

2004-2005 Assessment Planning for the General Education Curriculum (GEC)
Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC)

Outline	Page
I. 2004-2005 Quarterly Activities.....	2
II. Organizational Structure.....	4
III. Reporting Procedures.....	4
IV. General Education Assessment Plan.....	5
A. Background.....	5
B. Principles.....	6
C. Rationale.....	7
D. Goals and Objectives.....	7
E. Methods.....	11
F. Time line.....	12
G. Feedback Process and Information Usage.....	13
V. Implementation Schedule.....	14
VI. Pilot Courses.....	15
VII. Departmental Course Report Requirements.....	17

2004-2005 Assessment Planning for the General Education Curriculum (GEC)
Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC)

I. Activities

A. Autumn 2004

Preliminary discussions were held Autumn 2004 regarding assessment planning in general education. The initial organizational structure for assessment was outlined for the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC) Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI) at its annual Autumn retreat (September 15, 2004). The Assessment Coordinator for ASC met individually with Sub-Committees B (October 13, 2004) and C (September 23, 2004) to: elaborate and clarify the assessment charge, provide additional background information, review the 1999 GEC Assessment Plan, and make available web sites which describe various assessment examples, planning activities, and implementation strategies at peer institutions. Faculty members of the sub-committees were asked to review the background and to begin preliminary discussions for concurrence with the 1999 plan and/or planning for a revised formal plan. Three additional meetings were held with the Chairs of Sub-Committees B and C, (October 21, 2004, November 10, 2004, and January 5, 2005), as well as regular meetings with the CCI Chair and Executive Associate Dean for ASC. Reports of planning were provided to the Executive Dean of ASC during regular ASC staff meetings, to the Deans of the five Colleges of ASC at an Executive Deans meeting, and to the Associate Deans responsible for assessment in each of the five Colleges. Discussions about specific planning for surveys were held with the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Studies, and meetings were held with the Vice-Provost for Curriculum to clarify expectations for the upcoming 2007 accreditation. Numerous other meetings were held for information gathering and to obtain feedback about preliminary ideas. Based on these discussions, an organizational structure for assessment administration was created, and the reporting procedures for major programs articulated.

B. Winter 2005

The ASC Assessment Coordinator met with Sub-Committees B and C every other week during Winter quarter to discuss the kind of assessment plan that would best serve the distribution / category model of general education in place at Ohio State. Faculty continued to review general education assessment plans from peer institutions with particular attention to institutions that also had distribution models of general education, began refining goals and objectives for each of the eight categories for purposes of assessment, and solicited feedback from Departments that offered general education courses with large enrollments about the feasibility of implementing a plan based on course review. Reports of

planning were provided to the Executive Dean of ASC during regular ASC staff meetings and to the Associate Deans responsible for assessment for each of the five Colleges. To continue to gather information about best practices, a Graduate Administrative Associate (GAA) was hired to help facilitate assessment related activities, including gathering background information on assessment models from peer institutions, survey activities across the colleges, research protocols for assessment, and the data warehouse as a potential source of outcomes information. The Assessment Coordinator attended the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU) annual meeting on Assessment and General Education, continued to meet with various College and Departmental representatives for both major and general education planning, met with a sub-committee of the General Education Review group, and explored additional methods of assessment for general education, such as ePortfolio. Based on information gathered in the above ongoing manner and their own internal deliberations, the members of Sub-Committees B and C voted informally to move forward with a plan that would require courses approved for general education status to be reviewed regularly based on learning outcomes. Sub-Committees B and C charged a small working group of five faculty members who represented each of the two Sub-Committees and the majority of the general education categories across colleges to work out the details for implementing the above conceptual plan. Remaining committee members were charged to refine category goals and objectives for the final plan.

