**ASCC Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel**

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, September 29th, 2021 1:00PM – 2:30PM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Barker, Breitenberger, Craigmile, Dinan, Hilty, Ottesen, Panero, Steele, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 09/15/2021 minutes
	* Craigmile, Breitenberger; unanimously approved
2. Earth Sciences 5242 (new course)
	* **The Panel asks that the department clarify whether this course can be used in partial fulfillment of the Earth Sciences major (Course Request Form, pg. 2 under “Requirement/Elective Designation”).**
	* **If the course can be used in partial fulfillment of the major, the Panel requests that the department submit an updated curriculum map that reflects how Earth Sciences 5242 will function within the broader curriculum.**
	* *The Panel recommends that the syllabus include more information surrounding the snorkeling/swimming activities:*
		+ *Is there a swimming/water safety skill pre-requisite for the course?*
		+ *If a student is unable to swim, how should they request modifications and/or accommodations?*
		+ *How/when will students’ swimming skills be evaluated?*
	* *The Panel recommends that the syllabus include more detail about the field notebook assignment to indicate to students how much work will be expected and how this assignment will be evaluated (syllabus pg. 2 under “Course Grade will be based on the following”).*
	* *The Panel recommends that the Grading Scale be altered to include grades of D, D-, and E (syllabus pg. 3 under “Course Grade will be based on the following”).*
	* Ottesen, Barker; unanimously approved with **2 contingencies** (in bold above) and *3 recommendations* (in italics above.)
3. Mathematics 5588 (new course)
	* The Panel recommends that the department modify the Course Request in curriculum.osu.edu to include the rank of “Doctoral” (Course Request pg. 1 under “Subject/CIP Code – Intended Rank).
	* The Panel requests that the department include information about the course’s required textbook(s) in the syllabus. If there is no textbook, this should be clearly stated.
	* The Panel requests more information regarding the grading of the Group Projects (syllabus pg. 1 under “Grade” and “Group Projects”)
		+ Since the students will be providing 40% of their own grade on the projects, the Panel asks that there be a more detailed form for students evaluating their own/their peers’ performance.
		+ 60% of the group project grade comes from the “visiting professionals.” The Panel asks that the department clarify how these experts will be guided in grading student projects.
		+ The Panel requests that the department provide more information about the role of the instructor in grading the group projects
	* The Panel asks that the department provide more information on the syllabus regarding the role of the visiting professionals vs. the role of the course instructor. In particular, the Panel asks that the syllabus explain more thoroughly who students should contact with questions about the group projects or material presented in class.
	* The Panel requests that the department provide more details regarding the Individual Presentation (syllabus pg. 1 under “Individual Presentation”,) including guidance on the length of the presentation and whether students will be expected to prepare a written and/or visual component, such as PowerPoint slides.
	* The Panel recommends that the department consider adding a grading scale to the syllabus.
	* The Panel kindly asks for more information regarding the target audience for the course, including whether the course would be open to professionals in the field as well as graduate and advanced undergraduate students.
	* The Panel asks that the department include more details about course readings (if any) on the course schedule (syllabus pg. 2 under “Schedule”). These details should include some indication of the amount of reading per class session in the form of page numbers or chapters.
	* The Panel recommends that the department provide a more detailed course schedule (syllabus pg. 2 under “Schedule”) that outlines exactly what students can expect to do in class and outside of class during each week.
	* In general, the Panel requests that the department provide a better overview of course activities. The Panel feels that the syllabus does not give students an accurate picture of what they should expect and what will be expected of them.
	* No vote
4. Mathematics 5637 (new course)
	* The Panel requests that the department seek a concurrence from the Department of Statistics.
	* No vote
5. BS/MS Molecular Genetics (new)
	* **The Panel requests that the department add the desired term of implementation to the proposal.**
	* **The Panel asks that the department correct the language surrounding the lack of a direct entry at the MS level (Program Proposal, pg. 2 under “Molecular genetics BS/MS proposal: Program Rationale” and Program Proposal, pg. 3 under “Minor updates to Molecular Genetics MS program to facilitate BS/MS”), as a direct entry MS has recently been approved per the department’s request.**
	* **The Panel requests that the department clarify how the requirement to take at least one course in each of the four pillars of Molecular Genetics (Program Proposal pg. 5 under “General Requirements”) is related to the old requirements for the degree. Could it be that the requirement was already there but perhaps not articulated (because due to the smaller number of courses available students couldn’t help but take course work in the four pillars)? Otherwise, if this is an “addition” or “reorganization” of the requirements of the MS, the Panel asks that it be included in the list of changes to the program (Program Proposal, pg. 3-4 under “Minor updates to Molecular Genetics MS program to facilitate BS/MS”).**
	* *The Panel asks the department to consider whether the addition of the “four pillars requirement” (see contingency 3 above) will result in more than 10 percent of the program being altered.*
	* The Panel suggests that the department be more specific regarding information provided to students via the 4-year plan and the advising sheet, especially as the department crafts their forms and handouts for the new GE in AU22.
		+ The Panel recommends labeling all General Education courses by category in the 4-year plan and differentiating them from the Molecular Genetics major electives so that it is clear to students that all requirements have been accounted for.
		+ The Panel encourages indicating which major pre-requisites will also be used to meet General Education requirements and specifying which GE category they fulfill.
	* The Panel engaged in an extensive discussion of the cost of the program and the value of the degree to the student. The Panel encourages the department to consider offering Teaching Assistantships and Research Assistantships to students in this program whenever possible to further the goals of access and affordability.
	* Breitenberger, Ottesen; unanimously approved with **3 contingencies** (in bold above,) *1 recommendation* (in italics above,) and 2 comments