**ASCC Themes Panel**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, August 11, 2022 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Cody, Conroy, Daly, Ferketich, Fredal, Hilty, Kogan, Nagar, Putikka, Rush, Steele, Vaessin

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of 7-14-22 minutes
   * Putikka, Rush; **unanimously approved**
2. Plant Pathology 4321 (new course requesting new GE Theme Sustainability)
   * Theme Advisory Group: Sustainability
     + The reviewing faculty appreciate the potential for the course to integrate well with the Sustainability theme, but believe it bears further development to make these implicit connections to Sustainability more explicit throughout the course proposal. Specifically, the reviewing faculty ask that:
       - The syllabus establish the theme within the body of the topics and readings early on, taking care to directly underscore the links between Sustainability and the course content. Although the theme ELOs are listed in the schedule in the current proposal, the connections between the theme ELOs and the corresponding content are unclear.
       - The course proposal more overtly articulate the links between biological invasion and Sustainability so the connections between the two are integrated throughout the fabric of the course. For example, the reviewing faculty note that the first article in the bibliography from 2011 grounds the course well in the study of biological invasion, but that the general Sustainability framework within these dimensions remains nebulous.
       - The Sustainability theme’s presence in assignments also be developed further, directly underscoring where and which aspects of the theme will feature in various activities. For example, the reviewing faculty note that presentations are intended as a means to make the Sustainability link, but it is unclear how this will be accomplished, as the rubric only notes “depth of research” while nothing in the ratings connects to the theme.
     + **No Vote**
   * Themes Panel: Sustainability
     + The reviewing faculty concur with their colleagues on the Theme Advisory Group and would like to see the same changes made to the syllabus.
     + On the bottom of page 8 of the syllabus, the reviewing faculty kindly note that there is a typo regarding the total possible number of quiz points, which should be 180 rather than 165 (per the How Your Grade Is Calculated chart at the top of the same page).
     + On page 14 of the syllabus, the reviewing faculty recommend clarifying which students qualify to use the services of CFAES counselor David Wirt, as the course will be taken by students across the university and its various colleges.
     + The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
     + **No Vote**
3. ENR 3400 (existing course requesting new GE Theme: Sustainability)  RETURN
   * Theme Advisory Group: Sustainability
     + The reviewing faculty recognize and appreciate the effort to show specific sustainability links along with human/environment considerations in the course goals, although the former is not always as explicitly stated as the latter. In general, the syllabus reflects an ongoing preference for the term “environment” to the exclusion of the term “sustainability” in topics and title; the reviewing faculty are concerned that this might suggest, from a sustainability standpoint, that this course is focused only on environment in a way that seems to work at cross-purposes with the point of having a sustainability theme. To remedy this, the reviewing faculty ask that the department:
       - **Implement slight revisions in the course goal language; there are points where the instructor could substitute “sustainability” in place of “environment” without changing the meaning of the course intent, and would better align with the sense of being a GE Sustainability course.**
       - **Add brief language to the syllabus about how “sustainability” is to be understood amid this description of the emergence/evolution of “conservation biology” — since if students are taking the course in partial fulfillment of the GE Theme requirement, they may wonder if that is the same thing as sustainability.**
     + **Approved** via e-vote with **two (2) contingencies** (in bold above)
   * Themes Panel: Sustainability
     + **The reviewing faculty concur with their colleagues on the Theme Advisory Group and would like to see the same changes made to the syllabus.**
     + **The reviewing faculty kindly request that the syllabus include a bibliography of projected reading assignments so the committee might better evaluate if the class is an advanced-level critical-thinking course on the theme in question.**
     + **The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.**
     + *The reviewing faculty recommend removing any reference to an “OSU standard grading scheme,” as Ohio State does not have a standardized grading scheme.*
     + Putikka, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **three (3) contingencies** (in bold above) and *one (1) recommendation* (in italics above)
4. FABE 3210 + 3211 (new courses requesting new GE Theme Sustainability, **with HIP Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching**) RETURN
   * Theme Advisory Group: Sustainability
     + **Approved** via e-vote
   * Themes Panel: Sustainability
     + Vaessin, Rush; **unanimously approved**
   * HIP Team-Teaching
     + The reviewing faculty are unable to see how the instructors co-teaching the course will engage in Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching as defined by the High-Impact Practice forms created by the Office of Academic Affairs (see here: <https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/interdisciplinary-team-courses-description-expectations.pdf>). While they acknowledge that the course is being co-taught, in order to count within the Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching category, a course must establish that an interdisciplinary co-teaching style will be developed and implemented, as defined by the Office of Academic Affairs. For example:
       - “In multidisciplinary courses, faculty present their individual perspectives one after another, leaving differences in underlying assumptions unexamined and integration up to the students. In interdisciplinary courses, whether taught by teams or individuals, faculty interact in designing a course, bringing to light and examining underlying assumptions and modifying their perspectives in the process. They also make a concerted effort to work with students in crafting an integrated synthesis of the separate parts that provides a larger, more holistic understanding of the question, problem or issue at hand. Smith’s iron law bears repeating: ‘Students shall not be expected to integrate anything the faculty can’t or won’t’ (quoted in Gaff, 1980, pp. 54-55). (Klein & Newall, 12).”
