

2013 Assessment Plan for General Education (GE)
College of Arts and Sciences

General Education Assessment Plan

I. Background and Recent Activities.....	2
II. Operating Principles.....	4
III. Key Approaches and Rationale.....	4
IV. Goals and Objectives.....	5
V. Methods.....	11
VI. Timeline.....	12
VII. Feedback Process and Information Usage.....	13

Appendices

1. 2013-2018 Implementation Schedule.....	14
2. Assessment Report Requirements.....	17
3. Category-Level Rubrics.....	18

2013 Assessment Plan for General Education College of Arts and Sciences

General Education Assessment Plan

I. Background and Recent Activities

2004-2010

Every student participates in a General Education (GE) program as part of his/her undergraduate education. The Ohio State University (OSU) adopted a General Education Curriculum (GEC) distribution model in the early 1990's in which students were required to take course work in select categories. The model was initially articulated by the College of Arts and Sciences (ASC) which has oversight for courses approved for GE status, and adapted for use in each of the university's other colleges with some college-specific modifications. Specific expected learning outcomes (ELOs) were associated with each category. A GEC assessment plan, based primarily on course-level assessments in large enrollment courses in each category, was adopted in 2005 and scheduled to be reviewed in 2010. The plan was carried-out for five years during which more than 50 large-enrolled-in courses, with Columbus and regional campus contributions, provided outcomes based assessment reports. An ASC Assessment Panel reviewed reports and provided feedback for any needed actions. Findings from these reports, along with other assessments, were shared with the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee (ASCC) and University-level Advisory Committee on General Education (ULAC-GE).

2009-2012

The GE program was revised during the institution's transition from a quarter- to semester-based academic calendar in 2009-2011, informed by prior assessments and data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and first delivered in summer 2012. The semester-based GE maintains the prior category distribution approach but provides new topical areas and options as well as greater flexibility in how students can complete their requirements. The current categories and topics are: Writing and Communication: Level One and Level Two; Foreign Language; Literature; Visual and Performing Arts; Cultures and Ideas; Historical Study; Quantitative Reasoning: Basic Computation and Mathematical or Logical Analysis, and Data Analysis; Natural Science: Biological Science and Physical Science; Social Science: Individual and Groups, Organizations and Politics, and Human, Natural and Economic Resources; Diversity: Social Diversity in the US and Global Studies, and new options for Cross-Disciplinary Seminar, Service-Learning, and Education Abroad course work.

In anticipation of delivery of the new model, the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA), in collaboration with the College of Arts and Sciences (ASC) and endorsed by the both the ASCC and ULAC-GE, submitted a proposal to the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) to attend their national 2011 Institute on General Education and Assessment (IGEIA). A six-member campus team, including faculty representatives from the ASCC Assessment Panel, ULAC-GE, and the Council on Academic Affairs (CAA), attended the Institute with several aims in mind. Among them were to: (1) consider alignment of curricular goals with category-level ELOs of the new delivery model, (2) determine options for an overarching assessment plan for the revised GE program, and (3)

consider particular methods and evaluation designs for new experiential learning options in Education Abroad and Service Learning.

Much conversation at the IGEA focused on AAC&U's recent undertaking to create scoring guides or rubrics to assist faculty in assessing the kinds of learning expected of college graduates, such as communication, critical thinking, and analytical reasoning.. Faculty panels nation-wide had created a set of agreed upon scoring guides, referred to as Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE) rubrics (aacu.org), that utilized a 0-4 point scale and seemed especially useful in evaluating GE-type learning goals. The team discovered increasing numbers of institutions were implementing rubric-based assessment methods and adapting the VALUE scoring guides for their own uses. The team also determined that the application of a common rubric for OSU's category-level ELOs could be especially useful in assessing them across different courses.

