**ASCC Themes I Subcommittee**

Unapproved Minutes

Wednesday, April 24th, 2024 2:00-3:30 PM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Andridge, Fredal, Griffith, Neff, Steele, Tanner, Vaessin, Vankeerbergen

**Agenda:**

1. German 3253.01 (existing course with GEL Cultures and Ideas; requesting number change, course title/focus change, and GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the department modify the GEN Submission Form and the course syllabus (with special attention to the Course Schedule, pgs. 15-18) to provide more specificity regarding the course’s focus. At this time, they are unsure whether the course focuses specifically on the experiences of German and/or German-speaking immigrants (as opposed to a broader group, like European immigrants, or all immigrants), and whether the course explores how immigrants were affected by the dominant culture, or how the immigrants themselves influenced the established culture; they note that a narrower lens might make the connection the Traditions, Cultures and Transformations Theme clearer.
      2. The reviewing faculty observe that there is very specific information in the syllabus and the GEN Submission form regarding how the assignments fit the Goals and ELOs of the Theme, but how the course’s readings fit is less clear. They ask that the department provide more information in the Course Schedule (pgs. 15-18) and the GEN submission form that clearly shows the relationship between the readings and the Theme.
      3. The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
      4. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department change the information provided in curriculum.osu.edu under “Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes” to course-specific goals and ELOs; the GEN goals and ELOs should not be copy/pasted here . They note that there are some excellent bullet points on pg. 2 of the syllabus (under “Course Expected Learning Outcomes”) that could be easily modified for use in this section of curriculum.osu.edu.
      2. **Contingency:** Changes to University policies recently (03-01-2024) necessitated that the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee update the list of required syllabus statements for all syllabi to include a new statement on religious accommodations. The new version is a result of a directive by the Executive Vice President and Provost and can be found here on the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements). The reviewing faculty thank the department for replacing the previous statement found on pg. 14-15 of the syllabus. Please note that the link at the bottom of the statement (“Policy: Religious Holidays, Holy Days, and Observances”) must be included to fully comply with the law.
      3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department correct *either* the Course Schedule (syllabus pgs. 15-18) *or* the statement on pg. 9 of the syllabus in regard to due dates for Online Discussion Board posts, as pg. 9 indicates that they are due on Wednesday/Sunday, while the Course Schedule notes that they are due on Fridays.
      4. Comment – The reviewing faculty observe that, at times, they had difficulty discerning whether the syllabus and GEN Submission form were discussing *German* immigrants (i.e., those from a specific geographic space) or *German-speaking* immigrants (i.e., those with a common language experience.) More clarity in this area would make the topic of the class easier for students to discern.
      5. Vaessin, Andridge; unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above), *one recommendation* (in italics above), and one comment.
2. German 3253.02 (“new” course requesting 100% DL and GEN Theme GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations; will automatically receive the GEL Cultures and Ideas of the in-person version)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the department modify the GEN Submission Form and the course syllabus (with special attention to the Course Schedule, pgs. 17-20) to provide more specificity regarding the course’s focus. At this time, they are unsure whether the course focuses specifically on the experiences of German and/or German-speaking immigrants (as opposed to a broader group, like European immigrants, or all immigrants), and whether the course explores how immigrants were affected by the dominant culture, or how the immigrants themselves influenced the established culture; they note that a narrower lens might make the connection the Traditions, Cultures and Transformations Theme clearer.
      2. The reviewing faculty observe that there is very specific information in the syllabus and the GEN Submission form regarding how the assignments fit the Goals and ELOs of the Theme, but how the course’s readings fit is less clear. They ask that the department provide more information in the Course Schedule (pgs. 17-20) and the GEN submission form that clearly shows the relationship between the readings and the Theme.
      3. The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
      4. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department change the information provided in curriculum.osu.edu under “Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes” to course-specific goals and ELOs; the GEN goals and ELOs should not be copy/pasted here . They note that there are some excellent bullet points on pg. 2 of the syllabus (under “Course Expected Learning Outcomes”) that could be easily modified for use in this section of curriculum.osu.edu.
      2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty request that the department provide clearer information in the syllabus and/or curriculum.osu.edu about the format of the class. In curriculum.osu.edu, under “Offering Information-Course Components” the course is only listed as a lecture. However, pg. 5 of the syllabus mentions a recitation (under “How This Course Works-Mode of Delivery). From the description provided, this recitation appears to require synchronous meetings, while the top of page 5 identifies German 3253.02 as an “online, asynchronous course”. Furthermore, the description of the synchronous recitation sessions seems to indicate that they will not be formally scheduled in Buckeye Link/SIS and the Course Scheduler, but rather “arranged” between the students and the instructor after the course commences.

