**ASCC Themes I Subcommittee**

Approved Minutes

Tuesday, November 28th, 2023 2:30-4:00 PM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Andridge, Daly, Downing, Fredal, Griffith, Neff, Palazzi, Rehbeck, Steele, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of 11-14-23 minutes
   1. Vaessin, Rehbeck; unanimously approved.
2. Public Health Epidemiology 4432 (existing course previously approved for 100% DL; requesting GEN Theme Health and Wellbeing) (return)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty acknowledge that assignments #3, #4, and #5 are intended to collectively support the achievement of ELO 3.1 and ELO 3.2. They appreciate the department providing more information about these assignments, as well as the expanded discussion of how they are intended to contribute to students’ achievement of the ELOs. However, the reviewing faculty request that the department give additional attention to the following:
         1. The reviewing faculty are not clear on how the assignments, in their current form, will support students in analyzing health and well-being at an advanced level through the identified perspectives (ELO 3.1 - theoretical, scientific, cultural, policy). They ask that the department provide further clarification on how the assignments, readings, and/or lectures address this concern. Alternatively, the department may consider modifying the assignments to strengthen the aspects of scholarly exploration and in-depth analysis of critical issues.
         2. The reviewing faculty find these assignments to be limited in scope as they relate to helping students explore the two identified dimensions of well-being (intellectual and career). The addendum (syllabus pg. 4) provides some insight into how the course helps students achieve ELO 3.2, but the reviewing faculty request further clarification of how the course assignments, readings, and lectures will specifically support students exploring and analyzing well-being through these two dimensions.
      2. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. Overall, the reviewing faculty would like to see more details about how the course’s activities, readings, and assignments will support an “advanced, in-depth and scholarly” study of the theme, especially in relation to well-being.
      2. The reviewing faculty note that, in responding to the feedback of the TAG above, the department will likely make significant changes to the course’s assignments, readings, topics, and activities. As such, they would prefer to review the course again after these changes have been made.
      3. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
3. Classics 3700 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments)(tabled from last time)
   1. TAG
      1. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department amend the course schedule (syllabus pg. 7-10) to explicitly connect the daily/weekly topics and activities more closely to the ELOs of the GEN category, so that the links between the two are more obvious to students.
      2. Comment: The reviewing faculty appreciate the department’s careful consideration of the use of Chat GPT and similar software, and were glad to see that it’s allowability (or lack thereof) was clearly addressed for students in the section on Academic Misconduct (syllabus pg. 5)
      3. Vote to approve with *one recommendation* (in italics above).
   2. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department alter the language on pg. 1 of the syllabus that reads “This course meets the requirements for the GE Theme: Lived Environments”. As a 3-credit hour course, the course does not fully meet the requirements of the category, as students must earn between 4 and 6 credits to complete a theme. Given this, the reviewing faculty suggest language such as “Classics 3700 is approved as a part of the GEN Theme: Lived Environments category” or similar.
      2. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department alter the grade scale on pg. 3 of the syllabus, as the grade “D” is listed twice, but there is no grade of “D+”.
      3. Vaessin, Rehbeck; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above), and *one recommendation* (in italics above).
4. Kinesiology:Spt Indsty Spt Mgt 3100 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments) (tabled from last time)
   1. TAG
      1. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department provide more clarity for students regarding the use of artificial intelligence software (such as Chat GPT) in reference to the course’s writing assignments.
      2. Vote to approve with *one recommendation* (in italics above).
   2. Themes
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the department obtain a concurrence for the course from the Austin E. Knowlton School of Architecture, including the City and Regional Planning and Architecture sections.
      2. The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide a full bibliography for the course. While pg. 2 does note that “Additional readings will be made available in Carmen.”, the reviewing faculty would like more details about these readings, as they will be helpful in assessing the advanced nature of the course. While readings are only one of many factors used to determine whether a course provides an “advanced, in-depth, and scholarly” study of a subject, the reviewing faculty note that the required textbooks (listed on pg. 2 of the syllabus) are not from academic presses; thus, they hope to see additional readings of a scholarly nature that support the required textbooks. Alternatively, if the unit feels that the text *is* advanced, the reviewing faculty ask that the department explain more clearly how it presents the course material at an advanced level that contributes to students’ critical thinking.
