

From: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
To: [Perry, Robert](#); [Thaler, Lindsey](#)
Cc: [Vaessin, Harald](#); [Haddad, Deborah](#)
Subject: Physics 1231
Date: Thursday, March 26, 2020 4:30:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Robert and Lindsey,

Recently, the Natural and Mathematical Sciences Panel of the ASC Curriculum Committee reviewed a proposal for new course Physics 1231 with GE Natural Science-Physical Science.

The panel unanimously approved the course for the requested GE (for both BA & BS students) with one contingency and some comments/recommendations. Please find below the feedback of the panel:

- Contingency: The disability statement in the syllabus should be contain two key elements:
 1. It is SLDS that makes the determination of accommodations.
 2. It is the student's responsibility to communicate the accommodations to the professor.

If the faculty member would like to add that the SLDS doesn't directly reach out to professors on their behalf, then it should read: "The office of Disability Services does not reach out to your professors about approved accommodations according to the records you may have submitted."

- Comments/Recommendations:
 - a. Some of the statements about how the GE Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) will be met are unusual. Since the principle of a GE course is that it matches the ELOs of that GE category, it is rather surprising that the following statements appear on the syllabus or on the proposal since they appear to convey uncertainty that all the ELOs will be fully met:
 - i. P. 3 of syllabus. ELO 4: "Students understand that the social implications lie in the applications, and that in the case of physics the social implications are taken up more appropriately in the engineering courses that teach the applications. The reason for this is that physics does not go into details of how to build instruments or devices."
 - ii. The assessment plan says, "Realizing that a given course may not strongly meet all GEC objectives, we would wish that the average of the percent responses to the four learning objectives be >50%, indicating that these objectives as a set have been perceived to have been reasonably met."
 - b. Recommend increasing disability statement to 16 point font.
 - c. P. 1 of the assessment plan: Normalized gain equation does not appear correct as we have percentages. Should the 1 not be 100?
 - d. All the references to "GEC" in the proposal and the syllabus should be replaced by "GE." The GEC was discontinued in 2012, when the university transitioned to semesters.

In a minute, I will return the course request via curriculum.osu.edu to enable the department to address the feedback above.

Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Harald Vaessin (faculty Chair of the NMS Panel; cc'd on this e-mail), or me.

Many thanks,
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>