**ASCC Arts and Humanities Subcommittee 2**

Approved Minutes

Wednesday, September 25th, 2024 9:30 – 11:00 AM

CarmenZoom

**Attendees**: Crocetta, Diles, Köhnlein, Podalsky, Steele

**Agenda**

1. Approval 09-11-2024 minutes
	1. Köhnlein, Diles, unanimously approved
2. History 7902 (existing course requesting change of title, course description, and credit hours) (tabled from last time)
	1. Comment: The Subcommittee thanks the department for the opportunity to review this course, which they note will be an excellent addition/modification to the graduate curriculum.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide more information about how students’ final projects will be assessed (syllabus, p. 2).
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide information regarding what percentage of the final grade will come from each assignment. (syllabus, pp. 1-2)
	4. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide additional information about if (and, if applicable, how) in-class participation will be assessed (syllabus. p. 1-2).
	5. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department provide additional clarity regarding the “Archive object reflection” presentation (syllabus, p. 1). Specifically, they are interested in how many presentations each student will be responsible for. Since this is an integral part of each class meeting, they are unsure if students will have to do this multiple times if enrollment is low.
	6. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee suggests that the department provide more information for students about where and how they might find an archive to work with for the final project, and how the instructor might facilitate this process.
	7. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department provide page numbers for all readings in the syllabus (especially where portions of a book or monograph are assigned) so that students can better plan their work for the week (pp. 4-5)
	8. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee suggests that the department clarify for students what is meant by a “Knot” workshop (course schedule 4/13, syllabus p. 5), what will take place during this workshop, and what materials students will need to have prepared for that class meeting.
	9. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee suggests that the department note the days/times of the course in the syllabus header. While they understand from the description of each class meeting that the course will likely meet once/week for 3 hours, having that at the top of the syllabus would clarify contact hours.
	10. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends updating the diversity statement (syllabus, p. 4) as the university has recently changed this statement to encompass additional protected groups. Both statements are available in an easy-to-copy/paste format on our [website.](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements)
	11. Crocetta, Diles; unanimously approved with **four contingencies** (in bold above), *five recommendations* (in italics above), and one comment.
3. German and Scandinavian 3354.01 (existing cross-listed courses with GEN Theme Sustainability; requesting 100% DL)
	1. Comment: The Subcommittee would like the department to know that they appreciate the time and attention that has been given to this class, and they can clearly see the instructor/designer’s enthusiasm for the subject matter and engaging with students in this excellent course. While they understand that such a significant amount of feedback from the subcommittee (see below) can be daunting, they would like to emphasize that they are looking for more clarity rather than longer explanations or more information. They feel that direct, succinct information, especially regarding student grades, is especially important in a distance learning course, where students may not have any face-to-face contact with the instructor. Should the department wish to do so, the chair of this Subcommittee, Laura Podalsky.1, would be happy to discuss the feedback in greater depth, and you are welcome to reach out and schedule a meeting.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the revised submission of this request be accompanied by a brief cover letter that outlines the changes made to this course in response to the Subcommittee’s feedback.
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department change the “Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes” (curriculum.osu.edu under “Course Details”), reverting to the previous listing (with slight changes based on content, if necessary). The goals and ELOs in this part of the submission should not be a “copy/paste” of the GEN goals and ELOs; rather, they should be specific to the course.
	4. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department correct the statement on pp. 11-12 of syllabus (under “Credit hours and work expectation[s]) that says “…students should expect around 4 hours per week of time spent on direct instruction…in addition to 8 hours of homework…”, as in the 3 CH version of the course, this should be 3 hours per week of time spent on direct instruction and 6 hours of homework.
	5. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide greater clarity about how students will be evaluated, especially with regard to Core Assignment #1. The chart on p. 17 of the syllabus notes that 30% of a student’s grade is coming from “reading, viewing” and 10% is coming from “completing assignments”. However, on pg. 19 of the syllabus, the explanation of this assignment seems to associate those percentages to the expected *time* that students should spend rather than with their grade, and the reviewing faculty would like clarification on this. If the department is planning to grade students on their “reading, viewing”, a brief explanation of how they will assess this should be included in the syllabus. Although the Subcommittee does not know if the instructor plans to do this, they would like to mention that using the “log-in” and “time spent” data on Carmen is not an accurate reflection of student work, and it is not best practice to assess students based on this data.
	6. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide a brief explanation (syllabus pg. 19-20) of how students will be assessed on the Discussion/Engagement Assignments. As these will be graded P/F, students will need to know what will earn a “P” for this 20% of the grade.