       - “A team-taught course requires that two or more faculty from different disciplines, programs or departments develop and offer a course together. Team-taught courses must be taught collaboratively by faculty who integrate distinctly separate disciplines, model interdisciplinary academic exchange, and demonstrate the interdisciplinary nature of the course. This includes explicitly synthesizing across and between the disciplines that each instructor brings to the team-taught, interdisciplinary course."
       - “Teaching partners are expected to collaborate on defining the objectives for the course, putting together the course materials, conducting the formal instruction of students, and evaluating student performance. Note that courses in which one faculty member of record convenes the course and invites one or more guest speakers to take part in the class are not considered team-taught courses.”
     + Additionally, the reviewing faculty kindly request further information regarding where team-teaching/instructor interaction will occur, how exactly it is split between the course and the lab components, and how the concept of interdisciplinarity emerges and maintains across these divisions. Specifically, the reviewing faculty are uncertain whether the team-teaching will occur only in 3210, only in 3211, or in both components.
     + The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
     + **No Vote**
5. Food Science and Technology & FABE 3400 (existing cross-listed courses requesting new GE Theme Sustainability, **with HIP Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching**) RETURN  (THEME IS ALREADY APPROVED; ONLY HIP NEEDS TO BE RECONSIDERED)
   * Theme Advisory Group: Sustainability
     + **Approved** via e-vote
   * Themes Panel: Sustainability
     + Vaessin, Rush; **unanimously approved**
   * HIP Team-Teaching
     + The reviewing faculty would like to extend their appreciation and thanks for the submitted revision of Food Science and Technology & FABE 3400. They approve of this course for the GE Theme: Sustainability but do not approve of the revision for the High-Impact Practice: Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching. As an option, the reviewing faculty offer the opportunity to submit the course as a three-credit hour GE Theme: Sustainability course, scaled to meet the standards for a three-credit hour course, which will be reviewed by the Panel Chair. Please see below for additional feedback regarding the High-Impact Practice: Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching portion of the revision, should you wish to submit a revision for that.
     + The reviewing faculty are unable to see how the instructors co-teaching the course will engage in Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching as defined by the High-Impact Practice forms created by the Office of Academic Affairs (see here: <https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/interdisciplinary-team-courses-description-expectations.pdf>). While they acknowledge that the course is being co-taught, in order to count within the Interdisciplinary Team-Teaching category, a course must establish that an interdisciplinary co-teaching style will be developed and introduced, as defined by the Office of Academic Affairs. For example:
       - “In multidisciplinary courses, faculty present their individual perspectives one after another, leaving differences in underlying assumptions unexamined and integration up to the students. In interdisciplinary courses, whether taught by teams or individuals, faculty interact in designing a course, bringing to light and examining underlying assumptions and modifying their perspectives in the process. They also make a concerted effort to work with students in crafting an integrated synthesis of the separate parts that provides a larger, more holistic understanding of the question, problem or issue at hand. Smith’s iron law bears repeating: ‘Students shall not be expected to integrate anything the faculty can’t or won’t’ (quoted in Gaff, 1980, pp. 54-55). (Klein & Newall, 12).”