In regards to the final point, the reviewing faculty kindly remind the department that requiring student attendance at a weekly class meeting (online or in person) that is not scheduled via SIS/Buckeye Link is not allowed.

* + 1. **Contingency:** Changes to University policies recently (03-01-2024) necessitated that the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee update the list of required syllabus statements for all syllabi to include a new statement on religious accommodations. The new version is a result of a directive by the Executive Vice President and Provost and can be found here on the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements). The reviewing faculty thank the department for replacing the previous statement found on pg. 16-17 of the syllabus. Please note that the link at the bottom of the statement (“Policy: Religious Holidays, Holy Days, and Observances”) must be included to fully comply with the law.
    2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
    3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty recommend that the department review the policy surrounding the structure for the online discussion boards, which seem to focus significant work over the weekend (syllabus, pgs. 5-6), a policy which may be difficult for some students.
    4. Comment – The reviewing faculty observe that, at times, they had difficulty discerning whether the syllabus and GEN Submission form were discussing *German* immigrants (i.e., those from a specific geographic space) or *German-speaking* immigrants (i.e., those with a common language experience.) More clarity in this area would make the topic of the class easier for students to discern.
  1. Vaessin, Andridge; unanimously approved with **four contingencies** (in bold above), *one recommendation* (in italics above) and one comment.

