**ASCC Themes II Subcommittee**

Unapproved Minutes

Thursday, September 18th, 2025 2:15PM – 3:45PM

Hagerty 255

**Attendees:** Conroy, Cravens-Brown, Daly, Gregoire, Hunter, Nathanson, Palazzi, Søland, Steele, Terndrup, Vankeerbergen

1. Approval of 9-4-25 minutes
	1. Cravens-Brown; Terndrup; unanimously approved
2. Educational Studies: Higher Ed & Student Affairs 2500 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World **with Global and Intercultural Learning: Abroad, Away, or Virtual High Impact Practice**) (tabled from last time)
	1. The Subcommittee requests that the department provide a cover letter that details the changes made to the course submission materials in response to the feedback below.
	2. The Subcommittee asks that the department alter/augment the course’s Description/Rationale (syllabus p.1), Assignment Descriptions (syllabus, p. 5-8), and content/topics/readings (syllabus, pp.11-25 under “Course Schedule”) to reflect a stronger presence of the Theme throughout the course. Currently, the course appears to be focused on leadership education (with some attention to citizenship, diversity, and justice), rather than being a Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World course that views the theme’s content through the lens of leadership. They strongly recommend that the department use the [new General Education Themes rubrics](https://asccas.osu.edu/general-education-program/gen-race-ethnicity-and-gender-diversity-themes-information/gen-themes-0) as a guide when reconsidering these course components.
	3. The Subcommittee has a number of concerns regarding the course’s High-Impact Practice:
		1. The Subcommittee asks that the department clarify the destination for the Education Abroad experience. While they understand that this may change from year to year, it is unclear from the materials provided whether students will all travel together, or whether they will travel independently to different destinations. Furthermore, the information on p. 26 of the syllabus (under “Off-Campus Field Experiences”) seems to imply that students could choose not to travel and instead engage in “local community service with an international-focused agency” or engage in research with a faculty member. This information is also stated on p. 2 of the GE Theme form as an explanation for ELO 2.1:
			1. Suggested Strategies: A multi-week domestic service-learning project working with refugee or immigrant populations; an ongoing collaborative research effort with a local or international agency focused on addressing a significant global problem; or a short-term study abroad experience that incorporates outreach, dialogue with local community leaders, and in-depth multicultural tours and engagement opportunities.
		2. The Subcommittee requests that the department provide information about who will be supervising students’ experiences abroad and assessing students’ work during travel, especially if students will travel to different locations.
		3. The Subcommittee asks that the department provide an itinerary for the Education Abroad experience. Even if the experience will be in a different location for each iteration of the course, the Subcommittee requests a “sample itinerary” to aid in their evaluation of the High-Impact Practice.
		4. The Subcommittee assumes that this experience has been approved by the Office of International Affairs, and they ask that the department include with the proposal any documents that may have been a part of that approval process to aid in their evaluation of the High-Impact Practice.
		5. The Subcommittee asks that the department revise the plan for the “closing course debriefing” (High-Impact Practice Inventory under “Interactions with faculty and peers about substantive matters including cultural self-awareness, intercultural empathy, and academic content.”), as the Center for Belonging and Social Change has been closed.
	4. The Subcommittee requests that the department include in the course description in curriculum.osu.edu some mention of citizenship, diversity, and justice, to help ensure that future iterations of the course retain the focus on the GEN Theme.
	5. The Subcommittee asks that the department clarify the course’s prerequisites on p. 1 of the syllabus, as the current language around “prerequisite knowledge” may be confusing for students. If the unit would like students to have some background knowledge, the offer the friendly suggestion that the department could consider a general prerequisite, such as “completion of a GEN Foundation: Race, Ethnicity and Gender Diversity course”.
	6. The Subcommittee notes the inclusion of a Land Acknowledgment on p. 3 of the syllabus. As of 10-03-2025, it is no longer permissible to share Land Acknowledgments on “university channels or resources” per the university’s [SB1 Compliance website](https://compliance.osu.edu/focus-areas/sb1) (please see the link to the [“Philosophy on Statements”](https://omc.osu.edu/key-issues/philosophy-institutional-leadership-statements)). The course instructor(s) should consult with their TIU director/chair regarding whether or not this statement may be included within the syllabus.
	7. As of August 29th, 2025, all syllabi must have either a link to the statements below **or**these statements written out in their entirety within the syllabus (the statement(s) in **bold** below are missing from the current syllabus and/or incomplete/out-of-date). Syllabi should link to the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements) and/or copy-and-paste the statements from the Office of Undergraduate Education's website.
		1. Academic Misconduct
		2. **Student Life - Disability Services**
		3. **Religious Accommodations**
		4. **Intellectual Diversity**

