ASCC Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, April 13th, 2022 11:00 AM-12:30 PM

Carmen Zoom

Attendees: Abrams, Fletcher, Price-Spratlen, Ponce, Steele, Vankeerbergen

**Agenda**

1. Approval of 3-30-22 minutes
   1. Ponce, Abrams; unanimously approved
2. Poli Sci 4147 (new course requesting new GE Foundation REGD)
   1. The Panel appreciates seeing a submission for the REGD category from the Department of Political Science and shares the department’s desire to give students an opportunity to engage with REGD issues through a political science lens as a part of the GE
   2. The Panel acknowledges and values the inclusion of intersectionality in the course, including the TED talk by Crenshaw and the Cohen reading (though they note the absence of the Combahee River Collective that was mentioned in the GE proposal form on pg. 1,) but they request that the department include more readings that engage consistently with intersectionality throughout the course, especially after Weeks 4/5.
   3. The Panel asks that the department reconsider the structure of the course calendar to better reflect the course’s goals. They note that “siloing” the topics by race and/or ethnicity (syllabus pg. 8-9, under Weeks 4-8) and labeling a group of widely disparate identities as “others” (syllabus pg. 9 under Week 8) leans toward a binary structure that seems to disconnect the first part of the course from later topics and the GE category.
   4. The Panel asks that the syllabus demonstrate more clearly how and when students will engage in self-reflection and examinations of their own experiences. (GE ELO 2.1)
   5. The Panel asks that the department include some self-reflexive material that engages with the political science discipline’s traditional and historical treatment of REGD issues.
   6. While they did appreciate the additional information provided on this topic, the Panel requests that the department strongly consider renumbering this course, as they feel that the course content is better suited to the 3000 level when compared to other offerings in the department and the university’s description of the course numbering system, which can be found in the Faculty Rules, section 3335-8-05, available here: <https://trustees.osu.edu/bylaws-and-rules/university-faculty-rules>. Additionally, the Panel observes that enrollments in a foundational GE course could be negatively affected by placing the course at such a high level, and that the course might attract a more diverse student population if it were offered at the 3000 level.
   7. The Panel asks that the name of the GE category, as well as all GE Goals and Expected Learning outcomes, be presented on the syllabus as written by the Office of Academic Affairs, including aligning the ELOs with specific goals (syllabus pg. 1-2 under “GE Foundation…”). The official title of the GE category as well as language for the GE Goals and ELOs can be found here: <https://oaa.osu.edu/ohio-state-ge-program>.
   8. The Panel asks that the department include a paragraph following the GE Goals and ELOs that explains how this course will meet those GE Goals and ELOS, as specified by the ASC Curriculum Committee. The Panel adds that including some of the excellent content from the GE submission form in this statement might better help students understand how this course is centered on REGD issues. More information on required elements for syllabi can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
   9. The Panel recommends that all courses seeking approval in the new GE Foundations: REGD category include a Land Acknowledgement. A sample Land Acknowledgement, information about the purpose of such a statement, and further action steps can be found here: <https://mcc.osu.edu/about-us/land-acknowledgement>.
   10. No Vote
3. History 2001 (existing course with GE Historical Study & GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.; will be new GE Foundation Historical and Cultural Studies; requesting new GE Foundation REGD)
   1. The Panel appreciates the department’s work in altering the syllabus after its first review, including a revised course description, clarifying the grading and attendance policies, and notes the inclusion of more secondary texts, the addition of a Land Acknowledgement, and the removal of references to quarters. However, the Panel notes that additional revisions are needed.
   2. The Panel feels that the course is centered around an introduction to the early history of the United States (with significant attention to issues of race, gender, and ethnicity) rather than being centered around issues of race, gender, ethnicity and intersectionality while also providing a scholarly introduction to American history. The Panel respectfully asks that the department consider how race, ethnicity, and gender can be centered in the course, and demonstrate how the instructor will guide students in their understanding of the construction of racial, ethnic, and gendered identities in these time periods.