C. Spring 2005

The Assessment Coordinator and GAA for ASC met with the five-member working group of faculty for two, three-hour working meetings early spring quarter to refine details for an overall plan, including a reporting structure. The Chairs of Sub-Committees B and C met with remaining members of B and C Sub-Committees to articulate goals and objectives for each of the GEC categories based on the Model GEC. In addition, to begin to document any already ongoing assessment activities and identify best practices to serve as models for a larger roll-out of course review, the Vice-Provost for Curriculum and ASC Assessment Coordinator met with faculty directors of a selected set of GEC courses in which assessment was known to be organized and ongoing. The courses selected also represented the different categories of the GEC and had large enrollments. The working group of faculty subsequently drafted an assessment plan incorporating the selected courses as pilot courses for a larger course review plan. The draft was presented to Sub-Committees B and C, and informally approved. The Sub-Committees also refined the goals and objectives for assessment purposes. The Sub-Committees included, for each GEC category, a broad goals and rationale statement and approximately three learning objectives. Students should be expected to meet these learning objectives when completing their GEC requirements, course syllabi are expected to contain these objectives, and course assessment should address all or most of the stated learning objectives

for that category (or categories). The assessment plan, including the refined goals and objectives statements, will be submitted to the full CCI for approval.

II. Organizational Structure

1. The CCI, as the faculty representative body across the five colleges in Arts and Sciences, would have oversight for all ASC assessment activities.
2. CCI Sub-Committees B and C, would have responsibility for formalizing and implementing an Assessment Plan for General Education, with final approval required by the full CCI. When feasible, centralized efforts would be coordinated by the Assessment Coordinator for ASC.
3. Departments and/or faculty representatives for interdisciplinary programs would be responsible for developing and implementing Assessment Plans for Major Programs in ASC. These efforts would be de-centralized and administered by Department Chairs, likely through Departmental Undergraduate Studies Committees. College efforts would be coordinated by Associate Deans assigned responsibility for assessment. Plans would be reviewed by the Assessment Coordinator for ASC, the ASC Associate Executive Dean for Curriculum, and the Vice-Provost for Curriculum.
4. Deans for each of the five colleges would include an assessment report for major and general education assessment activities in their respective colleges as part of their annual reports to the Senior Vice-Provost and Executive Dean.

III. Reporting Procedures

1. Annual reports for all ASC major programs would be submitted July 1 by Department Chairs to the Assessment Coordinator for ASC through their respective College offices. Reports would include assessment planning, implementation, learning outcomes data, and how the information was used to improve curricular and instructional practices. Reports would be summarized by the ASC Assessment Coordinator for an annual report to the CCI the following October.
2. For the general education program, reports for course review of GEC approved courses would be requested on a rolling basis determined by CCI Sub-Committees B and C. Departments would be given notice at least three quarters, including summer, before the report would be due. Reports would include the same information as in major program plans: assessment planning, implementation, learning outcomes data, and how the information was used to improve curricular and instructional practices. GEC course review reports would be submitted by Departments to the CCI through the Assessment Coordinator for ASC at the requested deadline and copied to the appropriate College Dean. Reports would be reviewed across the year by Sub-Committees B and C with

forthcoming reports given to the full CCI on a rolling basis. All GEC courses are expected to be fully reviewed over a ten-year period. Following a full review, all large enrolled-in courses (annual enrollments greater than 1000) would be expected to provide progress reports every five years.

3. Based on information in both the major and general education course review reports, the CCI would make recommendations for follow-up curricular and assessment activities to major or general education programs. Information from all of the reports would be expected to be shared by Department chairs with faculty in their respective programs as well for their own internal use for curricular and instructional improvement. An executive summary of Departmental major program and GEC course review reports would be provided to the Vice-Provost for Curriculum and copied to the Senior Vice-Provost of Academic Affairs and Executive Dean of ASC annually in January, covering the activities of the previous calendar year.

