**ASCC Themes I Subcommittee**

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, January 17th, 2024 2:00-3:30 PM

CarmenZoom

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

**Agenda:**

1. Approval of 12-12-23 minutes
   1. Vaessin, Rehbeck; unanimously approved.
2. English 3041S (new course requesting GEN Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations with Service-Learning High Impact Practice)
   1. TAG
      1. Unfortunately, the reviewing faculty did not find this course to be a good fit for the Traditions, Cultures and Transformations Theme. Among other concerns, they were unable to see how the course’s topics, assignments, and assessments engaged meaningfully with “a “big” idea or technological advancement” or addressed the “interactions among dominant and subcultures”. They are not able to see how the course, in any form, could meet the goals and ELOs of the Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations Theme.
      2. Unanimously not approved.
   2. Themes
      1. The reviewing faculty find this course to be at an appropriate level for a GEN Themes course, but they support the assessment of their colleagues that, despite its rigor, the course’s topics, assignments, and assessments do not have a strong enough connection to the Theme.
      2. Should the department wish to make substantial and substantive changes to the course and re-submit it for review in a different GEN category, the reviewing faculty ask that the department utilize the standard GEN Submission form (found [here](https://oaa.osu.edu/ge-course-submission)) to communicate to the subcommittee how the course will fulfill the goals and ELOs of the chosen category.
      3. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
   3. HIP
      1. The subcommittee finds the service-learning elements of the course to be sufficient for a High-Impact Practice. Claire Sweigert, Program Director for Service Learning in the Office of Academic Enrichment, noted that her office had worked with the faculty member who developed the course, and that they felt that it was a strong example of a service-learning course.
      2. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course for the HIP, as a course cannot be approved for an HIP w/o being approved as a GEN Themes course in a particular GEN Themes category.
3. History 3251 (existing course with GEL Historical Study; requesting GEN Theme: Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty request that the department provide additional, specific information in the GEN Submission form and in the syllabus about which dominant and non-dominant subcultures the course will focus on.
      2. The reviewing faculty ask that the department amend the GEN Submission Form to include mention of which specific assignments, readings, and other course activities will compel students to engage with each individual ELO.
      3. Similarly, the reviewing faculty request that the department provide further explanation on the GEN Submission Form as to how the course’s assessments will measure students’ achievement of the GEN category’s ELOs.
      4. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide more information in the syllabus (either in the “Course Schedule” on pgs. 9-14 or in the “Required Textbook” section on pg. 4) about where students can access readings and other course materials that are not linked to in the Course Schedule. In the current syllabus, it is unclear whether some of the primary sources and many of the secondary sources (journal articles and other readings beyond the textbook/novels) will be uploaded to Carmen, or whether students will need to seek those readings out for themselves.
      2. Rehbeck, Palazzi; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above).
4. MRS 3217 (existing course with GEL Cultures and Ideas & Diversity-Global Studies; request to change level/number from 2217 & add GEN Theme Lived Environments)
   1. TAG
      1. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty note that the explanation of how the course meets the goals and ELOs of the GEN category (syllabus, pg. 3-4) is quite lengthy, and they recommend that the department consider a more succinct explanation that will be more accessible to students.
      2. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the grade percentages assigned to each assessment (syllabus pg. 5) be adjusted to reflect the inclusion of the reflection assignments (mentioned briefly on pg. 3) in the graded portion of the course, since these assignments contribute significantly to students’ achievement of the GEN goals and ELOs.
      3. Unanimously approved.
   2. Theme
      1. **Contingency**: The reviewing faculty ask that the department amend the statement on pg. 2 of the syllabus that reads “This course also satisfies the ‘Themes’ requirement (Lived Environments) of the GEN”, as this course does not, in and of itself, satisfy the requirement for 4-6 credit hours in the Lived Environments Theme. As an alternative, the reviewing faculty suggest the following: “This course is also approved as a part of the GEN Theme: Lived Environments” category.”
      2. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department include the reflection assignments (mentioned briefly on pg. 3) in the course schedule (syllabus pg. 7-13) so that students can consider these as a part of their weekly course preparation.
      3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty note that the explanation of how the course meets the goals and ELOs of the GEN category (syllabus, pg. 3-4) is quite lengthy, and they recommend that the department consider a more succinct explanation that will be more accessible to students.
      4. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the grade percentages assigned to each assessment (syllabus pg. 5) be adjusted to reflect the inclusion of the reflection assignments (mentioned briefly on pg. 3) in the graded portion of the course, since these assignments contribute significantly to students’ achievement of the GEN goals and ELOs.
