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, by the department chair, to the Office of Undergraduate Studies, with an electronic copy to the home college by September 1 of the following academic year.

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

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

AREA V SLO 3: Explain how a culture outside the U.S. has changed in response to internal and external pressures.

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

This SLO is assessed in a few different ways in the four course sections.

In two sections (taught by one instructor), this SLO continues to be the most challenging for students to grasp as they have little baseline to understand culture in general, lack the perspective to assess cultures under the impact of socio-political pressures mainly because they are challenged in differentiating how variables interact with reality on the ground, and finally often have over-simplistic views how human behavior. That said, within the context of the movements discussed, they were able to largely grasp how the acts of mobilization and resistance changes the culture of political engagement and participants view of it, of themselves, of their society, and their place in the world. Therefore, within the narrow confines of the course content and focus, students were enlightened in these specific areas.

The previous weekly graded discussions had a significant “Synthesis” component that was weighted heavily, but the instructor found that students had a very difficult time synthesizing multiple readings. The result was rather low scores. This year the instructor re-focused on their insights into each reading instead and used the synthesis as a broader measure across the entire post. This did not work and resulted in overly robust grades for the course. He also put more points behind the peer review and a writing training workshop for the writing assignment with the hopes of better performance/compliance but feel it was too much and this also resulted in inflated grades. Finally, the final paper continues to be too complex, again the problem with synthesizing materials. This may be too much for many students. Instead, perhaps more focused on just a few elements. The instructor feels that students are grasping SLO 3 concepts as illustrated by their ability to identify how cultural, political, and economic factors that drive resistance change across different movements in different cultures based on conditions on the ground. That is, how The Umbrella Movement in Hong Kong results from a unique blend of local, regional, and global cultural, political, and economic forces. That is, that larger internal and external forces can be similar (e.g. economic crisis) but articulate differently in each nation.
In two other sections (taught by another instructor), the instructor added a unit on the Euromaiden crisis, and the use of social media in the resistance movement of students during it. This meant students could compare and contrast it to the Egyptian Spring movement, and see varying degrees of cultural change in response to social change in two different political and cultural situations. This comparison was assessed in weekly discussion questions, and analysis of comparative social media usages in both situations. Readings focusing on those variables were presented as well. He felt it worked much more effectively. There was a much more online presence in that movement, and it effectively paired with the Arab Spring movement which we are already have as a module. Responses and discussions move much more smoothly now in transition between the two movements.

Out of approximately 105 students assessed, what percentage would you estimate:

Mastered SLO3 at a high level 45 students (42%) (averaged a “B+” or better on assessment activities)
Mastered SLO3 at an average level 48 students (46%) (averaged a “C” or better on assessment activities)
Either failed to master SLO3, or did so at a marginal level 11 students (11%) (“C-” or below on assessment activities)

(2) 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.)

Based on assessment, one teacher plans to focus the main paper less on the technical comparative analysis and more on the placing movements within a larger conceptual framework and then looking at their current state and potential future trajectory. He will continue to utilize highly structured and long-form weekly discussion provides a great foundation toward a more complex conceptual grasp of the larger issues of resistance movements.

Part 2

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

(3) 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?