1. English and Comparative Studies 5189S (existing cross-listed courses requesting GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations with Research and Creative Inquiry High Impact Practice)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the departments include in the syllabus and the GEN Submission Form a definition of “expressive culture” (syllabus pgs. 1, 3) that is accessible and understandable for undergraduates and/or people outside of the field, so that the course topics’ engagement with ELO 3.1 is clear.
      2. The reviewing faculty request that the department include in the syllabus and the GEN Submission Form an explicit statement regarding which “’big’ idea or technological advancement” the course is exploring. While the reviewing faculty suspect that the course is focused on the flight of extraction industries from the area, they would like to see this more clearly stated.
      3. The reviewing faculty ask that the departments include in the syllabus and the GEN Submission Form a clearer description of the aspects of “mainstream America[n]” culture that will be contrasted/compared with Appalachian society, as American culture can be incredibly varied and diverse.
      4. The reviewing faculty request that the departments include in the GEN Submission form additional information about how the assignments will give students the opportunity to demonstrate their achievement of the GEN Theme ELOs.
      5. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the departments provide information regarding how the departments/instructors plan to re-structure the course now that it is a four-credit hour course rather than a three-credit hour course. Since the Course Schedule (syllabus pgs. 8-12) is by week rather than course meeting, and neither the schedule nor the header (syllabus, pg. 1) describe how often the course meets or for how long, it is difficult to ascertain if the students will receive the required amount of formalized instruction. To this end, they offer the following friendly reminders:
         1. While High-Impact Practice (HIP) courses are required to be four credit hours, the “extra” or “fourth” credit hour is not “awarded” simply because they are HIP courses. Students must still receive at least the minimum amount of formal instruction for 4 credit hours according the State of Ohio guidelines, which can be found in the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Manual](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/asc-operations-manual) on pg. 19.
         2. When estimating how students’ time on-site fits into the required amount of formalized instruction, it may also be helpful to refer to the Education Abroad framework, which can be found on pg. 79 of the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Manual](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/asc-operations-manual).
      2. The reviewing faculty ask that the department provide more information about how the instructor will give guidance/feedback to students and/or how the Ethnographic Interviews, Archival Deposit, Public Project, and Fieldwork Final Report will be scaffolded, as these four assignments make up 70% of the students’ grades and are submitted on the last day of class. Since this will now be a General Education course, the reviewing faculty would like to see how student success will be supported, especially for students who are unfamiliar with the academic practices and expectations in the field.
      3. Changes to University policies recently (03-01-2024) necessitated that the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee update the list of required syllabus statements for all syllabi to include a new statement on religious accommodations. The new version is a result of a directive by the Executive Vice President and Provost and can be found here on the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements). The reviewing faculty thank the departments for replacing the previous statement found on pg. 7 of the syllabus. Please note that the link at the bottom of the statement (“Policy: Religious Holidays, Holy Days, and Observances”) must be included to fully comply with the law.
      4. The reviewing faculty ask that the departments amend the course description (curriculum.osu.edu under “General Information”) to include mention of the required travel over spring break so that students will be aware of this when registering for the course.
      5. The reviewing faculty suggest that the departments review the grading scale (syllabus, pg. 5) as it is unclear whether a student who earns a 60% will receive a “D” or an “E”.
      6. The reviewing faculty ask that the departments provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
      7. The Themes I Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
2. History 2213 (existing course with GEL Historical Study and GEN Foundation Historical and Cultural Studies; request to remove GEN Foundation Historical and Cultural Studies & add GEN Theme Lived Environments)
   1. TAG
      1. Approved.
   2. Themes
      1. **Contingency:** Changes to University policies recently (03-01-2024) necessitated that the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee update the list of required syllabus statements for all syllabi to include a new statement on religious accommodations. The new version is a result of a directive by the Executive Vice President and Provost and can be found here on the [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services website](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements). While the reviewing faculty thank the department for using the new statement on pg. 10-11 of the syllabus, the link at the bottom of the statement (“Policy: Religious Holidays, Holy Days, and Observances”) must be included with the statement to fully comply with the law.
      2. **Contingency:** The reviewing faculty ask that the department amend the “Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes” on curriculum.osu.edu (under “Course Details”), as this should be a more comprehensive and detailed listing of what the department expects that students learn in the course. To that end, they note that the “Additional Goals:” on pgs. 3-4 of the syllabus have some excellent material that may be useful in fulfilling this contingency.
      3. *Recommendation:* The reviewing faculty suggest that the department review the grading scale (syllabus, pg. 8) as it is unclear whether a student who earns a 67% will receive a “D” or a “D+”.
      4. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee/reviewing faculty recommends that the department use the most recent version of the Mental Health Statement (syllabus, pgs. 9-10), 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)
      5. Andridge, Vaessin; unanimously approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above) and *two recommendations* (in italics above).
3. Biology 2750 (new course requesting GEN Theme Lived Environments) (return)
   1. TAG
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit provide more explicit information in the syllabus and on the GEN Submission form about what lived environment(s) the class explores, and how humans interact with that/those environment(s). For example, what kinds of relationships between humans and the scientific environment will be studied? What aspects of the course will focus on humans and their interaction with the cultural environment?
      2. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit amend the course schedule to include reference to the specific lived environment(s) and relationships with people or groups of people addressed above in item i, so that students will see a direct link between the GEN Theme and the course material.
      3. The reviewing faculty recommend that the unit reach out to Dr. Elizabeth Griffith, faculty Chair of the Lived Environment Theme Advisory Group, for further guidance and examples of successful syllabi in similar courses.
      4. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
      5. The TAG declined to vote on the course at this time.
   2. Themes
      1. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit provide further information in the GEN Submission Form and the syllabus about the course’s activities in weeks 4-7. Specifically, they note that many of the topics covered here are similar to those that would be covered in GEN Foundation: Mathematical and Quantitative Reasoning (or Data Analysis) or GEN Foundation: Natural Sciences course, and they ask that the department provide more details about how the course will elevate these topics to an advanced level that is appropriate for a GEN Themes course.
      2. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit provide additional information on the GEN Submission Form and the syllabus about how advanced topics and critical thinking will manifest in the course. They note that there is some evidence of this in the GEN Submission Form, but the syllabus and course schedule seem to focus much less on the areas/topics that encourage higher-level thinking.
      3. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit re-consider the use of the “workshop” course component (curriculum.osu.edu under “Offering Information) and instead use “recitation”. According to the [Administrative Resource Center’s website](https://admin.resources.osu.edu/student-information-system-sis/sis-curriculum-program-course-request/course-numbercatalog), a workshop is defined as a “Generally brief, intensive instruction for a relatively small group of students that focuses on technique and skills in a particular field”. The unit is welcome to use the word “workshop” in the syllabus to describe the activities and day-to-day experiences of students in the recitation sessions, but it should not be a selected course component in curriculum.osu.edu for this course.
      4. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit correct the heading on pg. 2 of the syllabus which says that the items below the heading are the “General Education Natural Science Goals & Objectives”, as this course is not approved for the Legacy General Education or the GEN Foundation: Natural Science categories.
      5. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit re-align the information on pg. 9 of the syllabus to place all of the language from the required Student Life Disability Services Statement under the same heading, rather than moving the SLDS COVID-19 information to the section above about excused absences. Additionally, the reviewing faculty recommend that the heading “Accommodation of Special Needs” be removed in favor of “Disability Services” or similar, as the phrase “Special Needs” can have a negative connotation.
      6. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit provide a cover letter that details the changes that are made to the proposal in response to this feedback.
      7. The reviewing faculty declined to vote on the course at this time.
4. College of Medicine 3585 (new course requesting GEN Theme Health and Wellbeing) (return) FULLY APPROVED BY TAG; ONLY NEEDS REVIEW BY THEMES SUBCOMMITTEE
   1. Themes
      1. Vaessin, Andridge; unanimously approved.