IV. **Preliminary Assessment Plan for the General Education Program 2005**

A. *Background*

A General Education Program was articulated at The Ohio State University in a 1987 special report following extensive faculty study. The philosophy incorporated the principle that students should have a wide range of experiences distributed across the curriculum, and included eight components with specific goals and objectives defined for each component. Additionally, students were expected to progress through their general education and major programs, building on their learning, and culminating in a capstone experience. The Program was made operational through a new model General Education Curriculum (GEC) proposed in 1988, and subsequently implemented in 1990. The GEC included eight categories of courses in which students could enroll to meet general education objectives: Writing and Related Skills, Quantitative and Logical Skills, Foreign Language, Social Diversity in the United States, Natural Science, Social Science, Arts and Humanities, and Capstone Experiences. The current GEC curriculum was implemented in 1990 with some modifications across Colleges and Degree Programs. For example, only two levels of writing were required, and the Capstone experience was required only for B.A. students. Initial assessment of the GEC was conducted in 1995, including detailed syllabi analyses, and resulted in some streamlining of the requirements in 1996.

While the 1995 review provided important information about the curriculum as well as some indicators of student success (e.g., time to complete requirements), the review did not emphasize direct measures of learning outcomes. Nonetheless, more direct measures of student achievement have been ongoing in many of the categories. For example, in the Writing and Related Skills category, there has been a strong assessment emphasis on portfolio evaluations. In Foreign Language, placement testing and continuing individualized student

assessment in small classes have been prominent. As part of an accreditation review requirement in 1997, an Assessment Plan for the General Education Program was developed in 1999 with the intention of implementing more systematic assessment of learning outcomes by category, extending the already ongoing activities in the Writing and Foreign Language categories. In 2003, the Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee issued its report on its review of the GEC. While generally reaffirming the distributive nature of the GEC requirements, this committee called for increased oversight of and improved outcomes assessment in the GEC. Also in 2003, the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (ASC), which houses and oversees the GEC curriculum across the University, was reorganized and a newly structured faculty curriculum oversight committee was formed. The newly formed Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI) reviews GEC course approval and is charged with GEC assessment. Working Sub-Committees (B and C) of the CCI have reviewed the 1999 GEC Assessment Plan and refined the category approach to a course review across category approach based on student learning outcomes.

B. Principles

Goals and objectives of the GEC are consistent with the broader University mission of providing a quality learning experience for students. Part of the evaluation of the effectiveness of that experience should be based on student learning outcomes, using evaluation methods faculty within disciplines find appropriate. Departments which offer GEC courses have the responsibility for ensuring ongoing assessment based on learning outcomes, and for providing regular reports to the faculty oversight committee. The ASC CCI has the responsibility for determining the assessment course review process and implementation plan, and for reviewing Departmental reports. Further, the ASC CCI has the responsibility of articulating and refining GEC goals and objectives for assessment, and determining evaluation criteria.

Additional operating principles and long term recommendations include the following. The plan should be viewed as dynamic. Assessment should continue to be implemented in a manner that is manageable based on time and resources so that assessment becomes a routine practice. The CCI should be kept current about assessment practices nationally and locally. The CCI should be kept informed of other local outcome information that would be useful in evaluation of the effectiveness of the GEC. Education of instructors about assessment and evaluation of student learning with respect to GEC goals and objectives should become a regular part of training programs as faculty and graduate instructors change over time. Students should be regularly informed through a variety of avenues, including advising, of the purpose of general education and the goals and objectives they are expected to achieve. An Assessment Coordinator or similar position should become permanent to help ensure ongoing oversight and coordination of assessment activities for the GEC.