   3. The Panel notes and appreciates the statement about how the historical profession has addressed race, ethnicity, and gender diversity (syllabus pg. 6); however, they would also like to see an active engagement with these topics as a part of the course content and course calendar.
   4. The Panel respectfully and kindly reminds the department that, though they evaluate both the syllabus and the GE submission form, the syllabus itself should be written as a student-facing document. The Panel reviews syllabi with the student experience in mind and views a syllabus as the document that will most clearly demonstrate to students the focus, intentions, and purpose of the course. The Panel asks that the department exclude from the syllabus any material that has only been added for the benefit of the reviewers, though they remind the department supplementary materials that give more detailed information on assignments, grading, etc. may be included as a separate document or as a part of the GE submission form.
   5. The Panel is enthusiastic about the inclusion of Frederick Douglass’ work and asks that the department highlight the intersectional nature of his positions, as well as incorporating more intersectional material and more work from historians of color into the course content.
   6. The Panel observes that the explanation of how the course will meet the Goals and ELOs of the REGD category (Syllabus pg. 4-5) is focused on assignments and assessment. The Panel asks that the department use this section of the syllabus to provide more information for students about how the content of the class will address the Goals/ELOs.
   7. The Panel requests that the department include an explanation of how the course will meet the Goals and Expected Learning Outcomes for all GE categories that the class seeks to fulfill (in this case, for *both* the Historical Studies and REGD categories.)
   8. The Panel asks that the label of “Themes” (syllabus pg. 4 at the top of the table) be removed, as these are the Goals and ELOs for the GE Foundations: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity category, not one of the GE Themes categories.
   9. The Panel asks that the department remove references to History 2001H (syllabus pg. 3 under “History Minor”).
   10. No Vote
4. AAAS & WGSST 2367.04 (existing courses with GE Writing and Communication—Level 2; Literature; and Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.; will become new GE Foundation LVPA; requesting GE Foundation REGD)
   1. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department edit the name of the GE category to read “Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity” rather than “Race, Ethnic, and Gender Diversity” (syllabus pg. 2 under “General Education Goals and Expected Outcomes”).
   2. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends altering the syllabus to clarify the delivery mode of the course. The “How this Course Works” section of the syllabus (pg. 3) states that the course is “100% online”, however, pg. 1 of the syllabus gives a physical location (Mendenhall Lab).
   3. *Recommendation*: The panel notes that there is no “standard” grading scale at Ohio State and recommends that the language “OSU Standard Grade Guidelines” be amended to read “Grade Guidelines” or similar (pg. 5).
   4. *Recommendation*: The Panel recommends including the assignment due dates on the Course Calendar (syllabus pg. 9-11).
   5. Abrams, Ponce; unanimously approved with *4 recommendations* (in italics above.)
5. City and Regional Planning 3510 (existing course requesting new GE Foundation: REGD)
   1. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department consider the addition of a subtitle and/or change the title of the course, as they believe the current title plays into stereotypes about marginalized communities and does not do justice to the excellent quality of the course and the nuance with which it treats the subject matter.
   2. *Recommendation*: The Panel recommends that the department add more descriptive language and REGD terminology to the class titles/subjects so that students better understand the focus of the course, as terms like “broken windows” may be unfamiliar to students.
   3. *Recommendation*: The Panel recommends that the department remove all references to the course being delivered in a hybrid format (syllabus pg. 4 under “Attendance and Participation”), as the course request is for an in-person course.
   4. *Recommendation*: The Panel kindly reminds the department that there is no standard grading scale or letter grade scheme at OSU, and recommends that the phrase “Letter grades are assigned based on a standard scheme” be amended to read “Letter grades are assigned based on the following scheme” or similar (pg. 6 under “Criteria for Evaluation or Grading”).
   5. *Recommendation*: The Panel notes that the percentages assigned to the various assignments (syllabus pg. 6 under “Criteria for Evaluation or Grading”) do not add up to 100%, but rather 95%. The Panel recommends adjusting these percentages.
   6. Abrams, Price-Spratlen; unanimously approved with *five recommendations* (in italics above.)