       - “A team-taught course requires that two or more faculty from different disciplines, programs or departments develop and offer a course together. Team-taught courses must be taught collaboratively by faculty who integrate distinctly separate disciplines, model interdisciplinary academic exchange, and demonstrate the interdisciplinary nature of the course. This includes explicitly synthesizing across and between the disciplines that each instructor brings to the team-taught, interdisciplinary course."
       - “Teaching partners are expected to collaborate on defining the objectives for the course, putting together the course materials, conducting the formal instruction of students, and evaluating student performance. Note that courses in which one faculty member of record convenes the course and invites one or more guest speakers to take part in the class are not considered team-taught courses.”
     + The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
     + **No Vote**
6. Public Affairs 2150 (existing course requesting new GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World) RETURN  (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY TAG BUT NOT BY THEMES PANEL)
   * Themes Panel: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World
     + **The reviewing faculty kindly note that only the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs for the Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World theme need to appear in the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. Specifically, they ask that you add Goals 1 and 2, as well as corresponding ELOs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, and 2.2, which can be found on the ASCCAS website:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)**. They also ask that you remove the entire Goals and ELOs for the entire General Education Program, which begin on page 1 of the syllabus document.**
     + Vaessin, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **one (1) contingency** (in bold above)
7. Islamic Studies 3201 (existing course with GE Social Science—Individuals and Groups & Diversity—Social Diversity in the U.S.; requesting new GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World) RETURN  (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY TAG BUT NOT BY THEMES PANEL)
   * Themes Panel: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World
     + **The reviewing faculty note that the feedback cover mentions the course title as it appears in the syllabus, “Muslims in America and Europe: Citizenship and Living Between Worlds,” has also been amended accordingly on curriculum.osu.edu (replacing the word “citizenship” for “migration”). However, the title of the course on curriculum.osu.edu still reflects the older course title of “Muslims in America and Europe: Migration and Living Between Worlds.” The reviewing faculty request that the course title on the curriculum.osu.edu form be amended to match that found on the syllabus.**
     + *The reviewing faculty recommend double-checking the syllabus to ensure that any language intimating that this version of the course takes place in an online format is edited accordingly. For example, on page 13 of the syllabus, there is a reference to “synchronous/live” lecture sessions.*
     + *On page 7 of the syllabus, the reviewing faculty suggest removing the mention of university-issued iPads, as this resource is no longer available to students.*
     + Vaessin, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **one (1) contingency** (in bold above) and *two (2) recommendations* (in italics above)
8. Political Science 2120 (new course requesting new GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World & Health and Wellbeing) RETURN (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY BOTH TAGS; THEMES PANEL ALSO FULLY APPROVED FOR HEALTH AND WELLBEING; ASCC THEMES PANEL DID NOT APPROVE FOR CITIZENSHIP)
   * Themes Panel: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World
     + Putikka, Rush; **unanimously approved**
9. Anthropology 3350 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations)
   * **The reviewing faculty ask that the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs — as well as an explanatory paragraph outlining how the class intends to meet the Goals/ELOs for the Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations theme — be added into the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. The GE Goals and ELOs can be found here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)
   * Vaessin, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **one (1) contingency** (in bold above)
10. Earth Science 2122 (existing course with GEL Natural Science—Physical Science with lab; requesting GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution)
    * The reviewing faculty are unable to discern how this course will be an advanced study of the topic of Origins and Evolution. They ask further clarification be made within the course syllabus how the readings, assignments, and course content will allow this course to examine the concept of Origins and Evolution at an advanced level. For example, the reviewing faculty note that there are no stated prerequisites for the course, and that the designated textbook, *Visualizing Earth History*, is one typically assigned to foundations-level students.
    * The reviewing faculty understand that the course in its present form is approved for the Legacy GE (GEL) with a lab, making it a 4CH class. However, the Panel is extremely reluctant to approve a 4 CH course that does NOT qualify as a HIP course, as that would cause confusion among students, faculty, and staff, as well as a potential problem with degree audit and the requirements of the GE as presented to students (that the Theme can be fulfilled with 4-6 credit hours.). Thus, when revising the course, the reviewing faculty would like the School of Earth Sciences to consider the following options:
      + Revise/reorganize and resubmit the proposal to have the course considered as a 3+1 option to cater to both groups of students who might be enrolling in the course. Those taking the course for GEN can enroll in the 3-credit-hour portion of the class, while those taking the course for their major or Legacy GE can elect the 4-credit-hour 3+1 version with the lab component.
