

From: [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#)
To: [Husen, William](#)
Cc: [Steinmetz, Brad](#); [Haddad, Deborah](#)
Subject: Math 2010S
Date: Tuesday, October 6, 2020 4:41:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Dear Bill,

On Wednesday, September 23, the Arts and Humanities Panel 1 of the ASC Curriculum Committee reviewed a request to add GE Cultures and Ideas and GE Diversity-Social Diversity in the US to existing course Math 2010S (which already has GE Service-Learning).

The panel unanimously approved the request with a number of contingencies, which I here report:

- Syllabus: See syllabus template p. 13 of [ASC Curriculum and Assessment Operations Manual](#).
 - Include GE goals and Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) for all three GE categories, followed by brief statement that explains how the course will satisfy the stated GE ELOs.
 - Include weekly schedule of course meetings, including topics to be covered, readings, homework, and other assignments due dates etc
- One textbook is mentioned in syllabus: *Hidden Figures: The American Dream and the Untold Story of the Black Women Mathematicians Who Helped Win the Space Race*. However, the GE rationales mention a second book not included in syllabus: *Living Proof: Stories of Resilience Along the Mathematical Journey*. If it is indeed used, shouldn't it also appear in the syllabus?
- GE Assessment plan:
 - The assessment plan should be manageable. In the plans submitted, for each GE ELO, three or all four of the graded assignments for the course are listed as an assessment method. However, the point of the GE assessment plan is not to show that each GE ELO is covered (even loosely) in every single graded assignment in the course. Rather the point is to select one (maximum two) direct method(s) of assessment per GE ELO to collect accurate data about the fulfillment of each specific ELO. For the two assessment plans and appendices, please only retain the best direct assessment method (max 2 methods) for each ELO.
 - Related to the bullet point above: it is not clear how some methods are linked to the ELO they are said to fulfill. For example, the second direct assessment method for Cultures and Ideas ELO1 is to demonstrate competency with a slide ruler. It is not clear how this exercise shows that “students *analyze* and *interpret* major forms of human *thought, culture, and expression*.” Make sure that the method presented for assessing an ELO clearly relates to the wording of the ELO. If it does not, please remove that method from the plan.
 - Double-check the information in the appendices: For example
 - The explanation for the assessment method in the bullet point above refers the reader to Appendix C for a copy of the worksheet. However, Appendix C does not include that worksheet.
 - This is also the case for other methods of assessment for other ELOs. For example, first method for ELO1 of Cultures and Ideas: The reader is directed to Appendix C, but no relevant information is provided there.

- In Appendix A for the Cultures and Ideas plan, discussion prompts 1 and 6 that are said to cover ELO1 do not really seem to pertain to that ELO. That impression is then reinforced when upon looking at Appendix A for the Social Diversity in the US plan, the same two questions are also said to cover ELO1 for that GE category—more successfully in that instance.
- The concept of indirect assessment is misunderstood. Indirect measures are student surveys, self-evaluations, or focus groups about how they think the course fulfilled each individual GE ELO. Classroom discussions relating the hidden figures story to the students' experiences with STEM communities do not achieve that.

Your department/the faculty teaching the course might find it useful to look at an assessment plan for Philosophy 2458. It is on pp. 14-15 of the pdf here:

https://ascnet.osu.edu/storage/request_documents/4355/Philos%202458%20New%20Course.pdf

It is very simple & fully implementable.

In a minute, I will return the course request via curriculum.osu.edu to enable the department to address the feedback of the panel.

Should you have any questions about the feedback of the panel, please do not hesitate to contact Brad Steinmetz (faculty chair of the A&H1 Panel; cc'd here), or me.

Best,
Bernadette



Bernadette Vankeerbergen, Ph.D.

Program Director, Curriculum and Assessment

College of Arts and Sciences

154D Denney Hall, 164 Annie & John Glenn Ave.

Columbus, OH 43210

Phone: 614-688-5679 / Fax: 614-292-6303

<http://ascas.osu.edu>