      3. The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide more information about how the assignments and topics constitute and advanced study of the theme. To this end, they ask that the department do the following:
         1. Expand the assignment descriptions (the subcommittee is especially interested in more details about the Response Essays and the Concluding Project) found on pg. 3 of the syllabus.
         2. Expand the paragraph that follows the GEN Goals and ELOs (syllabus pg. 2) with more information for students about how the course fits the Goals and ELOs of the GEN category, especially ELOs 1.1 and 1.2.
         3. Separate the Attendance and Participation grade from the grade for the Reflection Essays and provide more information about what these essays will entail.
      4. The reviewing faculty ask that the department alter the language on pg. 2 of the syllabus that reads “KNSISM 3100 fulfills the General Education theme in Lived Environments”, as this 3-credit hour course does not, in and of itself, fulfill the GEN Theme: Lived Environments requirement of 4-6 credit hours. Instead, the reviewing faculty recommend the following: “KNSISM 3100 is approved as a part of the GEN Theme: Lived Environments category” or similar.
      5. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
5. History of Art 4798.03 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments)
   1. TAG
      1. Comment – The reviewing faculty feel that this course is a wonderful fit for the Lived Environments theme, and they commend the department for their responses on the GEN Submission Form, which clearly and convincingly explained how the course meets the goals and ELOs of the category.
      2. *Recommendation –* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department amend the course schedule (syllabus pgs. 6-8) to integrate the Lived Environment ELOs into descriptions of the daily topics and activities, so that students are more aware of the connection between the course’s topics and the GEN Theme.
      3. Voted to approve with *one recommendation* (in italics above).
   2. Themes
      1. *Recommendation*: The reviewing faculty recommend that the department reach out to the faculty and staff of the Knowlton School of Architecture with information about this course, as many students from that School may be interested in this Education Abroad program.
      2. Vaessin, Rehbeck; unanimously approved with *one recommendation* (in italics above).
6. Biology 2750 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments)
   * 1. TAG
        1. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit re-focus the topics, readings, assessments, and other course activities on the ELOs of the Lived Environments theme. In its current form, the course’s focus seems to be on the scientific methodology and modern methods of biological research rather than on the Lived Environment(s).
        2. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit alter the GEN Submission form to explain how the specific readings, assessments, topics, and activities in the course will address the goals and ELOs of the GEN Theme, rather than listing the course-specific ELO’s that align with the GEN Theme ELOs.
        3. The reviewing faculty suggest that the unit re-consider the course’s title, as the current title, “Biological Reasoning for Informed Citizenship” implies that the course will be focused on citizenship, which implies its inclusion in a different GEN Theme category.
        4. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
     2. Themes
        1. Comment: The reviewing faculty are excited to see a course on this topic and see it as a valuable contribution to the curriculum in the College of Arts and Sciences.
        2. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit consider a narrower focus for the course. In its current form, the wide variety of topics covered by the course make it difficult to fit into any one General Education Category. Should the unit wish to discuss strategies for refining, revising, and/or re-envisioning the course for inclusion in the new General Education, the reviewing faculty suggest that the unit reach out to Bernadette Vankeerbergen.1, Assistant Dean of Curriculum.
        3. Should the unit decided to re-submit a revised version of the course at a later time, the reviewing faculty recommend that the unit use the most recent version of the Student Life Disability Services Statement (syllabus, pg. 9), which was updated to reflect the university’s new COVID-19 policies in August 2023. The updated statement can be found in an easy-to-copy/paste format on the [Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Assessment Services website](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements).
        4. Should the unit decide to re-submit a revised version of the course at a later time, the reviewing faculty recommend that the unit use the most recent version of the Mental Health Statement (syllabus, pg. 9), as the name and phone number of the Suicide/Crisis hotline have changed. The updated statement can be found in an easy-to-copy/paste format on the [ASCCAS website.](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements)
     3. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.