**ASCC Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel**

Approved Minutes

Thursday, September 8, 2022 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Barker, Cody, Cole, Dinan, Hamilton, Kaizar, Ottesen, Vankeerbergen

**Agenda:**

1. Welcome and introductions.
2. Overview of the work of the panel
3. Approval of 5-9-22 minutes
	* Hamilton, Kaizar; **unanimously approved**
4. Physics 5810 (renumbering of existing course from 6810)
	* Regarding prerequisites, the Panel recommends that the department also consider whether or not to include “or graduate standing, or permission of instructor,” and (where applicable) the honors versions of any of the courses currently listed on the curriculum.osu.edu form.
	* In the syllabus, please include a course schedule that approximates what topics the instructor anticipates covering weekly (if not daily, as applicable) so students have a stronger sense of the pacing of the class material for the term. This course schedule should also feature titles, author names, and/or links to downloads for reading assignments, as well as any important benchmarks.
	* The Panel asks that the syllabus include further detail about the anticipated workload and the expectations for specific assignments in the course — especially regarding what the final project entails, as it comprises 30% of the students’ overall grade for the term. For instance:
		+ How is the final project scaffolded into the course throughout the semester?
		+ What, specifically, will the final project help assess about a student’s grasp of the course material?
		+ How is this final project integrated with any other assignments and/or aspects of the course?
	* Also, the Panel would like clarification on how any and/or all assignments will be impacted by the fact that the course is being adjusted from a 6000-level to a 5000-level with an eye toward including prospective upper-level undergraduates, who are however perhaps less familiar with certain specialized, discipline-specific aspects of the class than their graduate student colleagues.
	* The Panel recommends expanding on the particular technology requirements students should anticipate being able to access for the course. For instance, technology requirements section (found on pages 4-5 of the syllabus) should also include language specifying what devices are permitted for in- and out-of-class work; state requirements for certain devices in this course also includes what specific programs require certain types of computers, specialized logins (e.g., dual authentication), etc.
	* The Panel suggests including more concrete, fleshed-out class policies for late and/or missing work, affording students a firmer grasp over this critical aspect of how their grade is calculated in this course.
	* With an eye to similar concerns, the Panel recommends including further clarifying information about the absence policies and procedures for the course. In particular, the Panel is concerned about the ambiguous relationship between the stated 0% attendance component and the 30% in-class worksheet component. For instance, even if a student reaches out in advance about an absence, would they not still lose the opportunity/points to complete the in-class worksheets on the day of their anticipated absence? These two components of the final grade seem inextricably connected as currently outlined in the syllabus.
	* As the Panel understands the present grading structure of the course — which members recognize was originally conceived with only graduate students in mind, when it was previously numbered at the 6000-level and thus exclusive to graduate students — it appears that an undergraduate student could, in effect, do the absolute bare minimum required for each assignment, and yet still end up with some kind of a B in the class at minimum. There are many possible solutions to address this issue of course rigor and grading in a class that enrolls both undergraduate and graduate students. One option the Panel recommends would be to create separate grading scales for undergraduate vs. graduate students, along with statements indicating the overall expectations for each group.
	* The Panel asks that the syllabus feature the most current Student Life Disability Services (SLDS) statement, available here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>
	* **No Vote**
5. Physics 1270 (existing course requesting GEN Foundation: Natural Sciences)
	* **The Panel requests that the full and complete Goals and ELOs for the GEN Foundation: Natural Sciences category — as well as an explanatory paragraph outlining how the class intends to meet these particular Goals/ELOs — appear in their own separate section on the syllabus, clearly distinguishable from the specific Learning Outcomes listed for the course as a course. The GEN Goals and ELOs can be found here on the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website:** [**https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos**](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos)
	* Kaizar, Cole; **unanimously approved** with **one (1) contingency** (in bold above)
6. Physics 1271 (new course) (return)
	* *On page 12 of the syllabus, the Panel recommends enlarging the font size of the Student Life Disability Services (SLDS) statement to 16 pt., which would better ensure students’ accessibility to the information about this resource.*
	* Barker, Cole; **unanimously approved** with *one (1) recommendation* (in italics above)