      5. *Recommendation*: The reviewing faculty recommend that the department use the most recent version of the Mental Health Statement (syllabus, pg. 6), 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)
      6. Andridge, Rehbeck; approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *five recommendations* (in italics above).
5. NELC 2244 (existing course with GEL Diversity--Global Studies & GEL VPA, previously approved for 100% DL; requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments) (return)
   1. TAG
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department carefully edit and resubmit the GEN Submission form, as it appears to contain text “left over” from another course submission.
      2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department amend the grading scale (syllabus pg. 6), as certain numbers “overlap” (e.g. 93, 90, 87, etc.) and it is not clear what final grade students will earn.
      3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department reconsider the policy of assigning a failing grade to any student who does not engage with the Carmen course for 10 days (syllabus pg. 8). While they understand that regular engagement with the course material is essential for student success, they note that such a rigid policy is highly unusual in online courses at Ohio State.
      4. Unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *one recommendation* (in italics above).
   2. Theme
      1. **Contingency:** As this is an online, asynchronous course, the reviewing faculty ask that the department provide additional details in the syllabus for students about what is and is not allowed in regard to collaboration, use of notes/texts for assessments, and other assignment-specific information surrounding Academic Misconduct. They strongly suggest that the department make use of the [ODE Syllabus template](https://ascode.osu.edu/asc-distance-learning-syllabus-template) (pg. 7-10), as it provides an example of how policies can be laid out for students on an assignment-by-assignment basis.
      2. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the college update the Title IX statement (syllabus pg. 13), as Kellie Brennan no longer works for the university. An 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. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the college update the technology recommendations found on pg. 4-5 of the syllabus. Updated recommendations can be found on the [OTDI Syllabus Template](https://teaching.resources.osu.edu/teaching-topics/online-hybrid-syllabus-template), pgs. 5-6.
      4. Vaessin, Rehbeck; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above).
6. Earth Sciences 2204 (existing course with GE Natural Science-Physical Science; requesting new GE Theme: Lived Environments) (return) FULLY APPROVED BY TAG; STILL NEEDS TO BE VOTED ON BY ASCC THEMES SUBCOMMITTEE
   1. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department remove the references to quizzes in the syllabus (pgs. 18 and 19), as the calculation table for final grades (syllabus pg. 8-9) does not include quizzes.
      2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty note that the only assignment-specific information regarding Academic Integrity (syllabus pg. 18) refers to quizzes, which do not appear to be a graded component of the course (see item “i” above). As this is an online, asynchronous course, the reviewing faculty ask that the department provide additional details in the syllabus for students about what is and is not allowed in regard to collaboration, use of notes/texts for assessments, and other assignment-specific information surrounding Academic Misconduct. They strongly suggest that the department make use of the [ODE Syllabus template](https://ascode.osu.edu/asc-distance-learning-syllabus-template) (pg. 7-10), as it provides an example of how policies can be laid out for students on an assignment-by-assignment basis.
      3. Rehbeck, Vaessin; unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above).
7. Psychology 2311 (existing course requesting GEN Theme Health and Wellbeing) (return) FULLY APPROVED BY TAG; ONLY ASCC THEMES SUBCOMMITTEE NEEDS TO VOTE
   1. Themes
      1. The reviewing faculty are not able to ascertain what makes the course an advanced study of Health and Wellbeing. Specifically, they ask that the department address the following:
         1. The course schedule and the assignment descriptions show few assessments that will require students to engage in critical thinking. While the reviewing faculty note and appreciate the addition of the appendix and do see some indication of more advanced engagement in some assignments, they do not see enough evidence of advanced and scholarly exploration of the theme.
         2. Students’ grade for the course is based entirely on class participation/attendance, the weekly reflections, and the compilation of these reflections into the learning portfolio. The reviewing faculty ask that the department adjust the course’s assessments to include a long-term assignment that will allow students to synthesize approaches to the theme that are taught in the course with their own scholarly exploration, such as a research paper, project, or similar assignment.
         3. The reviewing faculty ask that the department integrate further high-level, scholarly readings that support and engage with the topics that the textbook presents into the course schedule, as it is not clear that this textbook is advanced enough to support a themes course without supplemental readings.
      2. The reviewing faculty invite the department and the course developers to reach out to the faculty chair of the ASCC Themes I Subcommittee, Jim Fredal.1, if they would like to discuss how the course could be adjusted to reach the typical advanced level of a Themes course.
      3. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.