks that syllabi specify reading and task assignment deadlines for each class session. There are no due dates or even mention of assignments on the schedule.**
	+ **Online teaching environment. Exactly how the course will actually be taught online? How will instructors deliver their content? Since workshops take up so much class time, the syllabus could also describe this process.**
	+ **Rationale: On the course application, please provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *Readings: While citations are provided for Imaginative Fiction, and A Storybook Reader, there are no citations for the other texts that students analyze. ASC asks that our syllabi list the required texts for the course on our syllabi, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus , at the beginning or on the schedule,* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements*](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
	+ *Assignments:  Details for written assignments are provided. However, two of the assignments are written in response to prompts. To improve clarity for students, you could include an example of what these prompts might look like.*
	+ *Clarification: Under “policies for this online course,” there are written discussion posts mentioned, but these are not identified as assignments elsewhere on the syllabus.*
	+ *Modules: The syllabus indicates that each module is released one week ahead of time. Is there a particular day that modules are released?*
	+ *The syllabus could indicate the instructor and his/her contact information for the course.*
	+ *On p. 3 "virtual" is spelled incorrectly: "Carmen Zoom virtrual meetings"*
	+ *Some content clearly hasn't been updated for distance learning: "You will be expected to attend a public or virtual reading this semester, take notes, and write a 500-word reflection afterward. Some may be held in Denney Hall, but there are many opportunities on and off campus."*
	+ *Class sessions: What day and times will each synchronous session be?*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *several recommendations* (in italics above)
* English 2268 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ The ASC working group discussed English 2268 and agreed that returning the proposed course syllabus for further work on the syllabus is appropriate. We recognize that many multi-section courses are taught from a basic syllabus that instructors adapt as they see fit. However, the DL approval process relies upon a fully developed syllabus from a faculty member. The proposed course should have the detail comparable to the in-person version, and also elaborate on how instruction will be accomplished in the online environment. Below we indicate issues we believe can be addressed in a revision:
		- Class sessions: The syllabus should indicate at the beginning what term the course is for and what will be the mode of delivery-- not simply 100% DL, but the combination of synchronous and asynchronous modes.  How long will each synchronous session be, and what will be the days and times?
		- Online teaching environment: According to OSU policy, students should expect 3 hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week the syllabus should specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g., lecture videos, Zoom discussions). In the case of 2268, how will three hours of instruction be applied each week? How will the required three hours of instructional content will be delivered?
		- Readings: ASC asks that our syllabi list the required texts for the course on our syllabi, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus, on the schedule, or at the beginning https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements
		- Assignments. ASC also asks that syllabi provide information about the length and format of papers and examinations. Like the in-person version of the syllabus, a description and expectations could be provided for each type of assignment. Students could also benefit from a description of the workshopping activity that comprises such a primary aspect of the course. There’s very little information about course expectations or procedures.
		- Schedule: ASC suggests that syllabi specify reading and other task assignment deadlines for each class session. The schedule is vague on due dates and specific reading assignments.
		- Rationale: On the course application, please provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.
	+ Other Recommendations:
		- Clarification: Under the “policies for this online course,” there are written discussion posts mentioned, but these are not identified as assignments elsewhere on the syllabus.
		- Modules: The syllabus indicates that each module is released one week ahead of time. Is there a particular day that Modules are released?
		- The syllabus could indicate the instructor for the course and their email address/phone number.
	+ **No vote**
* English 3304 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ The ASC working group discussed English 3304 and agreed that returning the proposed course syllabus for further work on the syllabus is appropriate. The proposed course should have the detail comparable to the in-person version, but also elaborate on how instruction will be accomplished in the online environment. Below we indicate issues we believe can be addressed in a revision:
		- The syllabus should indicate at the beginning what term the course is for and what will be the mode of delivery-- not simply 100% DL, but the combination of synchronous and asynchronous modes that are used.
		- According to OSU policy, students should expect 3 hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week the syllabus should specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g., lecture videos, Zoom discussions). How will three hours of instruction be applied each week?
		- Assignments: The length of written assignments is not indicated.
