ASCC Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Diversity Panel

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, April 27th, 2022 11:00 AM-12:30 PM

Carmen Zoom

Attendees: Abrams, Fletcher, Hilty, Ponce, Steele

**Agenda**

1. Approval of 4-13-22 minutes
   1. Ponce, Abrams; unanimously approved
2. WGSST 2230 (existing course with GE VPA; will become new GE Foundation: LVPA; previously approved for 100% DL; requesting new GE Foundation: REGD)
   1. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department consider addressing REGD topics (especially intersectionality) more directly in the first few weeks of the class. They note that the first half of the course seems to be heavily focused on pop culture, while REGD topics are not explicitly engaged with until the 2nd half of the course. The Panel acknowledges that the instructor is likely looking at pop culture through an REGD lens, but they would like to see more explicit terminology used on the course calendar to signal to students how REGD topics will be central to the course.
   2. *Recommendation*: The Panel recommends that the subtitle to the REGD Goals and ELOs section of the syllabus (pg. 2 under “General education goals and expected learning outcomes) be altered to read “Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity” instead of “Race, Ethnicity and Gender”. Additionally, they recommend that the introduction to the REGD Goals and ELOS be altered to read “As a part of the Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity category…” instead of “As a part of the Race, Ethnicity and Race category…”.
   3. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department move the course learning outcomes (syllabus pg. 2) to follow the REGD Goals and Expected Learning Outcomes (syllabus pg. 3), and kindly suggests that this might allow the course learning outcomes to be combined with the paragraph explaining how this course meets the goals and ELOs for the REGD category should the department feel that this is appropriate.
   4. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department include in the syllabus a clear statement about what Legacy GE categories this course will fulfill, as well as what New GE categories it fulfills to help alleviate student confusion.
   5. Ponce, Abrams; unanimously approved with *four recommendations* (in italics above.)
3. WGSST 2327 (existing course with GE Cultures and Ideas; will become new GE Foundation: Historical and Cultural Studies; previously approved for 100% DL; requesting new GE Foundation: REGD)
   1. The Panel is excited by the course title and topic and appreciates the early focus on intersectional topics.
   2. The Panel asks the department to re-visit the organization of the course, keeping in mind the need to make the connections between embodiment, REGD topics, and the course topics more explicit, both in the course schedule (syllabus pg. 13-15) and in the course description (syllabus pg. 1). They would like to see more “signposting” for students that explains how disparate topics like food deserts, pornography, and the human voice are related to embodiment, REGD issues, and to one another. The Panel sees that many of these topics *could* be a part of embodiment, but they would like more information about how these topics will be employed in the discussion of topics such as race, ethnicity, power, privilege, and different bodies (transgender, intersex, etc.)
   3. The Panel requests that the GE submission form be altered to give more information about why certain topics are emphasized in the course. They note that much of the information on the form is focused on assignment parameters as they are presented to students, and they would like more information about how assignments such as the food map are related to race, ethnicity, gender, intersectionality and the body.
   4. The Panel requests that the department include full bibliographic information for the assigned readings.
   5. The Panel asks that the department amend the attendance and participation requirements. Currently, the syllabus (pg. 4 under “Attendance and participation requirements”) reads “Participating in synchronous class sessions: at least seven class sessions;” the Panel kindly asks the department to clarify whether this means that students must *attend* at least seven class sessions, or whether they must actively speak/contribute to classroom discussion during at least seven different meetings of the class over the course of the semester.
   6. The Panel asks that the department include the anticipated day/time structure of the synchronous class meetings in the heading information on the first page of the syllabus (i.e. WF 9:10-10:30 or MWF 11:10-12:05). While the Panel understands that this is an approximation at best, it is necessary to determine whether the department is planning the appropriate amount of direct instruction.
   7. No Vote
4. Linguistics 3601 (existing course with GE Cultures and Ideas & Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S. will be new GE Foundation: Historical and Cultural Studies; previously approved for 100% DL; requesting new GE Foundation: REGD)
   1. Comment: The Panel would like to express their enthusiasm for an REGD course in linguistics and commend the department for crafting a helpful and informative GE submission form.
   2. *Recommendation:* The Panel suggests that the department reconsider how some terminology (melting pot, minority) is presented in the syllabus; they note that the lack of quotations marks (especially when punctuation *is* used surrounding terms like “ethnic” and “white”) lends these terms an air of legitimacy that may run counter to the goals of the course.
   3. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department reference REGD topics, especially those related to race and gender, more explicitly in the course assignments. For example, how will the readings and quiz about ethnic slurs engage with topics surrounding race?
   4. *Recommendation:* The Panel asks that any reference to a “standard” grading scale (syllabus pg. 3 under “Grading and Course Policies”) be removed from the syllabus and replaced with language such as “The course will utilize the grading scale seen below:”, as OSU does not have a standard institutional grading scale.
   5. Abrams, Ponce; unanimously approved with one comment and *three recommendations* (in italics above,) and one comment.
5. WGSST 2400 (existing course with GE Cultures and Ideas; previously approved for 100% DL; will be grandfathered into new GE Foundation Historical and Cultural Studies; requesting new GE Foundation: REGD)
   1. Comment: The Panel commends the department on creating a strong REGD course that engages students across historical concepts and articulates that clearly via the course goals and expected learning outcomes.
   2. **Contingency:** The Panel asks that all Goals and ELOs for the GE Foundations: Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity be included on the syllabus (pg. 2 under “Course Learning Outcomes.”) and that the heading be edited to read “GE Foundations: Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity” rather than “GE Category: Race, Ethnicity, and Gender.” The most up-to-date listing of the Goals and Expected Learning Outcomes for the GE can be found here: <https://oaa.osu.edu/ohio-state-ge-program>
   3. **Contingency:** The Panel asks that the department more clearly articulate how race and ethnicity interact intersectionally with gender in regard to the course topics. They would like to see this addressed in both the course description (syllabus pg. 1), and the course schedule (syllabus pg. 9-12) as a way of “signposting” for students how REGD issues will be central to the course.
   4. *Recommendation:*  The Panel recommends that the department remove references to “synchronous” meeting times (syllabus pg. 1), as the syllabus states that the mode of delivery is in-person.
   5. *Recommendation:* The Panel suggests that the department update their Title IX statement (syllabus pg. 15 under “Title IX”), as Mollie Peirano is no longer the Title IX Coordinator at Ohio State. The most up-to-date version of this statement is available here: https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements
   6. Ponce, Abrams; unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above,) *one* recommendation (in italics above,) and one comment.