Based on IGEA work, the team shared the following recommendations:

- Continue the 2005 Assessment Plan for GE overall with some modifications. Assessment efforts should continue to be focused, although not exclusively, on the courses most students take to complete their GE requirements (i.e., large-enrollment courses).
- Focus assessment on category-level ELOs which should be aligned with broader curricular goals and thus used to assess them in turn.
- Use common rubric-based means to assess ELOs for all courses in the new Education Abroad and Service Learning options. Courses approved for GE status in these new options should include appropriate assignments which could be used to assess GE ELOs, and a common faculty-developed rubric for each option should be applied to all such assignments.
- Based on the experiences of using a common assessment measure in the new options categories, roll-out a similar approach to other categories so evaluation of category-level ELOs is simplified and consistent.
- Modify the long-term staging of annual assessments such that 2-3 categories can be reviewed each year in depth rather than having every category represented every year with a limited number of courses

During the 2011-2012 academic year, the ASCC faculty Assessment Panel revised category/topic-specific ELOs to align with curricular goals of the new semester-based delivery system, adopted the OSU Institute's team recommendations for the new Education Abroad and Service Learning topical areas, and shared work and planning with the ASCC.

2012-2013

During the 2012-2013 academic year, the ASCC faculty Assessment Panel created scoring rubrics for Education Abroad and Service Learning GE ELOs in consultation with the Office of International Affairs and Service Learning Initiative respectively, and worked with the Education Abroad GE instructors to pilot the new scoring tool.

The panel also reviewed the 2004-2005 Assessment Plan and considered additional recommendations from the AAC&U IGEA team. The result is an updated 2013 *Assessment Plan for GE* to be implemented in 2014. The revised plan:

- Maintains the principles and assumptions of the previous plan, including an emphasis on outcomes-based course reports as the primary method to collect evidence.
- Incorporates potential departmental-level reporting to achieve greater reporting efficiencies for departments which offer large numbers of GE courses in specific areas, and also on regional campuses.
- Incorporates a common scoring rubric to assess category-level ELOs and to help determine modifications for the category as a whole.

II. Operating Principles

Goals and objectives of the GE 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 informed by faculty as appropriate. Departments which offer GE courses have the responsibility for ensuring ongoing assessment based on learning outcomes, and for providing regular reports to the faculty oversight committee. The ASCC has the responsibility for determining the GE assessment plan, implementing the assessment plan, and providing summary information to appropriate faculty committees including ULAC-GE. Further, the ASCC, with advisement from ULAC-GE, has the responsibility of articulating and refining GE goals and objectives for assessment and determining evaluation criteria. The ASCC Assessment Panel, a subcommittee of the ASCC, operates on behalf of the full ASCC for these purposes and provides its recommendations and findings to the ASCC as a whole.

The previous operating principles and long term recommendations for the updated plan include the following:

- The plan should be viewed as dynamic.
- Assessment should continue to be implemented in a manner that is manageable so that assessment becomes a routine practice.
- The ASCC should be kept current about assessment practices nationally and locally.
- The ASCC should be kept informed of other local outcome information that would be useful in evaluation of the effectiveness of the GE.
- Instructors should be kept informed of expectations for assessing student learning with respect to GE goals and objectives as faculty and graduate instructors change over time. Faculty development opportunities, such as rubric development and use, should be offered.
- 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.

III. Key Approaches and Rationale

- Course-level GE reporting implemented with the 2004-2005 Assessment Plan should continue in the near term. The course approach was initially emphasized 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. Also, departments and course instructors in the quarter-based curricula were using an appropriate mix of direct and indirect measures, including some limited usage of rubrics.

