

**From:** [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)  
**To:** ["fredal.1@osu.edu"](#); ["daniels.7@osu.edu"](#); ["lyvers-peffer.1@osu.edu"](#); ["gupta.229@osu.edu"](#); [Bitters, Todd](#); [Breitenberger, Caroline](#); [Haddad, Deborah](#); ["Mumy.1@osu.edu"](#); [Cohen, Jeffrey](#); ["zerby.8@osu.edu"](#)  
**Cc:** [Eakins, Barbara](#); [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)  
**Subject:** English 367 e-vote results  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 04, 2010 4:56:45 PM

---

Dear Sciences Subcommittee members:

All 7 voting members of the subcommittee cast their votes on the revisions for English 367. Most everyone approved the revisions to the assessment plan (there was one abstention). As for the 367.03-04 revisions, there were 3 votes in favor of the revisions, and 4 votes opposed to those revisions. In other words, the **revisions to 367.03-04 are sent back by a narrow margin**.

Though my instructions asked everybody to \*reply to all\*, I noticed that some members replied only to me. For the sake of transparency, I am here copying everybody's answer:

1. HI Bernadette, I vote to approve all of them.
2. I am casting a vote to approve the revisions.
3. I vote to approve 367 revisions.
4. I am still opposed to giving social diversity status to Eng 367.03 (regular and H) and 367.04 (regular and H). My first objection is a generic one having to do with generic course categories and then expecting all of the particular topics that can be offered to deliver the diversity component. My second objection is that the particular topics offered in the current versions of the syllabi do not obviously deliver the diversity content, meaning I think the committee's assessment at the last consideration still stands. I would be happy to give a detailed characterization of the lack of content in a face to face meeting. This takes care of my second objection so now back to the first.

We clearly thought that the previous syllabi did not, eith the topics at hand, deliver the diversity content. I take it the proposer think the current toopics do a better job of that. I do not see that the change of documentary films on the Film Experience syllabus actually does anything; the change of topic in the .04 syll may be marginally better but beauty/non-beauty is not a relevant category of diversity (see learning outcome description below), nor is ability; and it is doubtful that the Gender in the title is delivered in a way that enhances an understanding of social diversity. But that is beside the point. We have several instances here of topics in the generic courses not delivering diversity.

For example look at he 367.01 syllabus. If I could, I would withdraw its Social Diversity status because, as we all agreed, the course with the topic of "Bullshit" completely failed to deliver diversity. Henceforth I will never be in favor of courses with great latitude for topics being in the diversity category.

I'm OK with the assessment plan and suggest the diversity part be applied to "Bullshit" and see how it turns out.

Bottom Line:

367.03 Regular and H NO

367.04 Regular and H NO

Assessment Yes

I urge the rest of you to vote NO on the particular courses in question.

5. I vote No on the issue of Social Diversity.
6. I'm still struggling with the concept of a course with "Bullshit in America" as part of its title. Shouldn't one of the outcomes of a writing class be to be able to express oneself without resorting to offensive language? Oh well, moving on...

Assessment plan

I vote to approve, but with the following general comments:

1. In the student survey, the students will be asked about examining topics "through a diverse range of cultures, identities and viewpoints." I am willing to accept this wording as a proxy for the GEC language, "the roles of such categories as race, gender, class, ethnicity, and religion in the institutions and cultures of the United States," and "the role of social diversity in shaping their own attitudes and values." But it would be interesting to determine whether the students themselves can explain the connection between the survey language and the GEC wording.
2. The "direct measure" requires the instructor to evaluate a particular writing assignment using a questionnaire (also described in the assessment document as a rubric) on a Likert scale of 1-5 (weak to strong). My concern is that I would much prefer a real rubric, one that includes descriptors of specific characteristics that the instructor can identify in that student's work. There is likely to be much instructor variability in what "Strong" means with respect to "The paper considers and responds to categories of social diversity and the role of diversity in the development of its argument and in primary and secondary sources." It will take a lot of work to convert the questionnaire into a real rubric, but the information collected by instructors would be so much richer!

English 367.03 and 367.03H

I vote against approval. I see no evidence that the course meets the Social Diversity goals or learning outcomes. The "Digital Documentary," found only in the non-Honors version of the course, is the only assignment in which diversity is mentioned, and there it is more self-analytical rather than being directed toward a broader analysis of institutions of the United States.

English 367.04 and 367.04H

I vote against approval. I see no evidence that the course meets the Social Diversity goals or learning outcomes. There is no mention of diversity in the 367.or syllabus, and only a brief mention in 367.04H.

7. I'm voting NO on the first two, and I'll abstain from the assessment.

Please let me know if you have any question.

All the best,

**Bernadette**

Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

Curriculum Coordinator

The Ohio State University

College of the Arts and Sciences

Curriculum and Assessment Office

4132 Smith Laboratory

174 W 18th Ave

Columbus, OH 43210

Phone: 614-688-5679

Fax: 614-688-5678

<http://asccas.osu.edu>