

From: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
To: [Eakins, Barbara](#)
Cc: [Hadad, Christopher](#); [Vaessin, Harald](#)
Subject: Biology 2100 and Biology 1109
Date: Wednesday, December 05, 2012 12:13:40 PM

Dear Barbara,

On Monday (12-3-12), the ASCC Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel reviewed course requests for Biology 2100 and Biology 1109.

Biology 2100 (new course; requesting Natural Science--Biological Science GE):

This course was *unanimously approved*. Although primarily meant for Engineering students, some ASC students may wish to take the course to fulfill a GE requirement. The NMS Panel believes this course would be a GE Natural Science—Biological Science course *for BA and BS students*.

The Panel has a specific request to modify the prereqs information on the course form in curriculum.osu.edu. The Panel would like to add the information that Math 1151 is the real prereq. The other courses are recommended. The amended text will read: "Level 2 Standing required. Math 1151. Chem 1220 or 1250 and Math 1152 or 1172 recommended." *Please let me know that it is OK for me to make those changes in curriculum.osu.edu.*

The Panel also has a few recommendations re: how to clarify the syllabus when the course is offered:

- Syllabus:
 - Uses old version of GE language. Please use current language when the course is taught. Please see here: <http://ascas.osu.edu/curriculum/ge-goals-and-learning-outcomes#Natural%20Science>
 - The references to GEC should to be replaced with GE.
 - Disability statement should be replaced with approved language: see ASC syllabus template p. 13 https://ascas.osu.edu/sites/ascas.osu.edu/files/ASC_CurrAssess_Operations_Manual_2012-13.pdf
 - Provide more informative lecture schedule for the students when course is offered.

Except for letting me know whether we can indeed add Math 1151 in the prereqs field in curriculum.osu.edu, no further action on your part is required for this course.

-

Biology 1109 (new course; requesting Natural Science--Biological Science GE):

The Panel *did not take a vote* on this course. The Panel had a number of questions or concerns, which I here list:

- Sustainability is not addressed in the proposal. It is not clear how the topics in the proposal are linked to the theme of "sustainability." There is no definition of how the proposal views "sustainability." What does the proposer mean by that word?
Panel recommendation:
 - Either: If content of the course is maintained, rethink title and course description (e.g.. course as currently developed does not seem to address much sustainability, physics, or economics)
 - Or: If proposer wishes to maintain "sustainability" in title, provide justification for name and consider which changes in content would make this course more compatible with the topic of sustainability. In this case, the proposer will need to seek concurrences from the appropriate units around campus.
- Based on its preliminary analysis of the course as currently conceived, the NMS Panel believes this course would be a GE Natural Science—Biological Science course for BA-students only.
- Course form in curriculum.osu.edu: Intended rank: would this course really be intended for seniors?
- Editorial issues:
 - Syllabus:

- p. 1: Under “Course Objectives”: “I have designed this course to meet the needs and interests of college students who have majors outside biology” should be changed to “majors outside the biological sciences.”
- P. 2: Second paragraph: “... we will focus on four major areas of science.” This statement is actually followed by 7 course themes. Clarify.
- P. 3:
 - ✚ Total points is presented as ~1275. However, sentence right underneath that refers to ~1250. Please clarify whether SALG and other surveys are included in the total.
 - ✚ Grading scale contains mistakes: e.g., A goes through 92.9 but 93 is the beginning of A-. 90 is both A- and B+. Better leave info in parentheses out (since sentence refers to standard grading scale).
 - ✚ Disability statement should be replaced with approved language: see ASC syllabus template p. 13
https://asccas.osu.edu/sites/asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC_CurrAssess_Operations_Manual_2012-13.pdf
 - ✚ Remove/replace reference to Biology 102 in next-to-last paragraph
- GE rationale: Experiments conducted in the 1970s is listed as a point to justify expected learning outcome number 1 (pertaining to modern science). The issue is whether experiments conducted in the 1970s can be considered to be a part of “modern science.”
- GE Assessment plan: The references to GEC should to be replaced with GE.

I will return Biology 1109 via curriculum.osu.edu in a minute to enable the proposer to address the points above.

Should you have any question about this feedback, do not hesitate to contact Harald Vaessin, Chair of the ASCC NMA Panel (cc'd on this e-mail), or me.

Best wishes,
Bernadette

Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.
 Program Manager, Curriculum and Assessment
 Arts and Sciences
 The Ohio State University
 154D Denney Hall
 164 W 17th Ave.
 Columbus, OH 43210
 Phone: 614-688-5679
 Fax: 614-292-6303
<http://asccas.osu.edu>