- Departmental GE assessment reports should be implemented in departments which offer a large number of GE courses in a category and/or also on regional campuses. Incorporating departmental GE reporting provides an additional opportunity to assess a GE category across several courses at a time, potentially increasing efficiencies in the data collection and reporting process. Furthermore, if a department offers courses at beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels, the department can help assess achievement of learning across levels. Throughout this process of departmental-level reporting, it is suggested that departments work with the ASCC Assessment Panel to develop scoring rubrics for the category(s) that are most prevalent in their department.
- Use of category-level rubrics, all having a 0-4 scale, should be advanced. As described earlier, a common category rubric provides a means to evaluate ELOs more readily across courses, while a common scale potentially allows comparisons across categories of certain skills such as critical thinking and written communication).
- New GE courses proposed January 2014 and after will be expected to submit a GE assessment report after the second offering of the course. This approach is to ensure that all GE courses implement assessment plans and view assessment as an ongoing process.
- Additional sources of information which are available and relevant, and promising assessment approaches that emerge, should be incorporated into the committee's ongoing assessment of student learning. Previously committees have reviewed information relevant to the GE program from various college and institutional sources, including an ASC student exit survey, faculty focus groups, NSSE, and the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), to help evaluate student learning and inform the curriculum. Information on student learning from these and other sources should continue to be considered part of the overarching plan to assess GE.

Overall, the outlined strategy of collecting data using multiple approaches at the course and category level will allow for a better understanding of the effectiveness of the GE categories and their expected learning outcomes. In addition, these approaches will demonstrate how well individual courses are accomplishing these expected learning outcomes, which will enable necessary changes to be made to the program as well as to the courses that are approved for GE status. The combined course-and departmental-level approach, while still permitting course-level modifications to improve student learning, will also facilitate ongoing evaluation of the general education structure as a whole.

IV. Goals and Objectives

Writing and Communication

Goals:

Students are skilled in written communication and expression, reading, critical thinking, oral expression and visual expression.

Level One (1110)

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students communicate using the conventions of academic discourse.
2. Students can read critically and analytically.

Level Two (2367)

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Through critical analysis, discussion, and writing, students demonstrate the ability to read carefully and express ideas effectively.
2. Students apply written, oral, and visual communication skills and conventions of academic discourse to the challenges of a specific discipline.
3. Students access and use information critically and analytically.

Foreign Language

Goals:

Students demonstrate skills in communication across ethnic, cultural, ideological, and national boundaries, and appreciate other cultures and patterns of thought.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students employ communicative skills (e.g. speaking, listening, reading, and/or writing) in a language other than their native language.
2. Students describe and analyze the cultural contexts and manifestations of the peoples who speak the language that they are studying.
3. Students compare and contrast the cultures and communities of the language that they are studying with their own.

Literature

Goals:

Students evaluate significant texts in order to develop capacities for aesthetic and historical response and judgment; interpretation and evaluation; and critical listening, reading, seeing, thinking, and writing.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students analyze, interpret, and critique significant literary works.
2. Through reading, discussing, and writing about literature, students appraise and evaluate the personal and social values of their own and other cultures.

Visual and Performing Arts

Goals:

Students evaluate significant works of art in order to 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.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students analyze, appreciate, and interpret significant works of art.
2. Students engage in informed observation and/or active participation in a discipline within the visual, spatial, and performing arts.

Cultures and Ideas

Goals:

Students evaluate significant cultural phenomena and ideas in order to develop capacities for aesthetic and historical response and judgment; and interpretation and evaluation.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students analyze and interpret major forms of human thought, culture, and expression.
2. Students evaluate how ideas influence the character of human beliefs, the perception of reality, and the norms which guide human behavior.

Historical Study

Goals:

Students recognize how past events are studied and how they influence today's society and the human condition.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students construct an integrated perspective on history and the factors that shape human activity.
2. Students describe and analyze the origins and nature of contemporary issues.
3. Students speak and write critically about primary and secondary historical sources by examining diverse interpretations of past events and ideas in their historical contexts.

Quantitative Reasoning

Goals:

Students develop skills in quantitative literacy and logical reasoning, including the ability to identify valid arguments, and use mathematical models.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

Basic Computation

Students demonstrate computational skills and familiarity with algebra and geometry, and apply these skills to practical problems.

Mathematical or Logical Analysis

Students comprehend mathematical concepts and methods adequate to construct valid arguments, understand inductive and deductive reasoning, and increase their general problem solving skills.