C. Rationale

A course review approach using sampling techniques was recommended for assessment of the GEC. The course approach was selected because learning outcomes are easily measured and documented in the context of specific courses, and also because evaluation at the course level provides a good opportunity for direct and more immediate ongoing improvements in the course curriculum and instructional practices. Additional levels of analyses then become possible by aggregating information across courses within a category, and eventually across categories of the GEC as a whole. Purposeful sampling was viewed as a reliable and feasible method for evaluation given the size of the student population and GEC at Ohio State. About 30,000 undergraduate students are enrolled at Ohio State, with about 5800 new first quarter freshmen admitted annually during Autumn quarters alone. Further, students can enroll in over different 800 different courses to fulfill different components of the general education requirement. However, enrollment data indicate most students enroll in a subgroup of 25-50 different courses to fulfill their GEC requirements. Courses taken by a large number of students, and therefore representing the population at large, will be selected for initial assessment purposes. Further, in the subset of large enrolled-in GEC courses, multiple sections are generally offered and taught by a variety of instructors. As such, they are well suited for representative sampling of students, and for program specific versus instructor specific evaluation. The use of large enrolled-in courses is considered a first step in assessment, while other courses which can also fulfill GEC requirements but have different enrollment patterns, formats, and/or specialized populations, will be considered in the future.

D. Goals and Objectives

1. Writing and Related Skills

Goals/Rationale:

Writing courses across disciplines develop students' skills in writing, reading, critical thinking, and oral expression.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students apply basic skills in expository writing.
2. Students demonstrate critical thinking through written and oral expression.
3. Students retrieve and use written information analytically and effectively.

2. Foreign Language

Goals/Rationale:

Foreign language courses develop students' skills in communication across ethnic, cultural, ideological, and national boundaries, and help students develop an understanding of other cultures and patterns of thought.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students demonstrate basic skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing in a language other than their native language.
2. Students describe cultural differences in countries other than their own, and demonstrate an appreciation of these differences.

3. Quantitative and Logical Skills

Goals/Rationale:

Courses in quantitative and logical skills develop logical reasoning, including the ability to identify valid arguments, use mathematical models, and draw conclusions based on quantitative data.

Learning Objectives:

1. Basic Computational Skills. Students demonstrate computational skills and familiarity with algebra and geometry, and can apply these skills to practical problems.
2. Mathematical and Logical Analysis. Students comprehend mathematical concepts and methods adequate to construct valid arguments, and understand inductive and deductive reasoning, scientific inference, and general problem solving.
3. Data Analysis. Students understand statistics and probability, comprehend mathematical methods needed to analyze statistical arguments, and recognize the importance of statistical ideas.

4. Diversity: Social Diversity in the United States

Goals/Rationale:

Courses in social diversity will foster an understanding of the pluralistic nature of institutions, society, and culture in the United States

Learning Objectives:

1. Students describe the roles of such categories as race, gender, class, ethnicity, and religion in the institutions and cultures of the United States.
2. Students recognize the role of social diversity in shaping their own attitudes and values.

5. Diversity: International Issues

Goals/ Rationale:

International Issues courses help students become educated, productive, and principled citizens of their nation and the world.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students exhibit an understanding of political, economic, cultural, physical, and social differences among the nations of the world, including a specific examination of non-Western culture.

6. Natural Science

Goals/Rationale:

Courses in natural sciences foster an understanding of the principles, theories and methods of modern science, the relationship between science and technology, and the effects of science and technology on the environment.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science.
2. Students learn key events in the history of science.
3. Students provide examples of the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments.
4. Students discuss social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world.

7. Social Science

Goals/Rationale:

Courses in social science help students understand human behavior and cognition, and the structures of human societies, cultures and institutions.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of scientific inquiry as they are applied to the studies of individuals, groups, organizations, and societies.
2. Students comprehend human differences and similarities in various psychological, social, cultural, economic, geographic, and political contexts.

3. Students develop abilities to comprehend and assess individual and social values, and recognize their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

8. Arts and Humanities: Historical Survey

Goals/Rationale:

History courses develop students' knowledge of how past events influence today's society and help them understand how humans view themselves.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students display knowledge and understanding of human history.
2. Students compare contemporary social values with those of other communities in time and space.
3. Students place current problems and issues in their larger historical context.

9. Arts and Humanities: Analysis of Texts and Works of Art

Goals/Rationale:

Students evaluate significant writing and works of art. Such studies develop capacities for aesthetic and historical response and judgment; interpretation and evaluation; critical listening, reading, seeing, thinking, and writing; and experiencing the arts and reflecting on that experience.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students develop abilities to be enlightened observers or active participants in the visual, spatial, musical, theatrical, rhetorical, or written arts.
2. Students describe and interpret achievement in the arts and literature.
3. Students explain how works of art and literature express social and cultural issues.

