General Education Annual Course Assessment FormA

Course Number/Title __MatE198A_________ GE Area __S&V (in conjunction with Engr 195A & 195B)___________

Results reported for AY 2016-2017 ___________ # of sections __1_________ # of instructors __1_________

Course Coordinator: __Guna Selvaduray_________ E-mail: __guna.selvaduray@sjsu.edu____________________

Department Chair: __Guna Selvaduray__ College: __Engineering_____________________

Part 1 To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY? All Area S SLOs were assessed in MatE 198A. One section was offered in Fall 2016.

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

S-LO1: Describe how identities (i.e. religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age) are shaped by cultural and societal influences within contexts of equality and inequality.

MatE 198A Essay 1: Consider your identity as a future engineer. How is your identity as an engineer shaped by cultural and societal influences within contexts of equality and inequality? (250-500 words).

In Fall 2016, there were eleven students enrolled in MatE 198A. Of the eleven students, two exceeded the criteria for SLO #1, six met the criteria for SLO #1, and three did not meet the criteria.

S-LO2: Describe historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality, and structured inequalities in the U.S.:

MatE 198A Essay 2: Using the case studies provided in ENGR195A/B, describe how your project fits into the historical, social, political, and economic processes producing diversity, equality, and structured inequalities in the U.S. (500-750 words).

The results from the Fall 2016 assessment show that two students exceeded the criteria for SL #2, two students met the criteria for SLO #2, and four students did not meet the criteria. Three students did not submit the assignment. Overall, most of the students in the class either did not meet the criteria or submitted the assignment. The results led us to make changes for the following academic year.

S-LO3: Describe social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S. (i.e. religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age); and S-LO4: Recognize and appreciate constructive interactions between people from different cultural, racial, and ethnic groups within the U.S.:

MatE 198A Essay 3: Describe how the push for a lead free standard in electronic products (RoSH) increased social justice in the U.S. (250-500 words).

The results for the assessment of SLO #3 were disappointing. Only two out of eleven students met the criteria for SLO #3. Eight students did not meet the criteria and one student did not submit the assignment. The results led us to make changes for the following academic year.

S-LO4: Recognize and appreciate constructive interactions between people from different cultural, racial, and ethnic groups within the U.S.

• MatE 198A Essay 4: Consider a negative side effect of technology ewaste. Read the following articles and answer the questions in paragraph form. Your essay must cite your sources and be at least 500 words.

Articles:


Essay Instructions: Research the procedures regarding ewaste in your own town or region. What civic organizations promote the reduction of ewaste in your community? Either visit one of these groups’ websites or visit the group in person and describe the interactions between this group and the larger community.

For SLO #4, two students exceeded the criteria, two students met the criteria and six students did not meet the criteria. One student did not submit the assignment. The results led us to make changes for the following academic year.

(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.)

Although the class is small, it appears that students, in general, only met or exceeded the criteria for SLO #1. Feedback from students in the class appeared to support the belief that the General Education assignments in the class were not important to the students, despite the 30% weight given to these assignments. In Fall 2017, the department chair decided to become the coordinator of the course and a new faculty member with extensive experience in social implications of technology was hired.

Despite the detailed grading rubrics, many students didn’t really understand the level of analysis required for the papers, and their analysis was not of sufficient depth. Some good example papers have been posted on the MatE 198A Canvas site for the 17-18 year to help with this understanding.

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 (SLOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

All the sections are aligned with the Area S Goals, SLOs, Content, Support and Assessment.

(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, 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 SLOs for writing.

The one section was within enrollment limits of 40 students. Graders with backgrounds in the humanities were hired by the dean’s office to do all grading of the GE assignments in MatE 198A. All assignments were graded using detailed rubrics with certain rubric elements linked to outcomes in Canvas. Additional student feedback was provided via comments posted in Speedgrader. Students were allowed to revise and resubmit assignments to improve their grades once per assignment. Assignments with major grammar problems were not graded – they were returned to students to revise and resubmit.