Data Analysis

Goals:

Students develop skills in drawing conclusions and critically evaluating results based on data.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

Students understand basic concepts of statistics and probability, comprehend methods needed to analyze and critically evaluate statistical arguments, and recognize the importance of statistical ideas.

Natural Science

Goals:

Students understand the principles, theories, and methods of modern science, the relationship between science and technology, the implications of scientific discoveries and the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world.

Biological Science

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science.
2. Students understand key events in the development of science and recognize that science is an evolving body of knowledge.
3. Students describe the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments.

4. Students recognize social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world.

Physical Science

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the basic facts, principles, theories and methods of modern science.
2. Students understand key events in the development of science and recognize that science is an evolving body of knowledge.
3. Students describe the inter-dependence of scientific and technological developments.
4. Students recognize social and philosophical implications of scientific discoveries and understand the potential of science and technology to address problems of the contemporary world.

Social Science

Goals:

Students understand the systematic study of human behavior and cognition; the structure of human societies, cultures, and institutions; and the processes by which individuals, groups, and societies interact, communicate, and use human, natural, and economic resources.

Individuals and Groups

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they apply to the study of individuals and groups.
2. Students understand the behavior of individuals, differences and similarities in social and cultural contexts of human existence, and the processes by which groups function.
3. Students comprehend and assess individual and group values and their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

Organizations and Politics

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they apply to the study of organizations and politics.
2. Students understand the formation and durability of political, economic, and social organizing principles and their differences and similarities across contexts.
3. Students comprehend and assess the nature and values of organizations and politics and their importance in social problem solving and policy making.

Human, Natural, and Economic Resources

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the theories and methods of social scientific inquiry as they apply to the study of the use and distribution of human, natural, and economic resources and decisions and policies concerning such resources.

2. Students understand the political, economic, and social trade-offs reflected in individual decisions and societal policymaking and enforcement and their similarities and differences across contexts.
3. Students comprehend and assess the physical, social, economic, and political sustainability of individual and societal decisions with respect to resource use.

Diversity

Goals: Students understand the pluralistic nature of institutions, society, and culture in the United States and across the world in order to become educated, productive, and principled citizens.

Social Diversity in the United States

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students describe and evaluate the roles of such categories as race, gender and sexuality, disability, class, ethnicity, and religion in the pluralistic institutions and cultures of the United States.
2. Students recognize the role of social diversity in shaping their own attitudes and values regarding appreciation, tolerance, and equality of others.

Global Studies

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand some of the political, economic, cultural, physical, social, and philosophical aspects of one or more of the world's nations, peoples and cultures outside the U.S.
2. Students recognize the role of national and international diversity in shaping their own attitudes and values as global citizens.

Cross-Disciplinary Seminar

Goals:

Students demonstrate an understanding of a topic of interest through scholarly activities that draw upon multiple disciplines and through their interactions with students from different majors.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students understand the benefits and limitations of different disciplinary perspectives.
2. Students understand the benefits of synthesizing multiple disciplinary perspectives.
3. Students synthesize and apply knowledge from diverse disciplines to a topic of interest.

Service-Learning

Goals:

Students gain and apply academic knowledge through civic engagement with communities.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students make connections between concepts and skills learned in an academic setting and community-based work.
2. Students demonstrate an understanding of the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.
3. Students evaluate the impacts of the service learning activity.

Education Abroad

Goals:

By living and studying outside the U.S, students acquire and develop a breadth of knowledge, skills, and perspectives across national boundaries that will help them become more globally aware.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. Students recognize and describe similarities, differences, and interconnections between their host country/countries and the U.S.
2. Students function effectively within their host country/countries.
3. Students articulate how their time abroad has enriched their academic experience.

V. Procedures, Means and Methods

The following procedures will be used to implement the GE Assessment Plan. Use of rubrics will be encouraged as the primary means of assessment, although additional methods may be used.