10. Capstone Experiences

Goals/Rationale:

Thematic upper-division course work, drawing upon multiple disciplines, enriches students' experiences of the contemporary world.

Learning Objectives:

1. Students synthesize and apply knowledge from diverse disciplines to contemporary issues.
2. Students write about or conduct research on the contemporary world.

E. *Assessment Methods*

- Departments offering courses currently approved as fulfilling a GEC requirement should be able to provide student learning outcome evidence to demonstrate course effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives of the GEC category for which it was approved to maintain GEC status.
- Beginning Autumn 2005, all new courses submitted for GEC approval must include a plan for assessment with a subsequent report of effectiveness within five years.
- Sub-Committees B and C are responsible for developing reporting schedules and requirements (see report format*). Priorities for scheduling include: categories and/or courses for which assessment is well-established to model assessment and provide start-up time for other courses/categories to develop assessment techniques; large enrolled-in courses that most students take to fulfill requirements; category representation; and/or courses selected for special emphasis based on University-wide priorities.
- Departments will be notified of the request three quarters, including summer, before reports will be due. The request will provide: a rationale for the review process and course selection; an outline of expectations for the assessment report; a request for a syllabus containing category appropriate GEC goals; the expectations for outcome evidence; and will be accompanied by examples when possible. The request letter will be copied to the Dean of the College in which the course is offered. The first set of reports based on a pilot set of courses is expected early Winter 2006.
- Department Chairs may assign a faculty representative or course coordinator to generate the requested report for the course under review. Departments will submit the reports for their general education courses directly to the CCI by the requested deadline, copied to the Dean.
- Departments need to demonstrate in the report how the course meets GEC goals, with evidence of learning outcomes, and how the assessment information is used. Departments will determine the appropriate assessment methods for their discipline, but will be encouraged to include evidence of change as well as end result (summative) outcomes. Outcome information may lead to curricular or instructional changes, such as modification of expected learning outcomes for ongoing assessment, re-evaluation of course placement methods based on entering abilities of students, or how the course is delivered. The specific criteria for meeting goals will be established by the CCI, but Departments will not necessarily be required to meet every GEC goal within their category. Departments should be advised to maintain outcome data or assessment samples in accordance with any current University or Departmental standards.

- The schedule for reporting should begin with a pilot set of courses, and over the initial two years, include the review of up to 24 courses annually (approximately 3 courses/category/year). The intention is to review every course with GEC status over a ten-year period, beginning with representative courses within categories. A special focus could be considered at any time, such as a focus on particular categories, section sizes, or course level. Once reviewed and determined to fulfill GEC goals based on outcome information, large enrolled-in courses (over 1000 students annually) should provide a progress report every five years and be fully reviewed every 10 years.
- Sub-Committees B and C will consider incorporating other assessment methods into the overall plan on an ad-hoc basis after the course review process is in place. Examples include consideration of using technological resources for collecting outcome information relevant to general education, such as ePortfolios or course management systems, or developing an ASC graduating senior exit survey if feasible. The B and C Sub-Committees will also consider folding in other ongoing or planned assessment initiatives relevant to general education, such as reviewing National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) information which is already collected every three years, or reviewing outcome information from a proposed longitudinal study sponsored by the Lumina foundation in which Ohio State might participate. The consensus at present is not to use standardized testing as a primary assessment method.