	7. *Recommendation:* In order to make a clear separation between the percentages that are associated with time expectations and those that are associated with the overall grade assigned to each activity/assessment, the Subcommittee recommends that the department remove the descriptions of expected time commitment from the chart on pp. 17-18, from the descriptions of the assignments (pp. 19-24), and from the Course Schedule on pp. 30-43 of the syllabus. In its place, they simply suggest a brief statement under the “How this online course works” section that lays out a “typical” week for students (e.g. “In a typical week, students should expect to spend 1 hour watching lecture videos, 1 hour completing assignments associated with the lecture videos, and 1 hour completing the in-person or online discussions. Additionally, students should plan to spend 4-6 hours on readings, films, and larger writing assignments.”)
	8. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee strongly recommends that the department consider making the once/weekly 55-minute discussion session mandatory, as they feel this could greatly enhance students’ understanding of the material and experience in the course. Should the instructor decide to keep this activity optional, they also recommend that the instructor give students information about whether they will have to commit to one or the other for the entire semester, and whether the instructor will cancel the in-person sessions if no or few students utilize them in the first few weeks.
	9. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee strongly recommends that the department remove from the syllabus the references to “research and creative inquiry” (syllabus p. 9, 10, 14), especially in relation to a “final project”. As this version of the course is not a 4-credit hour High-Impact Practice course, use of this language (especially when coupled with reference to a “final project”, which does not appear to be an assignment for this class) could be unintentionally confusing or misleading for students.
	10. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department consider a more direct method (e.g. email, Carmen message, Carmen announcement) for changing due dates (syllabus p. 30), as simply changing them on Carmen may not be immediately noticeable to all students, especially in an asynchronous online course.
	11. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department reconsider the length of the syllabus. While they appreciate the detail provided to the reviewers, they are concerned about whether a syllabus of this length will be overwhelming for students and impede rather than enhance their understanding of this exciting course. For example, they offer the friendly observation that the course description (syllabus pp. 1-4), the explanation of how the course meets the GEN goals and ELOs (syllabus pp. 5-7) and the explanation of how the course fills the departmental goals and ELOs (syllabus p. 9) are much longer than those found in most courses. Generally, each of these features would be covered by one paragraph of 3-4 sentences.
	12. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department update **both** the Student Life Disability Services statement (syllabus pp. 28-29) **and** the diversity statement (syllabus p. 27), as both statements have been modified for the 2024-2025 academic year. Both statements are available in an easy-to-copy/paste format on our [website.](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements)
	13. Comment: The Subcommittee offers the friendly observation that there are 14 instructional weeks in a semester (rather than 15), so the course designer may want to take this into account when working with the course schedule.
	14. Crocetta, Köhnlein; unanimously approved with **five contingencies** (in bold above), *six recommendations* (in italics above) and two comments.
4. German and Scandinavian 3354.02 (new HIP, 4 credit version of 3354.01, which has GEN Theme Sustainability; requesting 100% DL and Research and Creative Inquiry High Impact Practice
	1. Comment: The Subcommittee would like the department to know that they appreciate the time and attention that has been given to this class, and they can clearly see the instructor/designer’s enthusiasm for the subject matter. While they understand that such a significant amount of feedback can be daunting, they would like to emphasize that they are looking for more clarity rather than longer explanations or more information. They feel that this kind of clarity, especially regarding student grades, can be very important in a distance learning course, where students may not have any face-to-face contact with the instructor. Should the department wish to do so, the chair of this Subcommittee, Laura Podalsky.1, would be happy to discuss the feedback in greater depth, and you are welcome to reach out and schedule a meeting.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the revised submission of this request be accompanied by a brief cover letter that outlines the changes made to this course in response to the Subcommittee’s feedback.
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department change the “Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes” (curriculum.osu.edu under “Course Details”), reverting to the previous listing for 3354.01 (with slight changes based on content and research component, as necessary). The goals and ELOs in this part of the submission should not be a “copy/paste” of the GEN goals and ELOs; rather, they should be specific to the course.
	4. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department explain how students in this four-credit hour version of the course are receiving more regular and substantive interaction with the instructor than those students enrolled in the three-credit hour version. Both courses seem to share the same amount of contact with the instructor (Core Assignments, Core Discussion), and the increase in time spent for the students in the four-credit hour version seems to be exclusive to out-of-class assignments (Research Assignments, Research Project). The Subcommittee strongly recommends that the department work with the [Office of Distance Education](https://ascode.osu.edu/) and their instructional designers to make certain that the amount of regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor in the 4-credit hour version is significantly “scaled up” from the 3-credit hour version.