		- The syllabus doesn’t deliver a clear sense of what a student can expect in the course. The assignments are interesting, but it is not clear from their descriptions how students will accomplish them in the online environment. For instance, will students complete assignments individually, or in groups? How will you instruct them for each assignment? More information is needed on how the instructor will engage with the students and the mode of delivery.
		- Clarification: Under Online Participation, it says there will be online quizzes, but there are no quizzes listed under the grading category, and no online participation (10%) listed under the grading category.
		- Schedule: ASC suggests that syllabi specify dates, reading assignments and other assignments due for each class session. More specific due dates would help students, as here only the week due is specified.
		- Rationale: Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.
	+ **No vote**
* English 3305 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ The ASC working group discussed English 3305 and agreed that returning the proposed course syllabus for further work on the syllabus is appropriate. The proposed course should have the detail comparable to the in-person version, but also elaborate on how instruction will be accomplished in the online environment. Below we indicate issues we believe can be addressed in a revision:
		- Mode of delivery: The syllabus should indicate that the course mode of delivery up front; it should indicate that the course will be fully online, and whether synchronous, asynchronous, or a combination of modes are used.
		- According to OSU policy, students should expect 3 hours per week on direct instruction of some type. For each week the syllabus should specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g., lecture videos, Carmen activities involving the instructor).  What, besides the 10-minute videos, contributes to the 3 hours/week direct instruction? Is there really only one video every two weeks??  The other assignments do not appear to involve direct instruction.
		- Readings: ASC asks that our syllabi list the required texts for the course on our syllabi, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus, on the schedule like the in-person syllabus does, or at the beginning <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>
		- Online environment: It is not clear from assignment descriptions how students will accomplish them in the online environment. Will students be completing them individually, for instance, or in groups?  How will teaching occur in the online environment?
		- Schedule: ASC requirements suggest that syllabi specify dates, reading assignments and other assignments due for each class session. The schedule seems overly condensed; it should break out each week individually. Assigned readings are nowhere specified.
		- Weekly “required learning activities” are not otherwise described.  Although each written assignment is described in some detail, there is no mention of length. Due dates are not included – only the two-week periods in which each is due.
		- Rationale: Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.
	+ Other recommendations and observations: The section on technology should remove this note: “To instructor: Amend this list according to your course technology requirements".  Page 6 instructions to customize was not edited out. On p. 9, “discussion board” has not been edited, as there is no mention of discussions elsewhere.
	+ **No vote**
* English 3662 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **Readings: Following ASC, citations for required texts for the course should be listed on the syllabus, which could be listed at the end of the syllabus, on the schedule like the in-person syllabus does, or at the beginning** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
	+ **Assignments and Instruction: ASC also asks that syllabi provide information about the length and format of assignments.  A description could be provided for each type of assignment. What will the instructor do each session? The assignments do not make it clear how students should prepare for classes.**
	+ **Schedule: ASC suggests that syllabi specify dates, reading assignments and other assignments due for each class session on the course schedule.**
	+ **Rationale: Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *In the opening line, "courses" is misspelled, and does not agree with the definite article "an", implying one course: "This is an introductory literary editing and publishing course."*
	+ *The name and contact information for the instructor can be provided.*
	+ *Delivery mode: Is the once/week course a three hour Zoom session? If so, what day and time?*
	+ *Title: The title of the course on the Syllabus says, Literary Editing and Publishing, but the official title of the course is “An Introduction to Literary Publishing.” To avoid confusion the syllabus should probably use the official title.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **four contingencies** (in bold above) and *four recommendations* (in italics above)
* English 4565 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **Readings: ASC asks that our syllabi list citations of the required texts for the course on our syllabi, which could be put as a list at the end of the syllabus, on the schedule, or at the beginning** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
	+ **Schedule: ASC also calls for syllabi specifying reading and other assignments due for each class session. Page nine says that due dates are on the schedule and that they’re on Carmen, but they aren’t on the schedule. The schedule could also supply more information about the macro-workshop part of the course. Presumably students are each assigned to one these, but how and when does this happen?**
	+ **Rationale: On the course application, please provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *Assignments: To improve clarity for students, you might include a one sentence example of the kind of prompts involved in the Process Writing assignments.*
	+ *Clarification: Participating in online activities for attendance: AT LEAST ONCE PER WEEK You are expected to log in to the live Zoom sessions as scheduled once weekly". Will the live, synchronous weekly sessions be recorded? This statement sounds like students have the option to log in and view a recorded lecture if they miss the live one, but then later it says "f you must miss class, please discuss your absence with the instructor as soon as possible.. ", so it sounds like the above must mean that they must log in at least once TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SYNCHRONOUS, LIVE SESSION. This could be made clearer.*
