General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: EE198B Senior Design Project I  GE Area: V

Results reported for AY: 2014-2015  # of sections: 3  # of instructors: 1

Course Coordinator: Parent  E-mail: David.Parent@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Ray Chen  College: Engineering

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? GELO 1: Students shall be able to compare systematically the ideas, values, images, cultural artifacts, economic structures, technological developments, or attitudes of people from more than one culture outside the U.S. EE 198B Reflection paper 1: Assume that your project is about to turn into a successful company. Using the studies provided in ENGR195B as a background, write about how to take into account at least two aspects (for example ideas, values, images, cultural artifacts, economic structures, or technological developments) while evaluating your decision to manufacture your product in two other countries.

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment? The results from the assessment of this assignment for fall 2014 were: 34% met expectations, and 66% did not meet expectations. There were several reasons for the low performance on this item. The first was that the prompt was part of the larger final project report and some of the faculty did not fill out the rubric, opting to give me a “grade the students deserved”. The second factor was that many of students had completed areas S&V the traditional way and did not fully address the assignment prompt. The third factor was that the area V content and rubrics were not fully developed by the coordinator.

(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.) To address the low performance of students in GLEO1, the following changes were made to the assignment/class:

- The prompt was pulled into its own assignment in canvas that would be graded by the coordinator only.
- The assignments for Area V were put into their own assignment group worth 20% of the final grade.

The results for spring 2015 were 94% met expectations and 6% did not meet expectations. These results can be explain by the fact multiple re-writes were allowed on the assignment until the student earned a “met expectations”. There were 3 students who did not make meet expectations. One used the assignment to vent that “foreigners were taking all the good jobs”, and one just flunked. The other student met S&V the traditional way.
The rubrics for the area V assignments still need work and the coordinator will ask for help from Area V experts.

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? Yes there is one instructor/coordinator for all sections.

(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.

The student groups are made up of 2-5 students and each group has an advisor that grades the student’s writing. We also have access to a grammar checker: Errnet which was designed to improve technical writing. The website of the tool is https://www.errnet.net. Assignments all have rubrics that address written communication.