- GE Assessment reporting should be consistent across all OSU campus locations and include all modes of delivery. Reporting should be representative of all students.
- The schedule for reporting should begin spring semester 2014. The intention is to review all GE categories over a five-year period, requesting a mix of course reports and departmental reports each term.
- Departments offering courses currently approved as fulfilling a GE category requirement should be able to provide student learning outcome evidence to demonstrate course effectiveness in meeting the goals and objectives of its GE category to maintain GE status.
- The ASCC Assessment Panel is responsible for developing reporting schedules and requirements. Priorities for scheduling include: categories and/or courses for which assessment is well-established to model assessment; 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.

- New GE courses proposed January 2014 and after will be expected to submit a GE assessment report after the second offering of the course. This approach is to ensure that all GE courses implement assessment plans and view assessment as an ongoing process.
- The specific criteria for meeting goals will be established by the ASCC.
- Departments will be notified of the request for a course or departmental report at least two semesters, including summer, before reports are 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 syllabi containing category appropriate GE goals; the expectations for outcome evidence that is representative of all students across all OSU campus locations and modes of delivery; and will be accompanied by examples when possible. The request letter will be copied to the Dean of the College or Division in which the course(s) is offered.
- Department Chairs may assign a faculty representative or course coordinator to generate the requested report. Departments will submit the report for their GE courses directly to the ASCC Assessment Panel by the requested deadline, copied to the Dean.
- Departments need to demonstrate in the report:
 - how the course(s) meets GE goals, with direct and indirect evidence of learning outcomes, and
 - how the assessment information is shared and used for improvement.
- Departments will also 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.
- Departments will determine the appropriate assessment methods for their discipline, but will be encouraged to incorporate the standard rubrics in courses with the same categories.
- Departments are advised to maintain outcome data or assessment samples in accordance with any current University or Departmental standards.

VI. Five-Year Time Line

Over the next five years, GE assessment activities are expected to include the following three components:

- a) course and/or departmental reviews by GE category;
- b) development of an assessment rubric for each GE category;
- c) overall review of the GE program.

Details of these three components are presented below.

Over the next five years, the Assessment Panel plans to review courses and/or to request departmental reports for at least 4 GE categories each year, so that course-embedded evidence will be gathered for all GE categories within the next 4 years. Faculty from the units that are asked to provide course-level or departmental-level reports for a particular GE category also will be convened to develop a GE assessment rubric for that category. If possible, this rubric-development step will take place before the course-level or department-level reports are requested for that category, so that all assessment results for that GE category can be reported using the GE assessment rubric. If prior development of the rubric is not possible, the faculty representatives from these units will be convened for rubric development at the same time the course-level or department-level reports are being prepared; the resulting rubrics will be used for future assessment in that GE category.

On the same timeline as the development of the GE assessment rubrics and the generation of course-level and department-level reports, focus groups of faculty who teach within each GE category may be convened to gather faculty opinion about student learning in that category, and to help make recommendations for improving GE learning outcomes in that category. During the fifth year, the program as a whole will be reviewed to determine if structural changes are warranted. Appendix 1 contains a more detailed implementation plan by year.

Each year, additional GE assessment data will be extracted from student opinion information gathered by the University-wide exit survey, with a particular focus on the GE categories under review that year. Evidence from any other university-wide sources, such as NSSE and CLA findings, will also be used as available in the annual review of student learning and to help inform improvement efforts.

VIII. Feedback process and information usage

On behalf of ASCC, the Assessment Panel will review submitted reports and recommend actions on a case by case basis. The Panel will provide feedback to Department Chairs, copied to the Deans, and make recommendations for continuing GE status as appropriate. Courses not adequately addressing GE goals and objectives would be provided time for corrective action. The ASC Dean and OAA will be consulted regarding Departments that do not participate.

Department Chairs are expected to share feedback with Departmental faculty, instructors, and/or curricular committees as appropriate.

The Assessment Panel will provide updates to ASCC regularly, and a full report annually to both the ASCC and ULAC-GE.

The overall plan will be reviewed every 5 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.