	+ *The syllabus should indicate the instructor and their contact information for the course.*
	+ *Class sessions: The syllabus could specify what day and for how long will each weekly synchronous session be.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *four recommendations* (in italics above)
* English 4568 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **ASC asks that syllabi provide information about the length and format of papers  and examinations,** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)**. Currently it is difficult to discern the particulars of the course assignments. A description and general expectations could be provided for each type of assignment.**
	+ **ASC also asks that syllabi specify on the schedule reading assignments and assignments due for each class session.**
	+ **Regarding OSU policy, students should expect 3 hours per week on direct instruction of some type. The syllabus could specify the instructor’s direct instructional content (e.g., lecture videos on what topics, Carmen activities). That is, each week could describe the particular activity with greater detail; the syllabus could describe the potential activities with more detail.**
	+ **Rationale: The application should provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ Unanimously approved with **four contingencies** (in bold above)
* English 7872.01 and 7872.02 (existing courses requesting 100% DL; identical courses except for letter grade vs. S/U)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ *Shortened citations for required readings have been provided; however since the topic is relevant to graduate students across units and colleges, having a syllabus with full citations for the readings might help potential students and their advisors learn what is covered in the seminar,* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements*](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
	+ *While not required by the College, the syllabus could include the grading scale.*
	+ *Regarding Assignments: It could be indicated earlier in the syllabus (before the Schedule) that students need to complete at least one short paper by Week 7 of the course. The due date for the transcript assignment could also be indicated in the description, like the other assignments. There is a description of what is required for most assignments; the syllabus could specify expected format and length of weekly responses.*
	+ *ASC Tech asked that the weekly schedule have dates, which can be added.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *four recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 1211 (existing course with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus is from Spring 2020. Provide an updated syllabus.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *The late assignment policy could be clarified. For example, what if a student has an issue emerge within three days of the due date?*
	+ *The assessment plan appears to be outdated and incomplete. The department should develop an assessment plan that is specific to the course rather than the generic assessment plan.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 2231 (existing course with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus is from Autumn 2019. Provide an updated syllabus.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *The late assignment policy could be clarified. For example, what if a student has an issue emerge within three days of the due date?*
	+ *The assessment plan appears to be outdated and incomplete. The department should develop an assessment plan that is specific to the course rather than the generic assessment plan.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 2301 (existing course with GE Historical Study; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *Typo: the syllabus says “PSU site license for Microsoft office…” instead of “OSU site license”*
	+ *The disability statement should be in 16 point font.*
	+ *Eliminate the percentages under the “points” category if total is 100 points.*
	+ *The assessment plan includes GE Diversity: Global Studies, which this course does not have status for.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 2704 (existing course with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus is from Autumn 2019. Provide an updated syllabus.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *Eliminate the percentages under the “points” category if total is 100 points.*
	+ *The assessment plan appears to be outdated and incomplete. The department should develop an assessment plan that is specific to the course rather than the generic assessment plan.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 3030 (existing course with GE Historical Study; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus is from 2019. Provide an updated syllabus.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *The assessment plan appears to be outdated and incomplete. The department should develop an assessment plan that is specific to the course rather than the generic assessment plan.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **three contingencies** (in bold above) and *one recommendation* (in italics above)
* History 3302 (existing course with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *A group project is mentioned on page 8, but it is not clear where this is actually used in the syllabus. This should be clarified in the final syllabus.*
	+ *Typo in syllabus (bottom of page 12 "shot" should likely be "short"*
	+ *No information regarding the structure or format of the midterm and final exam is given, aside from the date. There is also no information regarding the handling of missed exams. This should be clarified on the final syllabus.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 3680 and Religious Studies 3680 (existing courses with GE Historical Study and GE Diversity-Global Studies; request for 100% DL)
	+ **Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.**
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *“Live sessions” are mentioned as optional on pages 9-10, but they are not mentioned anywhere else on the syllabus. This should be clarified.*
	+ *Explain how guidance for projects will be handled.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* History 4125 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ Provide a more thorough curricular rationale for requesting 100% distance-learning status. Please see the attached DL Rationale Request Letter for more information regarding this contingency.