Instructors are also welcome to include any other standard and/or recommended syllabus statements found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's webpage which they deem relevant for their course. Please also refer to this page to ensure that the Diversity and Title IX Statements on p. 28 of the syllabus (now combined into the statement on “Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct”) and all other statements/links are current and accurate.

* + 1. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
1. Psychology 2750S (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World **with Service-Learning High Impact Practice**) (return; Theme fully approved; only High Impact Practice needs to be reviewed) (tabled from last time)
	1. **Contingency:** As of August 29th, 2025, all syllabi must have either a link to the statements below **or**these statements written out in their entirety within the syllabus (the statement(s) in **bold** below are missing from the current syllabus and/or incomplete/out-of-date). Syllabi should link to the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements) and/or copy-and-paste the statements from the Office of Undergraduate Education's website.
		1. Academic Misconduct
		2. **Student Life - Disability Services**
		3. **Religious Accommodations**
		4. **Intellectual Diversity**

Instructors are also welcome to include any other standard and/or recommended syllabus statements found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's webpage which they deem relevant for their course. Please also refer to this page to ensure that all other statements/links are current and accurate.

* 1. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the department include in the syllabus a statement about working with minors and a link to the [Office of Civil Rights Compliance website](https://civilrights.osu.edu/policies-and-standards) so that students can easily access information on this topic.
	2. *Recommendation:* While they note and appreciate the information about supervision being provided by the community partners, the Subcommittee suggests including in the course calendar some instruction for students on the key issues when working with minors.
	3. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends that the department remove the Diversity statement on p. 20 of the syllabus, as this statement has out-of-date links and has been replaced by the statement on “Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct” that the department has already included on the syllabus (p. 19).
	4. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee suggests updating the “Counseling and Consultation Services/Mental Health Statement” on pp. 18-19 of the syllabus, as the name and phone number of the national suicide helpline have changed. An updated statement can be found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements).
	5. Hunter, Terndrup; approved with **two contingencies** (in bold above), and *three recommendations* (in italics above).
1. Philosophy 2344 (existing course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World) (return) (tabled from last time)
	1. **Contingency:** Though the Subcommittee notes and appreciates the department’s statement about grading and theme engagement in the provided cover letter, they are still concerned about the possibility for students to “opt out” of a substantial number of assessments and still earn a passing grade in the course. For example, a student could choose not to engage with the group work involved in the “Target Country Reports” in any way (skipping the reports, the responses, and the presentation) and still earn enough points (76) to earn a “C” in the course (or skip the reports themselves and still receive an “A”). Given the structure, they ask that the department include in the syllabus a statement about the minimum level of student engagement with each assignment or group of assignments that will be required to earn a passing grade (D or better) in the course. They suggest a statement such as “Students are required to make a good-faith effort to complete all of the course’s major assessments (“x” number of Reading Annotations, “x” number of Weekly Reflections, and a substantial contribution to their groups Target Country Reports and Presentation); failure to do so will result in a failing grade in the course.”
	2. *Recommendation:* The Subcommittee recommends replacing the Title IX and Diversity statements on p. 12 of the syllabus with the new recommended statement on “Creating an Environment Free from Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct” that is available on the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements).
	3. Cravens-Brown; Hunter; unanimously approved with **one contingency** (in bold above) and *one recommendation* (in italics above).
2. Civics, Law, and Leadership 2210 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World) (tabled from last time)
	1. The Subcommittee requests that the Center provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	2. The Subcommittee asks that the Center augment the course’s materials to include more “in-depth and scholarly exploration of the theme” (ELO 1.2). Specifically, they request that a variety of scholarly approaches be included in the assigned readings for the course, so that students have the opportunity to engage with a range of different scholarly perspectives on the issues under debate for their interpretation of the primary texts and the topic of citizenship, justice and diversity.