Appendix 1
2013-2018 Implementation Plan
Preliminary Schedule for GE Evaluation

2012-2013

- Review course set 6 reports
- Initiate rubric-based assessment for Education Abroad & Service-Learning categories
- Establish timeline for reporting for the next five years
- Recruit departments for department-level GE assessment projects

2013-2014

Autumn 2013

- Request first course set reports under semesters (S1) – due June 1, 2014
- Review Education Abroad assessment reports
- Review use of rubrics for Education Abroad and Service-Learning courses
- Work with the department of History to develop guidelines and expectations for departmental reports which involves development of appropriate GE assessment scoring rubric.

Spring 2014

- Request second departmental reports
 - Department of English (Writing & Communication Level 1)
 - Department of Spanish and Portuguese (Foreign Language)
- Review graduating student and other survey data
- Review course data and student enrollment patterns
- Work with the Spanish & Portuguese department to develop guidelines and expectations for departmental reports which involves development of appropriate GE assessment scoring rubric.

2014-2015

Autumn 2014

- Request course set S2 reports
- Review History departmental report
- Request third set of departmental reports
 - Department of Economics (Social Science, Writing & Communication Level 2)
 - Department of Psychology (Social Science, Writing & Communication Level 2, Diversity in the US)
 - Center for Life Sciences Education (Natural Science – Biological Science)
 - Department of Mathematics (Quantitative Reasoning)
- Develop assessment rubric and guidelines for Cross-Disciplinary Seminar courses
- Rubric calibration for open option categories

Spring 2015

- Review course set S1 reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review second departmental reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review graduating student and other survey data

- Review course data and student enrollment patterns

2015-2016

Fall 2015

- Request course set S3 reports
- Request fourth set of departmental reports (departments to be determined)

Spring 2016

- Review course set S2 reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review third set of departmental reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review graduating student and other survey data
- Review course data and student enrollment patterns

2016-2017

Fall 2016

- Request course set S4 reports
- Request fifth set of departmental reports (departments to be determined)

Spring 2017

- Review course set S3 reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review fourth set of departmental reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review graduating student and other survey data
- Review course data and student enrollment patterns
- Assist with reporting for NCA

2017-2018

- Review course set S4 reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review fifth set of departmental reports - provide feedback and make recommendations
- Review graduating student and other survey data
- Review course data and student enrollment patterns

Courses for Course Set Reports

- **Course set S1** - Visual and Performing Arts and Cultures and Ideas.
 - Art 2100
 - Art 2555
 - ArtEdu 1600
 - ArtEduc 2367.01
 - Compstd 2341
 - Compstd 2367.08
 - Compstd 2370
 - EALL1231
 - English 2263
 - English 3378
 - HistArt 2001
 - HistArt 2002
 - HistArt 2901
 - HistArt 3901
 - LARCH 2367
 - Ling 2000
 - Music 2252
 - Philos 1100
 - Philos 1300
 - Philos 1332
 - Theatre 2100
 - Theatre 2811
 - WGSST 2230
 - WGSST 1110
- **Course set S2** - Historical Study, Foreign Language, Global Studies, Writing & Communication Level 2, and Literature
- **Course set S3** - Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Quantitative Reasoning
- **Course set S4** TBD
- **Course set S5** TBD

Appendix 2
Assessment Report Requirements for
General Education Courses

Please provide the following information in the requested Assessment Report for General Education (GE) courses in your Department. The report should include information from regional campuses and distance offerings as appropriate. Please limit the report section to 5 pages, excluding the syllabus and appendices, for a single course and 10 pages if the report includes multiple courses.