	+ The syllabus includes outdated technology language (e.g. Windows 7 is no longer supported) and includes unnecessary technical skill language. Adjust the technology language.
	+ It is unclear if the online discussions are asynchronous.
	+ What are the policies for missed assignments?
	+ The 6th textbook says that the book “should be online, but it’s not.” Where should students access the book?
	+ **No vote**
* Linguistics 4100 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (i.e. Windows 7 is no longer supported). Adjust the technology language.**
	+ **The course appears to be synchronous, but this is unclear. This should be clarified. If the course is synchronous, the attendance requirements for synchronous sessions should be provided. Additionally, the policies for missed and late assignments should be provided.**
	+ *The rationale for requesting permanent DL status is minimalistic, and the department could provide a more thorough rationale.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *one recommendation* (in italics above)
* Psychology 4520 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
	+ **The syllabus includes outdated technology language (i.e. Windows 7 is no longer supported). Adjust the technology language.**
	+ *The rationale for requesting permanent DL status is minimalistic, and the department could provide a more thorough rationale.*
	+ *Remove “required” under “textbook” as there is apparently no required textbook.*
	+ *Disability statement should be in 16 point font.*
	+ Unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above)
* Committee member question: Do we want regional campuses to be able to create their own DL versions of courses? Students on regional campuses can take DL courses on the main campus.
	+ Some colleges are trying to restrict DL versions of courses on regionals and some are not. OAA wants students to have options. Not all regional students are eligible to take DL courses on main campus because they need to be academically eligible.
* Committee member comment: Recommend talking to ASCTech about outdated technology statements in the DL syllabus template (e.g. Windows 7+ is no longer supported). We should talk to ASCTech about removing irrelevant technology statements on individual courses.
* Committee member question: Should we be encouraging synchronous sessions for DL courses or should we allow instructors to decide?
	+ Asynchronous has been the gold standard for DL, but COVID has introduced more pressure for synchronous learning. Asynchronous DL requires more work to interact with the instructor.
	+ For some proposals it was simply unclear whether the course was synchronous or asynchronous.
	+ For some asynchronous courses submitted this summer often had no meaningful interaction between students and instructors. This is where working groups provided recommendations for more interaction.
* Committee member question: When will departments receive the Committee’s feedback?
	+ Thanks to the thoroughness of reports from the working groups, departments will be able to start receiving feedback in the coming days.
* Committee member question: French 1802 is also requesting a course title change in addition to DL status. If this course were new, would the department need to seek concurrence?
	+ The department should seek concurrence for this course title change. One solution would be to approve the DL status and ask for a new request in the fall for the course title change to seek the appropriate concurrences. If we addressed the course title change as a recommendation, it would not be binding. We could make this a contingency of approval since a course title change is outside the scope of ASCC this summer.
		- French 2801 is also requesting a course title change, but the change is non-controversial and does not require a concurrence.
* French 1802 – approve DL status with contingency regarding course title change and additional feedback as outlined above
	+ Steinmetz, Lam, unanimously approved
* French 2801 – approve DL status and course title change with additional feedback as outlined above
	+ Rush, Vasey, unanimously approved
* English 2266, 2268, 3304, 3305, History 4125 – return
	+ Wilson, Taleghani-Nikazm, unanimously approved
* Remaining classes approved with contingencies and recommendations as outlined above
	+ Rush, Vasey, unanimously approved