General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title   HIST 153: Women in Europe   GE Area  V

Results reported for AY 2015-16   # of sections  1;    # of instructors  1

Course Coordinator: Patricia Evridge Hill   E-mail: Patricia.Hill@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Glen Gendzel   College: Social Sciences

Part 1

To be completed by the course coordinator:

(1) What SLO(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.

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

I assessed the GELO by means of two papers asking students to compare women in two different countries via primary sources (first paper) and movies (second paper). For the first paper, students often compared the treatment of women witches in a Protestant country like Germany and a Catholic one like France; suffragists in England versus those in Germany or Italy; and laws relating to women in Rome and Napoleonic France. For the second paper, students liked to investigate movies about abortionists in France and England, Muslim women in France and Germany, and problems of marriage in England and France.

I evaluated the essays on the basis of their having a solid thesis that went beyond “the texts (or movies) were alike and different.” Students were also supposed to have consulted two secondary sources. I wanted them to learn to do independent research to deepen their knowledge of the cultures under consideration. One source had to come from the library. Their papers had to display their understanding of the history of each of the countries that came into play in their papers. (The course covered the history of these various countries from antiquity to the present.) They had to present quotations from the primary and secondary texts and from the movies (for the second paper) to back up their arguments and show skills in interpreting these quotations and putting them into the historical context.

Based on their scores on their papers, I concluded that students did least well in reading primary sources from earlier centuries. They do not have the patience to do close reading of texts, though one of the required books is a book of sources. Even their vocabulary is lacking. Out of 26 students, 13% demonstrated excellent mastery of interpreting original texts from different countries; 67% demonstrated acceptable skills; and 20% showed poor skills. I gave people the opportunity to rewrite their paper, and four students improved. As for movies, students showed they could handle questions relating to visual culture more easily. Also, we watched a movie in class about a Muslim woman adjusting to life in France and discussed it at length. Therefore they had more experience doing this assignment. Approximately 27% did well, 57% did an acceptable job, and 16% did poorly.
In the SOTES reports, I received a 4.7 in terms of the course’s effectiveness, a figure that suggests that the students felt that they got a great deal out of my instruction. However, when I teach the course again, I will make students bring their sourcebook to class and oblige them to analyze texts in small groups to get more practice. However, their ignorance is hard to anticipate and combat. One of the best students in the class asked me a question after she read one assigned reading, an autobiography written by a seventeenth-century German Jewish woman. The student wondered why the woman asked Jesus for help all the time! “Lord” to this psychology major meant only Jesus. I really think more instruction in the humanities and social sciences is imperative!

(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.)

I have no modifications planned for this year as the course will not be offered.

**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?

Yes.

(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 course enrollment is capped at 25 students.
General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title  HIST 155: Twentieth Century World  GE Area V

Results reported for AY 2015-16  # of sections 1;  # of instructors 1

Course Coordinator: Patricia Evridge Hill  E-mail: Patricia.Hill@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Glen Gendzel  College: Social Sciences

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.

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

This GELO was assessed in an in-class timed exam in which students were required to write an essay comparing the role of technology in two utopian projects discussed in the class (we studied in the class utopian urges in Germany, the Soviet Union, China, Rwanda, Iran, among others). They were then asked why utopian regimes were so prevalent in the 20th c. Together these questions require that students compare the ways that technology was used by various societies to achieve differing versions of purity and progress, and then to consider whether these societies have elements in common.

50% of the students wrote excellent answers, in which they noted similarities and differences in uses of and/or attitudes toward technology (e.g., means of progress, threat to tradition, state surveillance, empowerment of marginalized people), connected the differences to specific varying experiences in the 20th c. or before (for example, experiences with imperialism), and explained surprising similarities by pointing to common issues posed by modernity in the 20th c. 38% of the students provided good answers, in which they explained well how each society used technology to further particular economic and ideological goals, and stated but did not explain fully the underlying connections between the two societies. 11% wrote satisfactory answers, in which they listed key uses of technology in each society and suggested a similarity and/or difference, but did not elaborate on the implications of these uses or the connections between societies. There were no unsatisfactory answers. This assessment validated my decision, based on previous assessments, to incorporate more in-class exercises teaching students to compare evidence from different cultures and develop a nuanced historical thesis from it. In this semester, all students gained at least a basic mastery of this GE Learning Objective, with many attaining a quite sophisticated ability to compare and connect the technology, attitudes, and other experiences of cultures outside of the United States.
(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.)

Based on the assessment, I don’t plan to make any major changes in the next year.

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.

(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 course enrollment is capped at 25 students.