

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
To: [Brintlinger, Angela](#)
Cc: [Aski, Janice](#); [Hogle, Danielle N.](#)
Subject: RE: Russian 3530
Date: Tuesday, November 25, 2014 5:02:00 PM
Attachments: [Comparative Studies CS S1.docx](#)
[German 2250_GE_Rationale_Oct 29 2014.pdf](#)

Dear Angela,

I have submitted the revision for Russian 3530 to Janice Aski. Janice is approving the course as it is a fantastic course (so we will advance the course to OAA). However, she asks me to provide additional guidance about the GE assessment plan because the one submitted is not likely to lead to the type of GE assessment report that the Assessment Panel will want.

The main thing is to bear in mind that when the course is taught GE data needs to be provided separately for each GE expected learning outcome (ELO). (See Appendix 7 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual [p. 88] http://asccas.osu.edu/files/ASC_CurrAssess_Operations_Manual.pdf.) Indeed, OAA asks that each ELO be assessed individually. Russian 3530 as a whole (including its assignments) clearly pertains to the realm of “culture” and the realm of “ideas,” but the question to ask is whether the direct and indirect measures used for GE assessment of the ELOs indeed directly or indirectly speak to the individual ELOs?

Based on that, here are some points that I hope will be helpful:

- The two midterm and final exam questions provided do indeed pertain to cultural phenomena, but how do they pertain to each ELO? Does example #1 tie to ELO#1 and example #2 tie to ELO#2? Or do both of them exemplify how ELO#1 will be assessed? In that case, how will ELO#2 be assessed? In some of the wording used in the paragraph (e.g., “more than 75% of students are not mastering basic knowledge at midterm”), the reader is under the impression that what is being assessed here is acquisition of knowledge by the students rather than the success of the course at fulfilling the ELOs of the GE Cultures and Ideas category.
- This impression is reinforced when the reader gets to the indirect measures. The document states that opinion surveys and self-evaluations will be used:
 - “about 5 weeks into the class we will do an “opinion survey” to determine how well students are understanding and progressing toward the course objectives
 - near the end of the term, students will evaluate the “gap” in their skill sets on a self-evaluation: reading skills, analytical skills, research skills, ethnographic skills, writing skills”

These indirect assessment tools seem to address the goals of this particular course

rather than the ELOs of the GE category. A simple indirect way to assess that the course is successful at achieving the 2 GE ELOs would be to ask in a survey something along the following lines:

- In this course, I have been given the opportunity to analyze and interpret major forms of human thought, culture, and expression. Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree.
 - In this course, I have evaluated how ideas influence the character of human beliefs, the perception of reality, and the norms which guide human behavior. Strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree.
- The section on level of student achievement expected also pertains to assessing the students' acquisition of knowledge and skills related to the goals of the course.

I am attaching an excerpt of a recent good GE Cultures and Ideas assessment *report* produced by the Department of Comparative Studies for three of their courses. I am also attaching a good GE assessment plan for a new German course. That particular course is asking for GE Literature (so different from your particular course) but it may prove useful anyway. Hopefully, both documents will give you additional guidance on how GE assessment is different from assessment of student learning. Please also know that Janice, Steve Fink, or I are more than happy to meet with you if you would like—as this is often easier than explaining concepts via e-mail.

The Assessment Panel asks that GE assessment be implemented each time the course is offered and GE data gathered. After the second offering of the course, the Department will be asked to submit an initial report summarizing GE assessment results of those first two offerings (following the format of sections I and II of the Assessment Report Requirement in Appendix 7 of the ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual [p. 88]; see link above).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
Bernadette

Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.
Program Manager, Curriculum and Assessment
Arts and Sciences
The Ohio State University
154D Denney Hall
164 W 17th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
Fax: 614-292-6303
<http://asccas.osu.edu>

From: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 3:27 PM
To: Brintlinger, Angela; Peterson, Derek
Cc: Aski, Janice; Heysel, Garrett
Subject: Russian 3530

Hello Angela and Derek,

On September 26, the Arts and Humanities Panel reviewed a new course request for Russian 3530 (with GE Cultures and Ideas).

The course was unanimously approved with one contingency, namely that the GE Assessment Plan specifically link each of the 2 GE expected learning outcomes for Cultures and Ideas with the proposed direct and indirect measures. What about the examples provided make them specific to ELO#1 and ELO#2? The link with the provided indirect measures, in particular, is not clear.

I am attaching a sample assessment plan for GE Cultures and Ideas. Appendix A, B, and C (not here provided) would detail specific examples for the course.

If you have any questions about this feedback, please feel free to contact Janice Aski (Chair of the A&H Panel; cc'd on this e-mail), or me.

I will return the course via curriculum.osu.edu to enable the Department to address the contingency.

My best,
Bernadette

Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.
Program Manager, Curriculum and Assessment
Arts and Sciences
The Ohio State University
154D Denney Hall
164 W 17th Ave.
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 614-688-5679
Fax: 614-292-6303
<http://ascas.osu.edu>