F. Implementation Time Line

- During Spring 2005, begin initial evaluation of a set of GEC courses in which assessment practices are believed to be ongoing to document outcomes and find model templates. Also base course selection on large enrollments and representation of several GEC categories.
- Request from the initially selected courses a 2-4 page report in which assessment planning or other related activities are described, any outcome data are summarized, and use of the information is reported.
- Draft report requirements (attached)* and pilot usefulness of reporting format with initial set of courses selected for review.
- Draft form letter for Departments for planned course review roll-out, in which is described the rationale for the review process, course selection, and report requirements. Include a copy of the requested report format and examples of evidence.
- Send letter to Department Chairs for pilot courses, requesting formal reports to the CCI by the beginning of Winter 2006.
- Determine a second round of courses to be reviewed, and send request letter to Department Chairs copied to the Deans requesting reports to the CCI by the beginning of Spring 2006.

- By Summer 2005, determine current assessment practices and whether form needs modification.
- Update tentative schedule for ongoing review of courses (see attached tentative schedule).
- Begin planning for explanatory meetings with instructors of courses selected for review and determine need for additional educational and training activities for Autumn 2005.

G. Feedback process and information usage

- Sub-Committees B and C will review quarterly all submitted reports and report to the full CCI with action recommendations on a case by case basis. The CCI will provide feedback to Department Chairs, copied to the Deans, and make recommendations for continuing GEC status as appropriate. Courses not addressing GEC goals and objectives would be provided time for corrective action. OAA will be consulted regarding Departments that do not participate.
- The CCI will provide an annual executive summary report to the Vice-Provost for Curriculum in the Office of Academic Affairs and copied to the Senior Vice-Provost and Executive Dean.
- Department Chairs are expected to share feedback with Departmental faculty, instructors, or curricular committees as appropriate.
- The CCI can update the assessment plan at any time, but will review the overall plan every five years. The review may lead to recommendations for changes such as modifications in goals and objectives, the curriculum, placement practices, or instructional delivery practices based on the outcome information.
- The schedule for course review may be modified.

V. Tentative Roll-Out Schedule for GEC Course Evaluation

SP05:

- Pilot courses (to become Round 1 course set): Current status of assessment practices provided to help determine “best practices”
- Round 2 courses: Departments of courses for review notified

AU05:

- Pilot courses: Outcome information gathered
- Round 2 courses: Departments undergoing course review sent reminder notification
- Round 2 courses: Explanatory meeting held with Departmental representatives for courses undergoing review
- Round 2 courses: Assessment initiated (outcome information gathered if not already ongoing)

WI06:

- Pilot courses: Reports submitted to CCI
- Based on pilot course reports, report requirements for Round 2 may be revised and implementation process modified
- Round 2 courses: Continue data collection and evaluation activities

SP06:

- Round 2 courses: Reports submitted to CCI
- Round 3 courses: Departments of course for next review cycle notified

AU06:

- Round 3 courses: Departments sent reminder
- Round 3 courses: Explanatory meeting held with Departmental representatives for courses undergoing review
- Round 3 courses: Assessment initiated

WI07:

- Round 3 courses: Continue data collection and evaluation activities

SP07:

- Round 3 courses: Reports submitted to CCI
- Round 4 courses: Departments of courses for review notified.
- Implementation schedule reviewed to increase number of courses reviewed across the year

VI. **Pilot courses (Round 1)**

1. English 110
2. Psychology 100
3. Biology 101
4. History 151
5. History 152
6. Theatre 100
7. Spanish 102
8. Spanish 103
9. Spanish 104
10. Statistics 135

<u>GEC Category / College</u>	<i>Course</i>	[Enrollment AU03-04]
Writing / HUM	<i>English 110</i>	[5866] 273 sections
Social Sciences / SBS	<i>Psychology 100</i>	[5157] 101 sections
Diversity: Social Diversity In the United States / SBS	<i>Psychology 100</i> (double counts)	[5157] 101 sections
Natural Sciences / CBS	<i>Biology 101</i>	[3889] 8 sections
Art/History / HUM	<i>History 151</i> <i>History 152</i>	[3685] 34 sections [3181] 30 sections
Art/History / ARTS	<i>Theatre 100</i>	[2532] 16 sections
Quantitative / MAP	<i>Statistics 135</i>	[2202] 15 sections
Foreign Language / HUM	<i>Spanish 102</i> <i>Spanish 103</i> <i>Spanish 104</i>	[1306] 61 sections [1979] 90 sections [1689] 79 sections

