**ASCC Themes 2 Panel**

Approved Minutes

Tuesday, Feb. 28th, 2023 10:30AM – 12:00PM

Carmen Zoom

**Attendees:**  Hilty, Holt, Kogan, Nagar, Richard, Rohdieck, Smith, Steele, Putikka, Vankeerbergen, Vu

Agenda

1. Approval of 2/14/23 minutes
	1. Kogan, Nagar; unanimously approved.
2. Bioethics 3000 (existing course requesting GEN Theme: Health & Wellbeing)
	1. TAG
		1. Approved via e-vote.
		2. NOTE: Some comments from the TAG members are incorporated into the points of feedback from the Themes Panel below, as they offered similar feedback.
	2. Themes Panel
		1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department better illustrate how the assignments connect with the goals and ELOs of the GEN Theme: Health and Wellbeing category and how they constitute an advanced study of the Theme. They note that further description of the assignments in the syllabus (pg. 3-4) would be useful in understanding this connection.
		2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide additional details about the difference between “low-stakes” and “high-stakes” writing assignments.
		3. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department alter the GEN Goals and ELOs in the syllabus to reflect the most updated version of ELO 3.2 (pg. 2, numbered 1.2 on the syllabus). The corrected language should read “Identify, reflect on, or apply strategies for promoting health and wellbeing.” rather than “Identify, reflect on, and apply the skills needed for resiliency and wellbeing.” An easy to cut/paste version of the goals and ELOs is available here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos>. Additionally, the Panel asks that the department provide more information in the syllabus regarding how ELO 3.2 (1.2) will be met by the course’s activities, assessments, readings, etc.
		4. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide complete citations of the readings on the course schedule (syllabus pg. 6-9) so that students (and the reviewing faculty) have a better idea of the workload/advanced nature of the course.
		5. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department update the Student Life Disability Services statement (syllabus pg. 10 under “Accessibility Accommodations”), as the office’s website and their preferred syllabus statement have changed. An updated statement can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
		6. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department update the Student Wellness Statement (syllabus pg. 10), as Counseling and Consultation Services now recommends including information on after-hours services. An updated statement can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
		7. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department update the Statement on Title IX (syllabus pg. 11) as Kellie Brennan no longer works at the university. An updated statement can be found here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
		8. Kogan, Nagar; unanimously approved with **four contingencies** (in bold above), and *3 recommendations* (in italics above).
3. Communication 2596 (existing course with GE Cross-Disciplinary Seminar; requesting GEN Theme: Sustainability) (return)
	1. Themes Panel
		1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department include in the syllabus the goals and ELOs (as well as explanatory paragraph describing how this course meets those goals and ELOs) for the Legacy General Education (GEL) Cross-Disciplinary Seminar category, as Communication 2596 still caries that designation. The GEL Goals and ELOs are available in an easy to copy/paste format here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/legacy-general-education-gel-goals-and-elos>.
		2. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department continue to evaluate the exam format as the class moves forward (noting students’ level of attainment and understanding of all the goals and ELOs of the Sustainability Theme) since students may opt out of one exam. They also recommend that the department provide further clarification on the format of the exams, as it appears from the description on pg. 4 of the syllabus that some attributes of the exams (such as the 80-minute time limit) will only apply to the final exam.
		3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department number the Theme ELOs (syllabus pg. 2-3) in the manner presented here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/new-general-education-gen-goals-and-elos> in order to maintain continuity for all GEN Theme: Sustainability courses and so that the connection between the goals and their corresponding ELOs is highlighted.
		4. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department update the Mental Health statement found on pg. 5 of the syllabus, as the name and phone number of the suicide/crisis hotline have changed. An updated statement is available here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
		5. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department update the Title IX statement (syllabus pg. 5), as Kellie Brennan no longer works for the university. An updated statement is available here: <https://asccas.osu.edu/curriculum/syllabus-elements>.
		6. Nagar, Kogan; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *four recommendations* (in italics above).
4. Conversation with OTDI and ASCODE about online HIP Themes courses
	1. The Panel voiced a number of concerns about High-Impact Practice courses in the GEN Themes being offered as asynchronous online courses, especially team-teaching courses. Their concerns centered around the following:
		1. The current GE Submission and High-Impact forms are not prompting answers to the questions that the Panel has about how a class will be “high-impact”, especially when the course is online/asynchronous.
		2. The Panel struggles to see how a course will have integrative, interactive team teaching when students and instructors are not ever together in the same virtual and/or geographic space and without real-time interaction.
		3. While the Panel acknowledges that excellent teaching can be done in a well-designed online, asynchronous course, they wonder how it can be considered “high-impact” when the relationship building component that is so integral to high impact practices seems so difficult to duplicate in an asynchronous format. The solutions to this problem that the Panel has seen thus far seem to be considered “busy work” by students, and not an authentic form of interaction.
		4. The Panel members are open to new formats and innovative solutions, but they feel that instructors and departments need to seek expert help when designing the course and filling out proposal paperwork so the Panel doesn’t have to make assumptions, inferences, and other “leaps” of understanding about what is happening in the course, what students are learning, and how they are learning it.
	2. Staff and instructional designers offered some insights:
		1. It is important to not try to view online courses as only functioning well if they mimic in-person courses. Online learning is not about making a facsimile of the in-person experience, but rather taking advantage of benefits offered in this environment.
		2. The instructional designers shared an example of a course that they believe does this kind of work already, and examples of some of the materials that they use when helping to design courses with units/instructors.
		3. The instructional design experts were cautious about asking faculty/departments/units who design these kinds of courses to fill out additional paperwork that others don’t have to do.
	3. Discussion of the ways that the Themes Panel could better evaluate these courses:
		1. Potentially administer a different form or additional questions on the HIP form for courses planning to operate in an asynchronous format. Both groups did not respond positively to this idea, as it would require instructors and the Panel to do additional work when the process is already very labor intensive.
		2. Suggestion to review Carmen pages – this was discussed, but Asst. Dean Vankeerbergen pointed out that the ASCC has declined to review Carmen sites for a number of reasons surrounding accessibility, workload, and accuracy of record keeping.
		3. The suggestion of asking instructors/units to work with instructional designers, either via OTDI or their colleges’ Distance Education offices was received more favorably. (For other HIP categories, other resources - such as the Office of Academic Enrichment or the Office of International Affairs - may be more appropriate.) ASC folks are already required to have their DL courses reviewed by ASC ODE, but that office’s feedback is not binding and everyone hesitated to mandate use of these resources.
		4. Everyone agreed that additional conversation and consultation is needed on these topics.