

From: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
To: [Peterson, Derek](#); [Suchland, Jennifer](#)
Cc: [Aski, Janice](#); [Heysel, Garrett](#)
Subject: Russian 1103.99
Date: Thursday, December 14, 2017 9:43:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Jennifer and Derek,

On Tuesday, December 5, the Arts and Humanities 1 Panel of the ASC Curriculum Committee reviewed a course proposal for the distance learning version of "Intermediate Russian I," Russian 1103.99.

The request was unanimously approved by the Panel, though there were a number of comments pertaining to clarifying/finalizing the syllabus for when the course is first taught. Could you please communicate the following feedback/recommendations to the course instructor?

- P. 1: Dead weblink to outdated SU 2012 advising sheet should be removed.
Furthermore, it is not clear why GE advising sheet for the BA would only be provided since the GE Foreign Language requirement is also present in the BS. Request to remove that information in parentheses.
- P. 3: Typo: Pearson MyRussian Lab Provacy Policy
- P. 3: Bottom of page. The following sentence appears "Please note that the deadlines vary depending on how many credit hours you are registered for." This must be a cut-paste statement left over from another syllabus since the course at hand is a fixed 4-credit course. This statement should be removed.
- P. 4: "you must have met with your instructor for a homework check": The statement is confusing because it appears before the virtual meeting with the instructor is explained on p. 7.
- P. 4: Missing a deadline: 3% points will be subtracted: Should there be a difference if you miss the deadline by 1 day or 2 weeks?
- Perhaps include time limit for exams. This is not included in the syllabus.
- P. 6: Under "Student participation requirements": "This means that while be provide deadlines . . .": "be" should likely read "we."
- P. 8: Section on "Student Services at OSU":
 - Second statement: Not clear why the office of the Dean of Undergraduate Education is included. This is not a place where students can receive any services.
 - Third statement: "Other students can be found at the Student Academic Services building on Lane Avenue." Did you mean "other services"?
- Boilerplate statements in syllabus. Please make sure to not include boilerplate that is not necessary.
 - PP. 7-8 & 9: There are two statements on academic integrity. It would appear the first one comes from the ODEE template and the second is the one that is provided in ASC materials (and was approved by the ASC Curriculum Committee.) Please remove one of the statements.
 - Likewise, p. 10, there are two disability statements. In this case, the first one is the

one that is provided in ASC materials (and was approved by the ASC Curriculum Committee) and the second comes from the ODEE template. Please remove one of these statements. Prefer the first one, which is not only provided by ASC but also recommended by Student Life Disability Services; furthermore, it is more comprehensive than the second statement.

- P. 9: Trigger warning: Is it really necessary for this course? Does the course really include media that may be triggering to students (e.g., violence, acts of war, sexual violence)? Feel free to remove the statement if it does not apply to the course. Please consider that this statement if included in a syllabus for a course that does not include such media might actually scare away some students. On the other hand, if it does apply to some media used in the course, then consider adapting the statement for an online course. For example, as currently used, the statement includes a section about “leaving the classroom to take a water/bathroom break.”
- P. 11: Your mental health statement: Encourages students to contact the College of Pharmacy Office of Students Services. This must be a cut-paste oversight as ASC departments would never refer students to an office of student services in another college.
- GE Assessment plan:
 - Typo: Appendices A, B, and C, refer to EOL instead of ELO.
 - Appendix D states that for ELO 1 and ELO 2 “[w]e expect 80% of sampled students to achieve a score of 3/3 for each component.” Using a rubric does seem appropriate here. Thus, some corrections need to be made to the table that presents the overview of the GE assessment plan (on p. 1). Indeed, in that table, the level of achievement for the direct method for ELOs 1 and 2 is said to be: “80% of students should score 80% or higher on this assignment.” If indeed, a rubric will be used (which, again, seems most appropriate here), then the score of 3/3 should be included here as well (not an 80% grade).

The course request will now be advanced to OAA and OUR.

Should you have any questions about this feedback, do not hesitate to contact Janice Aski (faculty Chair of the Arts and Humanities 1 Panel; cc'd here), or me.

My best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

Program Director, Curriculum and Assessment

College of Arts and Sciences

154D Denney Hall, 164 Annie & John Glenn Ave.

Columbus, OH 43210

Phone: 614-688-5679 / Fax: 614-292-6303

<http://asccas.osu.edu>