Round 2 Courses

1. Economics 200
2. Chemistry 121
3. Chemistry 122
4. Mathematics 148
5. Mathematics 150
6. Sociology 101
7. Geography 200
8. Political Science 597
9. Art Education160
10. Comparative Studies 367.01-.04

<u>GEC Category / College</u>	<i>Course</i>	[Enrollment AU03-04]	
Social Sciences / SBS	<i>Economics 200</i>	[5299]	36 sections
Natural Sciences / MAP	<i>Chemistry 121</i>	[3309]	12 sections
	<i>Chemistry 122</i>	[1656]	8 sections
Quantitative / MAP	<i>Mathematics 148</i>	[2443]	23 sections
	<i>Mathematics 150</i>	[2649]	24 sections
Diversity: Social Diversity In the United States / SBS	<i>Sociology 101</i>	[3719]	33 sections
Diversity: International Issues / SBS	<i>Geography 200</i>	[1701]	25 sections
Capstone/SBS	<i>Political Science 597</i>	[1051]	24 sections
Art/History / ARTS	<i>Art Education160</i>	[1158]	7 sections
Writing / HUM	<i>Comparative Studies 367.01-.04</i>		

VII. Report Format

Departmental Course Report Requirements for General Education Assessment Plan

Please provide a brief 2-4 page report on the assessment of GEC learning outcomes in the course being reviewed. The requests for the initial sections of the report are only to verify that the information on file in the Curriculum Office about the course's appropriateness for GEC status is correct, unless changes have occurred since initial approval, and to submit a current syllabus which includes relevant GEC goals and objectives. The later sections of the report should include a very brief description of methods used to determine if GEC objectives are being met, a summary of the evidence, and a statement as to how that information is being used for ongoing curricular and instructional improvements. Appendices and additional information may be included, but the body of the report should be limited to four pages.

- I. **ABSTRACT:** Provide a 75-150 word summary of the report.
- II. **COURSE DESCRIPTION:** Verify the course description and statement as to how the course meets GEC goals and objectives for the category it was approved to meet. The ASC Curriculum Office will try to provide this information from the materials submitted when the course was approved for GEC status. If the information provided is no longer accurate, please indicate what has changed. If the Curriculum Office is unable to locate the initial approval documentation, please provide a new statement as to how the course meets relevant GEC goals and objectives.
- III. **GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:** State the GEC goals and objectives of the category for which the course is approved, along with any course specific expected learning outcomes that are being evaluated (these may be the same).
- IV. **METHODS:** Describe the methods, measures, student sample, and time line used to assess the learning outcomes. Examples of the methods employed might be a review of artifacts in portfolios, responses on surveys, scores on comprehensive or proficiency tests, or answers to questions on examinations directly linked to GEC goals and objectives. Depending on the size of the course, sampling of students might be appropriate. If so, describe the students, sections, instructors, evaluators, or other selection procedures that were used. Also include the time line for the assessment. For example, particular outcomes might have been assessed during different quarters or in different sections during the same quarter, and the multi-year plan for ongoing assessment might be included.
- V. **OUTCOME RESULTS:** Provide a summary of the outcome evidence obtained and a brief evaluation as to what the evidence suggests.
- VI. **FEEDBACK:** Indicate how the outcome information is shared and used, such as for ongoing curricular and instructional delivery improvements. This section is particularly important to ensure assessment information is used effectively.
- VII. **OTHER ACTIVITIES AND FUTURE PLANNING:** Describe any other ongoing or planned assessment activities.
- VIII. **SYLLABUS:** The syllabus must be attached and include statement of appropriate GEC goals and objectives.

Submit an electronic copy and one hard copy to: ASC Assessment Coordinator
105 Brown Hall
190 West 17th Avenue
CAMPUS

Copy report to College Dean

