General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title _HS 15: Human Lifespan Development______  GE Area ______D1_______

Results reported for AY __2017-2018___  # of sections ___5 (FA17) 3 (SP18)__  # of instructors ___6____

Course Coordinator: Anji Buckner (Assessment coordinator)  E-mail: anji.buckner@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: ___Yoshitaka Iwasaki______  College: of Health and Human Sciences (CHaHS)

Instructions: Each year, the department will prepare a brief (two page maximum) report that documents the assessment of the course during the year. This report will be electronically submitted to <curriculum@sjsu.edu>, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by October 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What GELO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

Closing the Loop - continued for GELO 4: Students will be able to recognize the interaction of social institutions, culture, and environment with the behavior of individuals.

Fall 2017 we Initiated the assessment cycle for GE learning outcome 3: Students will be able to evaluate social science information, draw on different points of view, and formulate applications appropriate to contemporary social issues. To assess this learning outcome faculty evaluated the team presentation, specifically focusing on rubric items that related to social sciences as well as implementing new activities designed to enhance critical review and ability to evaluate the credibility of sources.

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?

Closing the Loop - GELO 4: During the 2017/2018 academic year the teaching team implemented one new and one revised writing assignment. Faculty worked together, as well as in consultation with the campus Writing Across the Curriculum faculty, to finalize the writing prompts and grading rubrics. Overall, students did well on the new and revised assignments, but there is a continued need to further support student development of persuasive writing and in depth critical analysis skills. The new writing assignment asks students to analyze the relationship between college culture, health, and university resources and then present an argument to encourage new students to utilize resources or to advocate for a new service on campus. The majority of students who submitted the writing assignment(s) met the overall expectations, (average grade 76% across two sections includes those who received “0” for not submitting.) However, only 11/80 students received 5/5 for rubric item: Analysis and Persuasion: Paper convincingly argues point of view by providing relevant background information, using valid examples, acknowledging counter-claims, and developing claims – all in a clear and organized fashion. The majority of students received 3.5-4/5 for this specific rubric item, thus signaling additional work for faculty in terms of teaching and supporting students in refining their persuasive writing through this assignment. The second
assignment, revised from previous semesters, asks students to look introspectively at their own identity and relationships between their development, culture, and the environment. In this assignment, the majority of students met or exceeded expectations (81% and 84% assignment averages across two sections), but in the grading area of “analyzing connections” students continue to need improvement. In this item specifically, only 15/80 students received 25/25 points, with the majority scoring 22/25.

The key lesson is to continue to support student writing and critical thinking in writing with these two assignments and to devote class time to support the process.

The results for the assessment of GE learning outcome 3 were mixed. The team presentation was a consistent strength across the sections. Only 1 team, out of 16 included in the assessment (across 2 sections) did not receive full credit on the rubric item: clearly explained policy. All teams received full credit for "identified social issues". The team that did not receive full credit took an unorthodox approach to the team presentation assignment and while they discussed the policy with me beforehand, they did not clearly convey the policy to peers during their presentation. No changes at this time, but continue to work with students through the team presentation process.

The results for the new activities to support students in their ability to determine credible resources was illuminating and revealed an avenue that this teaching team will continue to explore. In Fall 2017, two sections piloted an in class activity and discussion. Informal feedback suggested that students need more accountability and scaffolding in learning this skill, particularly as access to information continues to expand. During Spring 2018, two sections piloted a more extensive online assignment that was graded. The activity utilized resources from a Stanford study to guide students through process of checking website/source credibility.

The majority of students across 2 sections were able to distinguish articles and advertisements; low majority correctly identified whether or not a source was credible (61% and 53%). Majority of students do not practice "lateral" checking for credibility. Most common methods used for checking credibility included: about us page (80%/65%); reviewed references (74%/68%); check domain (86%/94%). Only (34%/19%) searched laterally by accessing the parent organization. Students who did originally identify the article as not credible were surprised by what the lateral search revealed about the article. Faculty were surprised by the number of students who, across 2 sections, did not acknowledge the conflict of interest between the source and the information in the article. The majority of students, if they noticed, did not report that a lobby group was behind the article and therefore, their analysis is potentially one-sided in their benefit.

This finding reveals a clear need and faculty will continue to work with this online activity and build in an in-class follow up activity to further support and discuss how to evaluate the credibility of sources.

(3) What modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming year? (If no modifications are planned, the course coordinator should indicate this.)

There are no additional plans for closing the loop on the assessment of GELO 4. The writing assignments represent a clear set of instructions, related to the course and GE learning outcomes. Faculty will continue to work with students as they develop and deepen their critical thinking skills through these assignments.
Faculty will continue to support student development in terms of evaluating credible sources through the online activity and a follow up in class activity. Additionally, the application of these skills will be noted in their writing assignments and their team presentations as both require the use of credible sources.

No additional course revisions are noted at this time.

Part 2

To be completed by the department chair (with input from course coordinator as appropriate):

(4) Are all sections of the course still aligned with the area Goals, Student Learning Objectives (GELOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

All sections are aligned with the goals, learning outcomes, content, and assessment processes and expectations.

(5) If this course is in a GE Area with a stated enrollment limit (Areas A1, A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z), please indicate how oral presentations will be evaluated with larger sections (Area A1), or how practice and revisions in writing will be addressed with larger sections, particularly how students are receiving thorough feedback on the writing which accounts for the minimum word count in this GE category (Areas A2, A3, C2, D1, R, S, V, & Z) and, for the writing intensive courses (A2, A3, and Z), documentation that the students are meeting the GE GELOs for writing.

This course is currently capped at 30 students which allows instructors to adequately provide individualized feedback on both writing and oral presentation skills. No changes are indicated at this time.