

**From:** [Neff, Jennifer](#)  
**To:** [Andrews, Adam](#); [Kulesza, Amy](#)  
**Cc:** [Vaessin, Harald](#); [Lower, Brian](#); [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#); [Steele, Rachel](#); [Hilty, Michael](#)  
**Subject:** Biology 2750  
**Date:** Thursday, March 27, 2025 2:47:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Good afternoon,

On Monday, March 17<sup>th</sup>, the Themes 1 Subcommittee of the ASC Curriculum Committee and the Theme Advisory Group for Lived Environments reviewed a GEN Theme: Lived Environments request for Biology 2750.

The reviewing faculty declined to vote on the request at this time and ask that the following be addressed in a revision:

- While the course currently focuses on the cultural environment, thus fulfilling the Lived Environments Goals, the reviewing faculty recommend improving the fulfillment of ELO 3.2 by engaging with other types of environments (e.g., agricultural, built, economic, intellectual, natural).
- The reviewing faculty recommend that the Center for Life Science Education consider how they can strengthen the course's fulfillment of ELO 4.1 by incorporating historical examples of environmental change (such as deforestation, industrialization, and urban expansion), cultivating deeper discussions on how environmental crises have shaped public policy and social movements.
- The reviewing faculty encourage the CLSE to consider enriching the fulfillment of ELO 4.3 by adding diverse beliefs about human-environment interactions in the course to provide students with a broader analytical framework, including comparative perspectives on how biology and the public realm interact in different countries.
- The reviewing faculty appreciate the Center's efforts in revising this course to fit into the Lived Environments Theme. They offer the friendly advice to the CLSE that submitting the revisions as soon as possible would help ensure that the proposal is returned to the same group of faculty on the Themes Subcommittee for continuity in feedback.
- The reviewing faculty note that the course content appears to conflate lived environments, social environments, and cultural environments. They encourage the CLSE to provide students with a clearer distinction between these concepts to ensure that they fully understand the unique characteristics and interconnections of each.
- The reviewing faculty are concerned with the overall level and rigor of the course. While it is understandable that the course, as a General Education course, may not delve into highly specialized content, the reviewing faculty want to ensure that it is taught at a more in-depth level appropriate for the Themes. Many elements of the course seem foundational and suited to introductory material (e.g., assignments based on tasks like submitting a journal article), which may be too basic for this stage. The reviewing faculty request that the assignments and assessments be adjusted to reflect the expectations of advanced work, ensuring they are appropriately challenging within the discipline. The reviewing faculty ask that the unit reach out

to Harald Vaessin ([vaessin.1@osu.edu](mailto:vaessin.1@osu.edu)) to schedule a meeting to discuss what an advanced yet accessible Themes course should entail.

- The reviewing faculty request that the connection between each week's material be made clearer. To meet the expectations of an advanced Themes course, it is crucial to provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their ability to integrate various concepts. A final project or assignment that ties the course together could serve this purpose effectively. While the reviewing faculty acknowledge that synthesis is possibly already embedded within the course, it is not clearly articulated in the syllabus. They request that this be highlighted to make the integration of knowledge more apparent to both students and the reviewing faculty.
- The reviewing faculty note that the syllabus includes language in the Student Life Disability Services Statement that is not consistent with the approved verbiage. While this additional language is certainly relevant, the reviewing faculty ask that it be removed from under the heading of the university's statement on disability services. This content can be incorporated elsewhere in the syllabus, but it should not appear within the SLDS section. [Syllabus pp. 10-11]
- The reviewing faculty request that a cover letter be provided that details all changes made as a result of their feedback.

I will return Biology 2750 to the CLSE queue via [curriculum.osu.edu](http://curriculum.osu.edu) in order to address the above feedback.

Should you have any questions about the feedback of the reviewing faculty, please feel free to contact Harald Vaessin (faculty Chair of the Themes 1 Subcommittee), Brian Lower (faculty Chair of the Theme Advisory Group: Lived Environments), or me.

Best,  
Jennifer



**THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**

**Jennifer Neff**

Curriculum and Assessment Assistant

**The Ohio State University**

College of Arts and Sciences

ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services

306A Dulles Hall, 230 Annie and John Glenn Ave, Columbus, OH 43210

614-292-3901 / [asccas.osu.edu](http://asccas.osu.edu)

Pronouns: she/her/hers