

From: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
To: [Armstrong, Philip](#); [Weiner, Isaac A.](#); [Vu, Elizabeth A.](#)
Cc: [Horn, David](#); [Heysel, Garrett](#); [Oldroyd, Shelby Q.](#); [Miriti, Maria](#)
Subject: Comparative Studies 2099, 2301, 2367.08, and 3686
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 3:16:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Philip, Isaac, and Elizabeth,

On Friday, August 7, the ASC Curriculum Committee (ASCC) reviewed proposals to offer distance learning versions of the following existing courses: Comparative Studies 2099, 2301 (with GE Literature and GE Diversity-Global Studies), 2367.08 (with GE Writing and Communication-Level 2, GE Cultures & Ideas, and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.), and 3686 (with GE VPA and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the U.S.).

Please find below the feedback of the Committee:

Comparative Studies 2099: Unanimously approved with *one recommendation (in italics below)*

- *Attendance policy refers to COVID-19. The request is to teach the course online permanently. In the long run/during normal times, please remember to delete that reference and replace it with something relevant. The same comment applies to the discussion about personal well-being during COVID-19 on page 8.*

-

Comparative Studies 2301: Unanimously approved with **one contingency (in bold below)** and *three recommendations (in italics below)*

- **It is not clear whether the course will have any lectures. If so, are they going to be pre-recorded or live (synchronous)? If recorded, where will they be available? Please add explicit information about instructor-student interactions.**
- *Consider adding synchronous meetings with the instructor or providing other direct student-instructor interaction.*
- *P. 5: Statement under Teaching Philosophy: "Like many of you, I would prefer to be learning together in person, but I am committed to maximizing the possibilities of this online format." It is unexpected that a permanent DL course states that they would rather meet in person. This language may work well in the short term with COVID but should be removed in the long run.*
- *GE Assessment plan:*
 - *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75% of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is not relevant in this context. Second, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.*
 - *The direct method of assessment is based on analysis of the weekly assignments, final paper, and final exam. A sample rubric shows how to produce a score from analyzing an essay. That is not a rubric for GE assessment. Indeed, measures unrelated to the ELOs are used in calculating the score -- see the first four criteria of the rubric. Second, the rubric simply states the ELOs are graded on a 10-point scale. A true rubric describes the*

characteristics the performance must exhibit in order to receive a certain score.

-
Comparative Studies 2367.08: Unanimously approved with *five recommendations (in italics below)*

- *There is some confusion in course delivery, which is stated to be asynchronous. Later in the pacing section, there is a presentation of pausing during class periods to promote "discussion"/ note cards... This needs to be corrected for DL mode of delivery.*
- *It seems that the course will be offered in discrete modules, but the structure could be presented more clearly.*
- *2367 is a writing course and there should be clearer evidence that writing/communication pedagogy is at the heart of this course. The in-person syllabus seems to have more opportunities to receive feedback on & revise the writing. We ask the instructor to consider adding opportunities for students to write and receive feedback from the instructor.*
- *The course description and topic do not align with the in-person syllabus and the generic description of the course. The DL syllabus focuses on "disability identity and culture in the U.S. and beyond" which is much more specific than the generic description of the course. The description also mentions "beyond" the US, whereas the catalog says the focus will be on the US. The department may want to consider reconfiguring this course as a topics course.*
- *GE Assessment plan:*
 - *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75% of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is irrelevant in this context. Second, the course is qualified for three GE categories (not two) and all three need to be addressed. Third, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.*
 - *The direct method is based on analysis of weekly discussion posts and the final paper. A sample rubric is provided to produce a score from the analysis of the final paper --which is good. However, one important shortcoming is that the assessment addresses all seven ELOs together by computing one overall score. The seven ELOs should be assessed separately using seven rubrics. Also, there should be a rubric for analyzing weekly discussion posts.*

Comparative Studies 3686: Unanimously approved with *four recommendations (in italics below)*

- *The course has only three synchronous sessions (first day, mid term, and last day). The instructor may want to consider adding more synchronous live interactions or other direct student-instructor interaction.*
- *There is no indication that the instructor will post lectures on Carmen for students to view.*
- *Consider moving the COVID statement prior to all of the rigid participation/attendance statements.*
- *GE Assessment plan:*
 - *Concerning the expected level of student achievement, the proposal states that "at least 75% of the students will reflect undergraduate-level mastery of 75%*

of the GE ELOs for two GE categories." However, undergraduate-level mastery is not relevant in this context. Second, an expected level of achievement should be specified for each ELO.

- *The direct method is based on analysis of the assignments. A sample rubric is provided to produce a score from the analysis of the final project. The assessment addresses all four ELOs together by computing one overall score, and measures unrelated to ELOs are mixed into the calculation as well -- see the first five criteria of the rubric. Each ELO should be assessed separately, and there should be a rubric for each ELO.*

In a minute, I will return 2301 via curriculum.osu.edu in order to enable the department to address the Committee's feedback. (Please notice that in the short run, for Autumn delivery, 2301 does not need to go through the DL assurance process. However, to obtain permanent DL status, a revision addressing the feedback above will need to be submitted by the department.) As for 2099, 2367.08, and 3686, they will be advanced to OAA and the Registrar's Office.

Should you have any questions about the feedback of the Committee, please feel free to contact Maria Miriti (incoming faculty chair of the ASCC), 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://ascas.osu.edu>