General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: Philosophy 104 “Asian Philosophy”  GE Area: V

Results reported for AY: 2016-17  # of sections: 5  # of instructors: 3

Course Coordinator: Bo Mou  E-mail: bo.mou@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Janet Stemwedel  College: H & A

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 October 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?

We assessed SLO 3: “Students shall be able to explain how a culture outside the U.S. has changed in response to internal and external pressures.”

In view of this learning goal, the syllabus explicitly indicates this is one of the class emphases: “We emphasize appreciation of some representative ideas and visions in Asian philosophy and their historical and cultural contexts in which they changed and developed over time when facing internal and external challenges/pressures so as to achieve new visions and perspectives and to expand our understanding of the world and human life”; the syllabus also explicitly specifies how to fulfill this learning objective in this way: “Learning Objective 3 (LO3): Students shall be able to explain how a culture outside the U.S. has changed in response to internal and external pressures. To achieve this objective, the course examines how some movements of thought under examination has changed in response to internal and/or external pressures (if any). Sample activities for mastering this GE LO include examinations of the development of Confucianism from Confucius to Mencius and Xun Zi’s approaches, and development of Buddhism from its early version to some of its more recent movements (such as Chan/Zan Buddhism). Assessment tools for this learning objective include <1> paper assignment, <2> essay questions in the exams. In this way, in this academic year, it has been suggested that the assessment questions concerning the aforementioned expected contents be included to assess the SOL 3. [The above citations from Bo Mou’s syllabus for Phil104]

Generally speaking, during 2016-17 with its focus on SOL 3 assessment, the instructors are expected to assess SLO 3 via an essay question that can explicitly test the students’ understanding and capacity in this connection for this advance-level GE class (together with or without true-false/multiple-choice questions) in a two-step procedure, i.e., a pre-test exercise or group discussion and a specific GE assessment test (or one part of the final exam) to test the students’ understanding and capacity in this connection. The paper assignment also implicitly addresses the expectation in this connection.

For example, in Bo Mou’s class, the discussion and essay-question-preparation questions for this purpose include these: (1) as far as classical Chinese philosophy is concerned, we discussed how, when facing “internal challenges” from the Mohist “utilitarian” approach, the “virtue-ethics” approach of the classical Confucianism further developed (its related discussion question is given this way: “Confucius maintains love with distinction while Mo Zi insists on universal care for each; would you think Confucius can respond to Mo Zi’s challenge by maintaining both universal love/care and love with distinction in a consistent way?”); (2) we discussed how, when facing “external challenges” from
the Hegelian model, the *Yin-Yang* model of interaction and transformation can be further developed through our contemporary elaboration of Zhuang Zi’s Daoist methodological strategy (a kind of objective perspectivism): this Zhuang-Zi style methodological strategy, on the one hand, can include both the *Yin-Yang* model and Hegelian model as eligible “perspectives” in handling “conflict” situations (taking which one is sensitive to distinct features of such situations) and, on the other hand, takes a higher vantage point of view seeing distinct eligible perspectives as finite with their own limitations while complementary. (2) was also implemented through the term paper assignment: the students were asked to apply the relevant points of the *Yin-Yang* model, the Hegelian model and Zhuang Zi’s methodology to the issue of how to look distinct approaches in philosophy, society or their own areas of study. Closely related to the foregoing term paper assignment, there was one special PHIL104 student-instructor joint workshop on the theme, “How to Look at Distinct Approaches in Philosophy and Society,“, held at SJSU on 13 May 2017, where eight selected PHIL104 students made presentations of their term papers; with the support of SJSU Dr. Lin Endowment (on Chinese philosophy) and of the SJSU Philosophy Department, three selected PHIL104 students plus two SJSU philosophy graduate students successfully participated in, and made their presentations at, the joint workshop on the same theme held at Capital Normal University, Beijing, China, on 7-8 July 2017.

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

In the 2016-17 academic year, there are three instructors who taught Phil104: Bo Mou (one section) and Chanh Phan (two sections) for Fall 2016, and Bo Mou (one section) and Anthony Korsund (one section) for Spring 2017. Bo Mou used the aforementioned essay question in the final exam and term paper assignment as the assessment procedure in this connection. For PHIL104 section in Spring 2017, Bo Mou’s assessment result which reflects the students’ performance in SOL3 is this: among 44 students, 13 out of 44 students received the “very good” (equivalent to “A” or “A-”) assessments; 20 out of 44 students received the “good” (equivalent to “B+”, “B” or “B-”) assessment; 8 out of 44 students received the “satisfactory” (equivalent to “C+” or “C”) assessment; 3 out of 44 students received the “unsatisfactory” (equivalent to those grades below “C”) assessment. Chanh Phan’s assessment result for his PHIL104 class in Fall 2016 is this: among the 38 students who took the exam evaluation (2 students had dropped to the course), 2 of the 38 students received the “A” grade range. 7 of the 38 students received the “B” grade range. 8 of the 38 students received the “C” grade range. 13 of the 38 students received the “D” grade range. 8 of the 38 students received the “F” grade range. Anthony Korsund's assessment results for SLO 3 in paper assignment #3 are as follows: among 39 students enrolled in the course, 37 students completed paper assignment #3 which aimed at assessing SLO 3 as stated in the essay question indicated earlier; 16 out of 37 students received a "very good" (equivalent to A-, A or A+ grade) assessment; 17 out of 37 students received a "good" (equivalent to B-, B or B+) assessment; 1 out of 37 students received a "satisfactory" (equivalent to C grade) assessment; and 3 out of 37 students received an "unsatisfactory" (equivalent to D grade) assessment.

(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.)

No modifications to the course, or its assessment activities or schedule, are planned for the upcoming 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 (SLOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?
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 instructor of record provides feedback and grades all writing assignments and welcomes, if not requires, first drafts of all writing assignments and provides feedback on drafts. If sections are exceptionally oversized they are graded by the instructor of record with the assistance of an Instructional Student Assistant (ISA). The ISA must be approved both by the Instructional Assistant Coordinator and the Philosophy Department Chair for their excellence in both composition and their expertise in the field of philosophy at issue. Whenever an ISA aids in the grading of a large course, s/he provides feedback along with grading. In all cases, when the help of an ISA is employed, the instructor of record must explicitly notify the students of the class that some writing assignments have been graded and feedback has been provided by an ISA. If a student is unhappy with an ISA grade the instructor of record will reread the paper, provide additional feedback, and regrade the assignment (if that is warranted.) Generally speaking, any instructor who is teaching more than 100 GE students in a semester receives ISA help.