- I. Summary of the assessment plan and report (200 words or less)

- II. The report (5- or 10-page limit as noted above) which should include:
 - a. Brief description of the course(s) included in the report
 - b. Summary of assessment data collected for each GE Expected Learning Outcome (ELO) the course should achieve. Direct assessments are expected for most ELOs, which can be augmented with indirect evidence as appropriate
 - c. How the evidence was communicated and shared (e.g., with faculty, students, advisors)
 - d. Actions taken based on the evidence to improve student learning and achievement of GE ELOs
 - e. Next steps planned in GE course assessment and/or course improvement to help meet GE ELOs

- III. Appendices
 - Appendix 1 (required): Syllabus for course(s) assessed which should contain:
 - a. Relevant GE ELOs
 - b. Statement as to how the course helps students achieve these GE ELOs
 - Appendix 2 (required): Brief description of the assessment plan which includes:
 - a. GE ELOs for course(s) in the report
 - b. Means of assessment for each ELO
 - c. Criteria for successful achievement of each ELO
 - d. Ongoing timeline for implementing GE assessment in the course/department
 - Additional Appendices (if appropriate):
 - a. Assessment rubrics used
 - b. Other supporting information

Submit a single digital document that includes the above components to:

asccurrofc@osu.edu
154 Denney Hall
164 W. 17th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43210
Phone: 1 614 292-7226
Fax: 1 614 292-6303

Copy report to College Dean and Curricular Dean

Appendix 3
GE Category Level Rubrics

Assessment of Education Abroad GE Courses				
<p>This scoring rubric is designed to help instructors and members of relevant committees assess how well students are meeting the ELOs as reflected in end-of-course reflection assignments. Students are not expected to have acquired all the knowledge, skills, and attitudes/perspectives listed under the various ELOs in order to complete the assignment satisfactorily. At a minimum, students are expected to meet Milestone 2.</p>				
	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
(ELO1) Knowledge of host country and US: Culture and worldview frameworks	Articulates sophisticated understanding of differences, similarities, and interconnections between cultural rules and practices of host country and US.	Demonstrates deeper understanding of differences, similarities, and interconnections between cultural rules and practices of host country and US.	Describes similarities and differences and recognizes interconnections between cultural rules and practices of host country and US.	Recognizes similarities and differences in cultural rules and practices between host country and US.
(ELO2) Skills for effective functioning:				
(a) Verbal and nonverbal communication	Articulates a complex understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication between host country and US. Is able to skillfully negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Shows higher level understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication between host country and US. Begins to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.	Shows basic level understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication between host country and US. Shows awareness that misunderstandings across cultures can occur.	Shows minimal level understanding of cultural differences in verbal and nonverbal communication between host country and US.

	another cultural group. Asks complex questions about other cultures, seeks out and articulates answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.	these questions.		
--	--	------------------	--	--

Assessment of Service Learning GE Courses

This scoring rubric is designed to help instructors and members of relevant committees assess how well students are meeting the ELOs as reflected in end-of-course reflection assignments. Students are not expected to have acquired all the knowledge, skills, and attitudes/perspectives listed under the various ELOs in order to complete the assignment satisfactorily. At a minimum, students are expected to meet Milestone 2.

	Capstone (4)	Milestone (3)	Milestone (2)	Benchmark (1)
(ELO1) Students make connections between concepts and skills learned in an academic setting and community-based work	Connects, analyzes, and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from course content to Service Learning activity.	Connects and analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from course content to Service Learning activity.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from course content to Service Learning activity.	Student expresses a limited, unclear connection of course content to Service Learning activity.
(ELO2) Students demonstrate an understanding of the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.	Articulates a thorough and complex understanding of the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.	Identifies and clearly understands the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.	Identifies the issues, resources, assets, and cultures of the community in which they are working.	Shows minimal awareness of the issues, resources, assets and cultures of the community in which they are working.
(ELO3) Students evaluate the impacts of the service learning activity.	Student thoroughly evaluates the impacts of the Service Learning experience on themselves, the organization, and also considers the long term impact of the work on the community.	Student evaluates the impacts of the Service Learning experience on themselves and the contributions that they made to the goals and aims of the organization.	Student evaluates the impacts of the Service Learning experience on themselves.	Student minimally evaluates the impacts of the Service Learning experience.