      + Alternatively, perhaps, update the course so that the course includes a High-Impact Practice, and resubmit for consideration under GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution with HIP, which will keep the class at 4-credit hours.
    * The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
    * **No Vote**
    * ADDENDUM: The reviewing faculty discussed the issue of 4-credit-hour courses seeking Themes designation without High-Impact Practice; for the time being, consensus is to provide options in the feedback to departments that will allow them to pursue Themes designation, but while also preserving the 4CH Themes designation for HIP only. The Panel is extremely reluctant to approve a 4 CH course that does NOT qualify as a HIP course, as that would cause confusion among students, faculty, and staff, as well as a potential problem with degree audit and the requirements of the GE as presented to students (that the Theme can be fulfilled with 4-6 credit hours.).
11. Earth Science 2122H (existing course with GEL Natural Science—Physical Science with lab; requesting GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution)
    * The reviewing faculty are unable to discern how this course will be an advanced study of the topic of Origins and Evolution. They ask further clarification be made within the course syllabus how the readings, assignments, and course content will allow this course to examine the concept of Origins and Evolution at an advanced level. For example, the reviewing faculty note that there are no stated prerequisites for the course, and that the designated textbook, *Visualizing Earth History*, is one typically assigned to foundations-level students.
    * The reviewing faculty understand that the course in its present form is approved for the Legacy GE (GEL) with a lab, making it a 4CH class. However, the Panel is extremely reluctant to approve a 4 CH course that does NOT qualify as a HIP course, as that would cause confusion among students, faculty, and staff, as well as a potential problem with degree audit and the requirements of the GE as presented to students (that the Theme can be fulfilled with 4-6 credit hours.). Thus, when revising the course, the reviewing faculty would like the School of Earth Sciences to consider the following options:
      + Revise/reorganize and resubmit the proposal to have the course considered as a 3+1 option to cater to both groups of students who might be enrolling in the course. Those taking the course for GEN can enroll in the 3-credit-hour portion of the class, while those taking the course for their major or Legacy GE can elect the 4-credit-hour 3+1 version with the lab component.
      + Alternatively, perhaps, update the course so that the course includes a High-Impact Practice, and resubmit for consideration under GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution with HIP, which will keep the class at 4-credit hours.
    * In order to approve the honors version of this course, the reviewing faculty ask that the department provide an Honors syllabus that demonstrates the differences between the honors and non-honors versions of the class. At this time, the only difference between the two syllabi is in the course number (2122 vs. 2122H) and the course prerequisites (honors status).
    * The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
    * **No Vote**
12. Philosophy 3210 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations; course previously approved for 100% DL)
    * **The reviewing faculty ask that the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs — as well as an explanatory paragraph outlining how the class intends to meet the Goals/ELOs for the Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations theme — be added into the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. The GE Goals and ELOs can be found here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)
    * **On the first page of the syllabus, the stated prerequisite for the course is different than that which appears on the curriculum.osu.edu form. The curriculum.osu.edu form states “three credit hours in Philosophy, or permission of instructor,” while page 1 of the syllabus designates “three credit hours in Philosophy other than 1500, or by permission of instructor.” The reviewing faculty request that the course prerequisite on the curriculum.osu.edu form be amended to match that found on the syllabus or vice versa.**
    * **The reviewing faculty note that the GE submission form does not provide an explanation of how the course will address ELO 1.2, and asks that this information also be included.**
    * Putikka, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **three (3) contingencies** (in bold above)
13. Anthropology 3409 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution)
    * **The reviewing faculty ask that the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs for the Origins and Evolution theme be added into the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. The GE Goals and ELOs can be found here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)
    * **The reviewing faculty request that the GE form for the Origins and Evolution theme be resubmitted using the most up-to-date version that contains the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs. The current form for the Origins and Evolution theme is available here:** [**https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/submission-origins-evolution.pdf**](https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/submission-origins-evolution.pdf)
    * **On page 1 of the syllabus, there is a reference to the Evolutionary Studies Minor, which no longer exists. The reviewing faculty ask that this mention be removed from the document.**
