**ASCC Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel**

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, April 26th, 2023 12:30-2:00 PM

Carmen Zoom

**Attendees**: Barker, Cole, Dinan, Hamilton, Kaizar, Ottesen, Smith, Steele, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 4/12/23 minutes
   1. Barker, Hamilton; unanimously approved.
2. Pub Health: Biostatistics 2210H (existing course requesting GEN Foundation Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis))
   1. **Contingency:** The Panel asks that the department reproduce on the syllabus (pg. 2) the Goal of the Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis) category exactly as it appears [here](https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos), so that consistency is maintained for all courses in this GEN category. In addition, per a requirement of the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, the Panel asks that the department provide an explanation of how this course, in particular, meets the goals and ELOs of the GEN category. This explanation should follow the listing of the goals and ELOs on pg. 2 of the syllabus.
   2. *Recommendation*: In order to reduce student confusion, the Panel recommends that the department clearly label the course as being a part of the New General Education (GEN) and note on the syllabus (pg. 2) that the course does *not* fulfill any requirement in the Legacy General Education (GEL). This is especially important for GEN Foundation: Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis) courses since the name of the GEN category is very similar to the name of the mathematics and data analysis categories in the GEL.
   3. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the unit update the Mental Health Statement (syllabus pg. 9-10 under “Mental Health Services”), as the name and phone number of the crisis/suicide hotline have changed. An updated statement is available at: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
   4. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the unit update the Title IX Statement (syllabus pg. 11 under “Statement on Title IX”), as the office no longer recommends naming a specific staff member as a contact. An updated statement is available here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
   5. Kaizar, Hamilton; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *three recommendations* (in italics above).
3. EEOB 3495 (new course also requesting 100% DL)
   1. Note: The Panel discussed the possibility of asking for (a) concurrence(s) from other biological sciences units, but decided this was not necessary due to the course’s focus on evolution and ecology research.
   2. Comment: The Panel is supportive of the course and looks forward to having it as a part of the college’s offerings.
   3. The Panel asks that the department include in the syllabus a more detailed description of what a typical week looks like for students. They would like more information about how students’ time will be spent each week so that students have a better idea of the expected workload.
   4. The Panel requests that the department provide more information on the direct instruction and instructor presence. The Panel acknowledges that direct instruction can take many forms in an online, asynchronous course such as this one; however, they would like to understand what it will look like in this course. For example, what content is being created or mediated by the instructor? How will students interact with the instructor and benefit from their expertise? They observed that the “boilerplate” language from the “How This Online Course Works – Credit hours and work expectations” section of the Distance Learning Template syllabus (pg. 2) has been altered to eliminate the usual reference to direct instruction, which raised some confusion. They ask that this information be included so that the syllabus better communicates to both the Panel and students how the expected two hours a week of direct instruction is being presented.
   5. The Panel asks that the department provide additional information on the assignments, especially the expected length of the discussion posts and final reflection paper, details about how these written assignments will be evaluated, and a further explanation of how the course instructor will interact with students on the discussion boards. The final item is of particular interest since this seems to be the primary method of interaction between the instructor and the students (see feedback item #4 above).
   6. No Vote
4. EEOB 3496 (new course)
   1. Comment: The Panel thanks the department for their work on this course, and their attention to the needs of students in their program.
   2. *Recommendation:* The Panel notes that, in general, more information is needed in the syllabus regarding the course’s assignments, especially the following:
      1. The Panel recommends that the department clearly state the expected format and length of the research proposal so that students understand what is expected in this assignment.
      2. The Panel observes that there appear to be two different types of online discussion posts for this course - one type that responds to traditional writing prompts based on the readings, and another that involves proposing questions for the guest speakers. They recommend that these two different types of posts be separately described (syllabus pg. 5 under “Descriptions of major course assignments”) and clearly delineated on the course schedule (syllabus pgs. 9-12).
   3. *Recommendation:* The Panel recommends that the department consider modifying the course’s pre-requisites and/or the course description in the course catalog. They note that the current pre-requisites and course description indicate that a student could enroll in this course after taking an introductory biology course like Biology 1101 or 1113 or even as a 1st semester student if they have AP/IB/EM credit for a biology course. They suggest the addition of a sentence to the course description such as: “To get the most out of this course, you should be a 3rd or 4th year student who is actively engaged in planning your post-baccalaureate experience” or similar.
   4. Barker, Cole; unanimously approved with *two recommendations* (in italics above) and one comment.