



Outlook

Comparative Studies 2500

From Steele, Rachel <steele.682@osu.edu>

Date Tue 1/27/2026 6:27 PM

To Arceno, Mark Anthony <arceno.1@osu.edu>; Perez, Ashley <perez.390@osu.edu>

Cc Dugdale, Tom <dugdale.3@osu.edu>; Vankeerbergen, Bernadette <vankeerbergen.1@osu.edu>; Steele, Rachel <steele.682@osu.edu>; Neff, Jennifer <neff.363@osu.edu>; Wade, Macy <wade.619@osu.edu>

Good evening,

On Tuesday, January 13th, the Arts and Humanities I Subcommittee of the ASC Curriculum Committee reviewed a new Distance Learning course proposal for Comparative Studies 2500, as well as a request for the course to be approved as a part of the GEN Foundation: Writing and Information Literacy category

The Subcommittee did not vote on the proposal as they would like the following points addressed:

- a) The Subcommittee commends the department for the creation of a strong course on AI, and they look forward to seeing a refined version of the course based on the feedback below.
- b) The Subcommittee asks that the department reconsider the level of the course. Although the course title and the 2000-level of the course indicate an introductory study of the topic and the syllabus notes that “no prior knowledge or experience with AI systems is needed or presumed” (p. 2), the Subcommittee notes that the course topics, readings, and assignments are quite advanced, and likely worthy of a higher course number.
- c) In its current iteration, the Subcommittee is unable to see how the course is appropriate for the GEN Foundation: Writing and Information Literacy category. They note that the course descriptions (curriculum.osu.edu and syllabus, pp. 1-2) do not mention instruction in writing, and that the course learning outcomes (syllabus, pp. 2-3), assignments (syllabus pp. 10-19), and schedule (syllabus pp. 25-34) are largely focused on subject-matter content and the practice of producing writing that communicates this content rather than providing early-career students with instruction in writing and communication techniques. Furthermore, the focus on informational literacy in the form of “Critical AI Literacies” as outlined in the syllabus (pp. 2, 15) and on the GEN Submission Form (under “A. Foundations”) seems to overshadow the instruction in writing that is essential to a GEN Foundations course in this category.

In relation to the comments above, the Subcommittee offers the friendly reminder that, if the department intends for this course to align with the AI Fluency initiative requirements for students in the Comparative Studies major, students will *not* be able to “double dip” and count this course toward their GEN Foundations: Writing and Information Literacy requirement while also applying it to the Comparative Studies major requirements. Thus, if this is intended to be the Comparative Studies AI Fluency course, “relieving” the course of the burden of meeting the GEN Foundation: Writing and Information Literacy Goals and ELOs may allow the course to better serve the department and its students.

- d) The Subcommittee asks that the department clarify, simplify, and refine the course’s syllabus in the following areas:
 - i) P. 1 of the syllabus currently describes the course as “Hybrid Asynchronous Online and Synchronous Online”. The term “hybrid” has a specific definition at Ohio State (i.e., a course that is in-person 25-74% of the time, and online 25-74% of the time); as such, the Subcommittee asks that this term be removed from the syllabus. Similarly, since the course has synchronous components, (times when

students must be logged in and meet together in the online space), it should be categorized as a synchronous course even when some instructional components are delivered asynchronously.

- ii) While the Subcommittee appreciates the department's efforts to make the class flexible for students, they are concerned that the complexity of the course's structure (some required synchronous sessions and some optional synchronous sessions which are not consistent week-to-week) may cause confusion and uneven instruction. (Students who cannot attend the optional synchronous labs may not have the same access to instruction as students whose schedule enables them to attend.) They ask that the department reconfigure the course with these comments in mind.
- iii) The Subcommittee is observant of the work that went into crafting this extensive and detailed syllabus document. However, they ask the department to consider how the syllabus could be shortened to provide students with a more condensed overview of the course. They note that items such as the individual assignment rubrics (syllabus pp. 10-19), specific instructions for assignments (syllabus pp. 10-19), and the "Detailed Modules Description and Schedule" (syllabus pp. 34-66) might be better suited to a separate document and/or placement on Carmen.
- e) Should the department wish to continue to pursue the GEN Foundation: Writing and Information Literacy approval (see comment "c" above), the Subcommittee asks that the GEN ELOs (syllabus, pp. 3-4) be numbered (i.e., 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3) to illuminate the connection between the goals and ELOs. The GEN Goals and ELOs for all categories are available in an easy-to-copy/paste format on the [Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Assessment website](#).
- f) Should the department wish to continue to pursue the GEN Foundation: Writing and Information Literacy approval (see comment "c" above), the Subcommittee asks that a brief, student-friendly explanation of *how* the course meets the GEN Goals and ELOs be added to the syllabus. This explanation should immediately follow the listing of the goals and ELOs on pp. 3-4 of the syllabus.
- g) The Subcommittee observes that the grading scale on pp. 19-20 of the syllabus appears to be a combination of a rubric and a grading scale (generally, grading scales list only the numerical percentages assigned to each letter grade available at OSU), and they recommend that the more detailed descriptions be separated from the grading scale or eliminated from the syllabus altogether.

I will return Comparative Studies 2500 the department queue via curriculum.osu.edu in order to address the Subcommittee's requests.

Should you have any questions about the feedback of the Subcommittee, please feel free to contact Tom Dugdale (faculty Chair of the A & H 1 Subcommittee; cc'd on this e-mail), or me.

Best,
Rachel



Rachel Steele, MA

(Pronouns: she/her/hers / Honorific: Ms.)

Program Manager, Office of Curriculum and Assessment

College of Arts and Sciences

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

(614) 292-7226

Member, University Conduct Board

Graduate Student, History of Art

-BLACK LIVES MATTER-

STOP AAPI HATE

DACA/undocumented ally



I acknowledge that the land that The Ohio State University occupies is the ancestral and contemporary territory of the Shawnee, Potawatomi, Delaware, Miami, Peoria, Seneca, Wyandotte, Ojibwe and Cherokee peoples. Specifically, the university resides on land ceded in the 1795 Treaty of Greeneville and the forced removal of tribes through the Indian Removal Act of 1830. I honor the resiliency of these tribal nations and recognize the historical contexts that has and continues to affect the Indigenous peoples of this land.