	3. The Subcommittee asks that the Center incorporate into the course schedule opportunities for students to demonstrate their “developing sense of self as a learner” in an assessable manner (ELO 2.2). While the Subcommittee notes and appreciates the essay revision and writing workshops that will help students to improve their communication skills, this ELO is focused on students’ awareness of their own learning and reflection on/analysis of the ways that their thinking has changed over the duration of the course. While the Subcommittee acknowledges that there are many methods for assessing this ELO, they offer the friendly suggestion that asking students to complete a graded reflection on course topics at the beginning, mid-point, and end of the semester can be a simple and effective way to meet this ELO.
	4. The Subcommittee requests that the Center modify the Course Schedule (pp. 6-8) to reflect the 14 instructional weeks/70 instructional days that make up an OSU semester. Specifically, they are concerned about what material may be “cut” from the current 15-week curriculum when the course is taught. They offer the friendly suggestion that basing the course calendar on an actual OSU semester calendar (and notating/taking into account holidays and breaks) may be useful.
	5. The Subcommittee asks that the syllabus provide for students a stronger connection between the GEN category’s goals and ELOs and the course content via the course description (p. 1), the GE explanatory paragraph (p. 3), the assignment descriptions (p. 4) and the Course Schedule (pp. 6-8). They note that the connection is more evident in the GE Submission form, and they suggest that the Center incorporate some of the material from this form into the syllabus.
	6. The Subcommittee requests that the Center amend/expand the descriptions of the writing assignments in the syllabus (p. 4) to provide a clearer description of how these assignments will be used to assess students’ mastery of the GEN Theme ELOs. They ask that these descriptions include explicit reference to the ELOs and guidance for students about structuring their arguments with these ELOs in mind.
	7. The Subcommittee asks that the Center provide further information in the course description (syllabus, p. 1) about the way in which the course views the relationship between freedom, equality, and citizenship, and how this impacts the course’s topics and connections with the GEN Theme category.
	8. The Subcommittee asks that the Center re-phrase the statement which describes the way in which this course fits into the new General Education Curriculum (syllabus pg. 2 under “GEN Goals & Learning Outcomes”). Since this is a 3-credit hour course, it does not, in and of itself, “fulfill” the GEN Theme. Since the requirement is for students to earn 4-6 credit hours in this category, stating that a single course fulfills the requirement can be confusing or misleading for students. Instead, the reviewing faculty suggest wording such as “Civics, Law, and Leadership 2210 is an approved course in the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World category.”
	9. The Subcommittee asks that the Center revise the statement on Academic Misconduct to reflect the responsibilities of students and the instructor rather than the responsibilities of the Committee on Academic Misconduct as stated in the Faculty Rules. Appropriate statements can be found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements).
	10. The Subcommittee recommends that the Center include in the syllabus a statement about appropriate uses of AI (Artificial Intelligence) technologies for written work, as many of the courses’ texts are commonly assigned. In this same vein, they also recommend that the Center consider including in the syllabus a statement prohibiting the use of prior work (i.e., work done previously for other courses), as they note that many of the assigned texts are also present in other syllabi from the Center.
	11. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time.
3. Civics, Law, and Leadership 3300 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)
	1. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the Center provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	2. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the syllabus provide for students a stronger connection between the GEN category’s goals and ELOs and the course content via the course description (pp. 1-2), the GE explanatory paragraph (pp. 3-4), the assignment descriptions (pp. 4-6) and the Course Schedule (pp. 6-8). They note that the connection is more evident in the GE Submission form, and they suggest that the Center incorporate some of the material from this form into the syllabus.