	5. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide greater clarity about how students will be evaluated, especially with regard to Core Assignment #1. The chart on pg. 18 of the syllabus notes that 30% of a student’s grade is coming from “reading, viewing” and 10% is coming from “completing assignments”. However, on pg. 20 of the syllabus, the explanation of this assignment seems to associate those percentages to the expected *time* that students should spend rather than with their grade, and the reviewing faculty would like clarification on this. If the department is planning to grade students on their “reading, viewing”, a brief explanation of how they will assess this should be included in the syllabus. Although they do not know if the instructor plans to do this, the Subcommittee would like to mention that using the log-in and time spent data on Carmen is not an accurate reflection of student work, and it is not best practice to assess students based on this data.
	6. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department clarify what percentage of students’ final grades will be constituted from the Final Project. On p. 4 of the syllabus, it implies the project is worth 25%, but the chart on p. 19 says that it is worth only 10%. The Subcommittee notes that, since the research instruction and research project should roughly correspond to one credit hour (or 25%) of the course material, it is appropriate to assign a similar percentage of the overall grade to those assessments. However, the difference in percentages on pg. 4 and pg. 19 may make this difficult for students to understand.
	7. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the department provide a brief explanation (syllabus pp. 20-21) of how students will be assessed on the Discussion/Engagement Assignments. As these will be graded P/F, students will need to know what will earn a “P” for this 20% of the grade.
	8. *Recommendation:* In order to make a clear separation between the percentages that are associated with time expectations and those that are associated with the overall grade assigned to each activity/assessment, the subcommittee recommends that the department remove the descriptions of expected time commitment from the chart on pp. 18-19, from the descriptions of the assignments (pp. 20-23), and from the Course Schedule (pp. 31-47). In its place, they simply suggest a brief statement under the “How this online course works” section that lays out a “typical” week for students (e.g. “In a typical week, students should expect to spend 1 hour watching lecture videos, 1 hour completing assignments associated with the lecture videos, and 1 hour completing the in-person or online discussions. Additionally, students should plan to spend 4-6 hours on readings, films, and larger writing assignments.”)
	9. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee strongly recommends that the department consider making the weekly 55-minute discussion session mandatory, as they feel this could greatly enhance students’ understanding of the material. They are particularly concerned that the high-impact practice student experience (especially as it relates to the scaffolded research project) may differ greatly from student to student if this is optional. Should the instructor decide to keep this as an optional activity they also recommend that the instructor give students information about whether they will have to commit to one or the other for the entire semester, and whether the instructor will cancel the in-person sessions if no or few students utilize them in the first few weeks.
	10. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department consider adding the Creative Inquiry textbook from the 3-credit hour version of the class as an option for this version, as p. 23 of the syllabus seems to indicate that a creative project may be a possibility for this version of the course as well.
	11. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department considera more direct method (e.g. email, Carmen message, Carmen announcement) for changing due dates (syllabus p. 31), as simply changing them on Carmen may not be immediately noticeable to all students.
	12. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department reconsider the length of the syllabus. While they appreciate the detail provided to the reviewers, they are concerned about whether a syllabus of this length will be overwhelming for students and impede rather than enhance their understanding of this exciting course. For example, they offer the friendly observation that the course description (syllabus pp. 1-4), the explanation of how the course meets the GEN goals and ELOs (syllabus pp. 5-8) and the explanation of how the course fills the departmental goals and ELOs (syllabus pp. 9-10) are much longer than those found in most courses. Generally, each of these features would be covered by one brief, student-friendly paragraph of 3-4 sentences.
	13. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department update **both** the Student Life Disability Services statement (syllabus pp. 27-28) **and** the diversity statement (syllabus p. 26), as both of these statements have been modified for the 2024-2025 academic year. Both statement are available in an easy-to-copy/paste format on the [ASCCAS website.](https://asccas.osu.edu/submission/development/submission-materials/syllabus-elements)
	14. Comment: The Subcommittee offers the friendly observation that there are 14 instructional weeks in a semester (rather than 15), so the course designer may want to take this into account when working with the course schedule.
	15. Köhnlein, Crocetta; unanimously approved with **six contingencies** (in bold above) *six recommendations* and two comments.
5. Theatre 5798.04 (new course)
	1. Tabled for time
6. Slavic 3310 (existing course with GEL VPA and Diversity—Global Studies; requesting GEN Foundation LVPA)
	1. Tabled for time
7. German, Slavic, and South Asian Studies 3456 (new triple-listed courses requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World **with Interdisciplinary and Integrated Collaborative Teaching High-Impact Practice**)
	1. Tabled for time
8. French 3804 (new course requesting 100% DL & GEN Theme Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations)
	1. Tabled for time