

From: [Neff, Jennifer](#)
To: [Quinzon-Bonello, Rosario](#); [Kreml, Roland](#)
Cc: [Daly, Meg](#); [Lower, Brian](#); [Vaessin, Harald](#); [Vankeerbergen, Bernadette](#); [Steele, Rachel](#); [Hilty, Michael](#)
Subject: Cyber Security 2111
Date: Monday, May 19, 2025 11:44:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon,

On Monday, May 12th, the Themes 1 Subcommittee of the ASC Curriculum Committee and the Theme Advisory Group for Traditions, Cultures, and Transformations reviewed GEN Theme: TCT with Service-Learning HIP request for Cyber Security 2111.

The reviewing faculty voted not to approve the High-Impact Practice designation. Please see below for next steps and options for moving forward:

- At this time, the service-learning element of the course does not meet the expectations of the service-learning High-Impact Practice. The service component appears to consist of a one-time presentation to members of the demographic at a student's location. For the activity to qualify as service-learning, it must involve sustained engagement that is driven by the community's needs. Should the unit continue to seek approval as a High-Impact Practice course, the syllabus and supporting documents should provide more information about the nature of the community partners, how the demographic is defined, and how student engagement is consistent and informed by community input. Additionally, if students are expected to conduct a focus group as part of their presentation, it should be clearly indicated how they will be taught to ethically conduct this type of research.
- As described, the HIP activity may align more appropriately with the Research and Creative Inquiry High-Impact Practice, unless the course is revised to include deeper community partnership. However, the reviewing faculty encourage the unit to focus on resubmission as a 3-credit hour course in the Lived Environments Theme. HIP approval could follow after the course demonstrates strong alignment with the Theme.
- Please note, should the unit continue to seek the service-learning HIP, "S" should be added as a suffix to the course number ("2111S") in curriculum.osu.edu and on the syllabus, as this is the designation for service-learning courses.

As mentioned above, the reviewing faculty encourage the unit to focus on resubmission as a 3-credit hour course in the Lived Environments Theme by addressing the following feedback in a revision:

- The reviewing faculty request that the Lived Environments Goals and ELOs be stated in the syllabus along with a brief explanatory paragraph summarizing how the course meets the Goals and ELOs. The Lived Environments Goals and ELOs can be found in an easy to copy/paste format on the [Arts and Sciences Curriculum and Assessment](#)

[Services website.](#)

- The reviewing faculty are concerned that the course, in its current form, does not sufficiently meet the expectations of the Theme. More explicit connections are needed between course content and the Theme specific Goals and ELOs (3.1-4.3). The syllabus and supporting documents are vague and do not clearly indicate how students will engage with the complexity, uncertainty, and historical change that are central to the Theme. To strengthen alignment, the reviewing faculty request that the syllabus and GE submission form be revised to do the following:
- More clearly articulate how the course moves beyond foundation learning and fosters depth in analyzing both digital and real-world environmental change over time and across spatial contexts.
- Foster critical engagement with the logic and assumptions underpinning key course concepts (e.g., how different groups perceive and respond to online threats) in order to incorporate a more nuanced, evidence-based approach.
- Explicitly outline how students will examine the social, cultural, and political factors shaping digital behavior and perception.
- Clarify how students will engage with underlying frameworks (e.g., surveillance, power, and access, that structure digital discourse) of the Theme.
- The reviewing faculty request that the assignment descriptions in the syllabus have clearer alignment with the ELOs to ensure students are not only engaging with Theme concepts but are applying them in rich ways.
- To help demonstrate how the course builds toward achieving the Theme ELOs, the reviewing faculty request that the course calendar in the syllabus be revised to indicate how each class session will engage with Theme content.
- The reviewing faculty note that the assigned readings in the course schedule consist of introductory-level materials and lack the depth expected at the advanced Themes level. They request that the course include more rigorous, peer-reviewed scholarly sources (e.g., journal articles) that are not necessarily more technical, but rather offer an in-depth exploration of the Theme.
- The reviewing faculty request that the syllabus include descriptions that clearly explain the expectations of each assignment. They also request that both the syllabus and GE submission form make it clear how the assignments (especially the presentation) support engagement with the Theme. Currently, the assignments seem to have a relatively narrow and technical focus, with limited connection to the broader social and environmental contexts of the Theme.
- The reviewing faculty request that the scaffolding of the assignments in the course be strengthened. For example, the three reflection papers are a valuable component, but they currently account for 10% of the final grade each and may not allow for deep engagement. The reviewing faculty suggest that instead, one of these reflections

(perhaps the one focused on “how the demographic feels targeted”) be expanded into a more substantive research-based assignment that incorporates peer-reviewed sources. Additional low-stakes assignments leading up to the major papers could help students develop the skills needed for successful completion of the bigger assignment.

- The reviewing faculty request that the reference to the Embedded Literacies be removed from the syllabus, as this is often confusing to students. [Syllabus p. 1]
- The reviewing faculty note that the language for the Title IX statement appears in the syllabus twice, once under the heading “Title IX” and once under the heading “Sexual Misconduct.” The reviewing faculty recommend removing the latter from the syllabus. [Syllabus p. 5]
- The reviewing faculty recommend that the unit use the most recent version of the university’s diversity statement if they wish to keep it in the syllabus. The updated statement can be found in an easy to copy/paste format on the [Office of Undergraduate Education website](#). [Syllabus pp. 5-6]
- The reviewing faculty recommend that the unit update the links in the Title IX and religious accommodations statements due to the recent renaming of the Office of Institutional Equity to the [Office of Civil Rights Compliance](#). The full statements with the updated links can be found in an easy to copy/paste format on the [Office of Undergraduate Education website](#). [Syllabus pp. 5-6]
- The reviewing faculty recommend that the unit use the most recent version of the Student Life Disability Services statement, which can be found in an easy to copy/paste format on the [Office of Undergraduate Education website](#). [Syllabus pp. 6-7]
- The reviewing faculty request that a cover letter be provided that details all changes made as a result of their feedback.
- The reviewing faculty encourage the unit to reach out to Brian Lower.³⁰ (faculty Chair of the Theme Advisory Group for Lived Environments) and Meg Daly.⁶⁶ (Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education) to schedule a meeting to discuss how to best address the above feedback.

I will return the course to the unit queue via curriculum.osu.edu in order to address this feedback.

Should you have any questions about the feedback of the reviewing faculty, please feel free to contact Harald Vaessin (faculty Chair of the Themes 1 Subcommittee), Brian Lower (faculty Chair of the Theme Advisory Group: Lived Environments), Meg Daly (Associate Dean of Undergraduate Education), or me.

Best,
Jennifer



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Jennifer Neff

Curriculum and Assessment Assistant

The Ohio State University

College of Arts and Sciences

ASC Curriculum and Assessment Services

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

614-292-3901 / ascas.osu.edu

Pronouns: she/her/hers