	3. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee notes and appreciates the discussion of difference, equity, inclusion, diversity, and justice in Course Objectives (syllabus, p. 2); however, they would like these concepts (i.e. ELO 4.1 and 4.2) to be more visible throughout the course, especially in the assessments and course content. They note that coverage of these concepts may be embedded in the course materials, but it is difficult for a non-expert (and likely for students) to see this explicitly in the syllabus and to understand how students will demonstrate their ability to synthesize scholarly ideas around these concepts with the other content in the course.
	4. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the Center augment the course’s materials to include more “in-depth and scholarly exploration of the theme” (ELO 1.2). Specifically, they request that a variety of scholarly writings be included in the assigned readings for the course, so that students have the opportunity to engage with a range of scholarly perspectives on the issues under debate and the topics of citizenship, justice and diversity. While they note the inclusion of some outside texts, they observe that these are often textbooks or writing for the popular press rather than peer-reviewed academic literature.
	5. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee requests that the Center provide more information about the class debates (syllabus, p. 5) and how they will allow all students in the course to be assessed on their mastery of ELOs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2. In the current syllabus, it is difficult to discern how all students will have a chance to participate fully in these in-class activities and demonstrate their mastery of so many disparate ELOs.
	6. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the Center revise the statement on Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity (syllabus, p. 7) to align with Ohio State’s Code of Student Conduct and AI policies. While instructors *are* permitted and expected to set rules in their course for academic integrity, the determination of whether or not a student is in violation of those policies is the charge of the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM). Appropriate statements can be found on the Office of Undergraduate Education's [Syllabus Policies & Statements webpage](https://ugeducation.osu.edu/academics/syllabus-policies-statements).
	7. **Contingency:** The Subcommittee asks that the Center re-phrase the statement which describes the way in which this course fits into the new General Education Curriculum (syllabus pg. 2). Since this is a 3-credit hour course, it does not, in and of itself, “fulfill” the General Education Theme, as the requirement is for students to earn 4-6 credit hours in this category; stating that a single course fulfills the requirement can be confusing or misleading for students. Instead, the reviewing faculty suggest wording such as “Civics, Law, and Leadership 3300 is an approved course in the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World category”.
	8. *Recommendation*: The Subcommittee recommends that the Center explain more fully the exam procedures (syllabus, p. 5). When will students need to decide whether they will use a blue book or a lock-down browser? Will the exams be given via CarmenCanvas to ensure the use of the lock-down browser?
	9. Gregoire, Conroy: unanimously approved with **seven contingencies** (in bold above) and *one* recommendation (in italics above). Note: The Subcommittee has asked for the revision to be reviewed by the full Subcommittee rather than just the chair.
4. Civics, Law, and Leadership 3560 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)
	1. The Subcommittee does not believe that the course, in its current form, is appropriate for the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World. They find that the course is strongly focused on case studies of leadership (with very limited attention to the Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World theme), rather than being a Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World course that views the theme’s content through the lens of leadership. Furthermore, they do not find the course to be “advanced and in-depth”, and they do not believe that it features opportunities for “critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme”, “synthesiz[ing] approaches”, or “scholarly exploration”.
	2. Should the Center wish to undertake a comprehensive redesign of the course in the future, the Subcommittee offers the following logistical notes on the course:
		1. The Subcommittee asks that the Center remove references to additional requirements for Honors students (pp. 1, 2, 4, 6, etc.), as the course does not currently have an approved Honors Embedded version.
		2. The Subcommittee asks that the Center re-phrase the statement which describes the way in which this course fits into the new General Education Curriculum (syllabus pg. 2). Since this is a 3-credit hour course, it does not, in and of itself, “fulfill” the General Education Theme. Since the requirement is for students to earn 4-6 credit hours in this category, stating that a single course fulfills the requirement can be confusing or misleading for students. Instead, the reviewing faculty suggest wording such as “Civics, Law, and Leadership 3560” is an approved course in the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World category”.
	3. Cravens-Brown, Palazzi; vote of “no” with one abstention