    * *The reviewing faculty suggest that the department include the most up-to-date version of the University’s Title IX statement, which can be found here:* [*https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements*](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)*.*
    * Putikka, Vaessin; **unanimously approved** with **three (3) contingencies** (in bold above) and *one (1)* recommendation (in italics above)
14. Anthropology 5600 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution)
    * **The reviewing faculty ask that the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs for the Origins and Evolution theme be added into the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. The GE Goals and ELOs can be found here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)
    * **The reviewing faculty request that the GE form for the Origins and Evolution theme be resubmitted using the most up-to-date version that contains the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs. The current form for the Origins and Evolution theme is available here:** [**https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/submission-origins-evolution.pdf**](https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/submission-origins-evolution.pdf)
    * **On page 3 of the syllabus, there is a reference to the Evolutionary Studies Minor, which no longer exists. The reviewing faculty ask that this mention be removed from the document.**
    * **The reviewing faculty request that the syllabus include the most up-to-date COAM statement, which can be found here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
    * **The reviewing faculty ask that the syllabus feature the current disability statement, available here:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements**](https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements)
    * *On page 8 of the PDF, the syllabus states that “university rules do not allow instructors to discuss grades over the phone or through e-mail.” The reviewing faculty recommend clarifying this statement, as university rules do allow for discussion of grades over official OSU e-mail accounts.*
    * *The reviewing faculty recommend considering a prerequisite for undergraduates as they may be lost without some prior knowledge — or, alternatively, explain in the syllabus how a student entering the course from outside of Anthropology could take this course without prerequisites. If the department is concerned about scheduling difficulties for graduate students, a possible solution to this could be to make the prerequisites, for example, “Anthropology 2200 OR graduate standing.”*
    * Ferketich, Rush; **unanimously approved** with **five (5) contingencies** (in bold above) and *two (2) recommendations* (in italics above)
15. Anthropology 5609 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Origins and Evolution)
    * The reviewing faculty ask that the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs for the Origins and Evolution theme be added into the course syllabus, per a requirement of General Education courses. The GE Goals and ELOs can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos>
    * The reviewing faculty request that the GE form for the Origins and Evolution theme be resubmitted using the most up-to-date version that contains the full and complete GE Goals and ELOs. The current form for the Origins and Evolution theme is available here: <https://oaa.osu.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/general-education-review/new-ge/submission-origins-evolution.pdf>
    * Beginning on the first page of the syllabus and throughout the document, there are several references to the course being in hybrid format and mentions of “pandemic policy” that no longer apply to this version of the class, which will be taught fully in-person. The reviewing faculty ask that this language be removed from and/or clarified accordingly throughout the syllabus.
    * The reviewing faculty express concern about the required number of contact hours for the course being met as represented by the submitted course calendar (found on pages 8-11 of the PDF), which seems to have the instructor missing class dates as well as a lengthy amount of meetings devoted to student presentations. They would like to ensure that the calendar-of-record for the class reflects proper contact hours for a 3-credit-hour course.
    * The reviewing faculty would like some additional clarification from the department surrounding the prerequisites for this course. The course has a prerequisite of Anthropology 2200. As previously indicated for other Theme submissions from the Department of Anthropology, Anthropology 2200 has itself a prerequisite of Biology 1101 or equivalent. General Education courses should have few to no prerequisites and the reviewing faculty worry that having this prerequisite is too restrictive for a General Education course. They respectfully ask again that the Department of Anthropology consider removing Biology 1101 as a prerequisite for Anthropology 2200.
    * The reviewing faculty also recommend adding “OR graduate standing” as a prerequisite for the class if the department is concerned that adding a prerequisite may make scheduling difficult for graduate students.
    * The reviewing faculty recommend removing any reference to an “OSU standard grading scheme,” as Ohio State does not have a standardized grading scheme.
    * The reviewing faculty suggest that the department include the most up-to-date version of the University’s Title IX statement, which can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
    * The reviewing faculty request a cover letter that details all changes made in response to this feedback.
    * **No Vote**