**ASCC Social and Behavioral Sciences Panel**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, December 2, 2021 10:30AM – 12:00PM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Cody, Coleman, Guada, Nathanson, Piperata, Smith, Steele, Valle, Vankeerbergen, Vasey

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of 11-18-21 minutes
   * Moved to 12/16/21 meeting
2. Review model DL syllabus

* The Panel discussed the progress on a draft of a model DL syllabus, to be posted online upon completion. The panel is working on an additional exemplar in-person syllabus.

1. Sociology 4629 (course change from 5000 to 4000-level; increase credit hours from 3 to 4; requesting new GE Theme Health & Wellbeing with Research & Creative Inquiry high-impact practice)
   * **The Panel is unclear how the course will account for the additional credit hour in the proposed increase from 3 to 4 credit hours. There will need to be an increase in contact hours. It is also unclear how the course for 4 credits will be different from the course for 3 credits (in terms of content, assignments, etc.). Please make clear in the syllabus where, when, and how students will earn this extra time.**
   * **The Panel notes that pop quizzes currently are not built into the course point structure; these points should be formally included in the assignment breakdown so that students understand the way that they earn credit for all components of the class.**
   * **The Panel asks for clarification around the course absence policy; the policy should be predictable and consistent, clearly articulating the way it will impact a student’s grade after a certain point.**
   * **The course schedule should be amended to include the page-range amounts required for each assigned reading.**
   * **The new syllabus should be renumbered 4629 (not 5629) throughout the document.**

* *The Panel notes that they syllabus should include all of the correct and complete goals and ELOs for the Health and Well-Being theme – as well as a small narrative description of how the class intends to meet these ELOs.  The Themes Panel will send this back to the department as a contingency because the full listing of the goals and ELOs as well as the explanatory paragraph is a required syllabus item; the Panel strongly recommends that the department make these revisions prior to review at the Themes Panel. The complete list of goals and ELOs are available here:*[*https://oaa.osu.edu/ohio-state-ge-program*](https://oaa.osu.edu/ohio-state-ge-program)
  + *The Panel recommends that language around assignments be as clear and consistent as possible throughout the syllabus. Using “assessment,” “project,” and “assignment” interchangeably could prove confusing for students; terminology like “exam,” “homework,” and “participation” would more clearly distinguish the specific types of work required for the course.*
* *The Panel recommends that the department include the most up-to-date version of the Title IX statement, which can be found here:* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements*](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
* *The D- grade should be removed from the grading scale, as OSU does not formally award this mark.*
  + *The Panel recommends removing the mention of graduate students on page 4 and 5 of the syllabus.*
  + *On page 5 of the syllabus, the Panel suggests inserting the updated prerequisites listed on the curriculum.osu.edu form.*
  + Piperata, Nathanson; **unanimously approved** with **five (5) contingencies** (in bold above) and *six (6) recommendations* (in italics above)

1. Anthropology 2202 (existing course requesting 100% DL)
   * Per OSU protocol, the syllabus should be the best representation of the class – especially since the Panel cannot access supplementary tools like Carmen as part of the evaluation process. The Panel appreciates that various features of the course are built into Carmen, but per university policy, the syllabus must also reflect the full complexity of the class so students can make well-informed decisions before formally enrolling.
   * Please include further details on all parts of all assignments in the syllabus, matching the level of specificity from the submitted in-person version of the course. This includes articulating the particulars of each “challenge” assignment, so that students know what to expect from this component of the class.
   * Please provide a more detailed rationale that actively illustrates how this course is “well suited for DL,” pointing to specific assignments, activities, and aspects of the class structure.
   * Please clarify the specifics of the course delivery format, including:

* What parts are synchronous and/or asynchronous?
* When and how do lectures and discussions occur? Which lectures and/or discussions are “optional,” if any?
* If this 3-credit-hour class only meets once a week for 55 minutes, what accounts for the remaining hours of direct instruction/contact time? Where, when, and how students will earn this? Please note that a 3CH class comprises 3 hours of direct instruction weekly, and an additional 6 hours of preparation time outside class.
  + The course calendar should outline benchmarks and expectations for students on a day-by-day basis (rather than weekly), including specific due dates for any assignments.
  + The Panel requests that the course schedule be amended to include the page-range amounts required for each assigned reading.
  + What is the late assignment policy for the course? Can students turn in late work at all, and if so, is there a penalty?
  + The Panel suggests moving the discussion of particular assignments on page 4 of the syllabus to page 6, with the section explaining how grades are calculated.
  + The Panel recommends removing any reference to an “OSU standard grading scheme,” as Ohio State does not have a standardized grading scheme.
  + The Panel kindly notes that on page 1 of the in-person syllabus, the “syllabus statement” section is missing a word; it currently reads “the university *condones* violence.”
  + **No Vote**