5. Civics, Law, and Leadership 2000 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)
	1. The Subcommittee requests that the Center provide a cover letter outlining the changes made to the course in response to the feedback below.
	2. The Subcommittee requests that the Center modify the course’s assignments (syllabus, pp. 4-5) to have a stronger focus on the theme. Specifically, they would like the assignment descriptions to better outline how these assessments will give students the opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of the GEN ELOs, and they ask that the Center provide some examples of the in-class assignments and exam questions that will support this. They offer the friendly observation that several of the ELOs, including those focused on critical and logical thinking, intercultural competence, synthesis, self-reflection, description, critique, and analysis, do not lend themselves to multiple choice and short answer questions, and they note that alternative assessment techniques may be necessary to support the GEN Theme ELOs.
	3. The Subcommittee requests that the Center modify the course’s schedule (syllabus, pp. 5-9) to have a stronger focus on the theme. Specifically, they ask that the course schedule lay out more clearly for students how the topic of the theme will be present in the readings and goals for each topic/week, and that the schedule be modified to include additional scholarly readings that allow students to “engage in advanced, in-depth, [and] scholarly exploration of…the theme” (ELO 1.2) and “identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences as they apply to the theme” (ELO 2.1).
	4. The Subcommittee asks that the Center incorporate into the course schedule opportunities for students to demonstrate their “developing sense of self as a learner” (ELO 2.2) in an assessable manner. While the Subcommittee notes and appreciates the presence of in-class activities and exam questions that focus on student’s ability to identify with historical characters and connect these to their own experiences, this ELO is focused on students’ awareness of their own learning and reflection on/analysis of the ways that their thinking has changed over the duration of the course. While the Subcommittee acknowledges that there are many methods for assessing this ELO, they offer the friendly suggestion that asking students to complete a graded reflection on course topics at the beginning, mid-point, and end of the semester can be a simple and effective way to meet this ELO.
	5. As noted above, the Subcommittee requests that the course’s “range of perspectives” (ELO 3.1) include scholarly writings that approach the issues of citizenship, justice, and diversity from a number of different vantage points, and that these be an integral part of the course. Currently the course appears to engage principally with primary source documents and mainstream or popular press readings rather than using advanced, peer-reviewed scholarly literature.
	6. The Subcommittee requests that the Center include additional coverage of concepts surrounding diversity, equity, and inclusion (ELO 4.1), being especially careful to incorporate activities, assessments and materials that consider a variety of lived experiences within the full range of time and space explored by the course.
	7. The Subcommittee asks that the Center include in the course additional activities, assessments, and readings that focus on how “justice, difference, and citizenship interact with cultural traditions, structures of power, and/or advocacy for social change” (ELO 4.2). While they acknowledge and appreciate the material in Week 9 and other weeks that touch on the limits of self-governance, they ask that the course expand the coverage of this ELO beyond the exclusion of certain peoples from systems of government.
	8. The Subcommittee requests that the Center modify the course calendar (pp. 5-9) to reflect the 14 instructional weeks/70 instructional days that make up an OSU semester. Specifically, they are concerned about what material may be “cut” from the current 15-week curriculum when the course is taught. They offer the friendly suggestion that basing the course calendar on an actual OSU semester calendar (and notating/taking into account holidays and breaks) may be useful.
	9. The Subcommittee asks that the Center re-phrase the statement which describes the way in which this course fits into the new General Education Curriculum (syllabus pg. 2). Since this is a 3-credit hour course, it does not, in and of itself, “fulfill” the General Education Theme, as the requirement is for students to earn 4-6 credit hours in this category; stating that a single course fulfills the requirement can be confusing or misleading for students. Instead, the reviewing faculty suggest wording such as “Civics, Law, and Leadership 2000 is an approved course in the GEN Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World category”.
	10. The Subcommittee declined to vote on the course at this time
6. Civics, Law, and Leadership 2420 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)
	1. Tabled for time
7. Civics, Law, and Leadership 3550 (new course requesting GEN Theme Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World)
	1. Tabled for time