General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title          UNVS 96GC                      GE Area                      C2

Results reported for AY     2013-2014                     # of sections               1                     # of instructors   1

Course Coordinator          Dr. Revathi Krishnaswamy        E-mail                      revathi.krishnaswamy@sjtu.edu

Department Chair            Dr. Dennis Jaehne               College                     Undergraduate Studies

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 (Fall 2013)?

**GE SLO #1:** Enable students to recognize how significant works illuminate enduring human concerns.

**GE SLO #2:** Enable students to respond to significant works by writing both research-based critical analyses and personal responses.

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

**GE SLO #1** was assessed using embedded multiple-choice questions on the final exam. The questions required students to recognize or identify major concerns expressed in passages taken from significant literary works they had studied in the course (See Appendix for sample questions).

Quantitative Analysis: Scores on the embedded exam questions in the exam were as follows:

Of the 51 students assessed, 8 (15%) demonstrated a high level of achievement (B or better grade), 14 (27%) demonstrated a satisfactory level of achievement (C grade), and 29 (56%) demonstrated a low or unsatisfactory level of achievement (D or lower grade).

Qualitative Analysis: Since more than 50% of the class scored below C, it looks like many students had difficulty identifying the correct answer to the questions in the exam. It’s not clear why, especially since all the literary texts from which the passages were taken had been extensively discussed through detailed PPTs and video lectures. In fact, even students who had not read the texts or watched the videos before the exam should’ve been able to answer many of the questions simply by reading the passage closely and carefully. The fact that they didn’t, suggests one of two possibilities: low level reading skills or final exam burn out.

**GE SLO #2** was assessed using the research essay. The essay was based on material studied in the “geopolitics” segment of the course. Assigned readings included short stories about U.S.-Mexico and Israel-Palestine. Students were asked to analyze what the stories revealed about the relationship between Mexican laborers and American corporations OR between Israelis and Palestinians. In addition to analyzing the short stories, students were required to research and incorporate relevant...
supporting information from at least two additional scholarly sources.

**Quantitative Analysis:** Scores on SLO specific items on the rubric used to score the paper were as follows: Of the 55 students assessed, 28 (50%) demonstrated a high level of achievement (B or better grade), 17 (30%) demonstrated a satisfactory level of achievement (C grade), and 7 (13%) demonstrated a low or unsatisfactory level of achievement (D or lower grade).

**Qualitative Analysis:** Since more than 80% of the class scored C or better, the course was obviously effective in teaching students how to respond to literary texts. I believe this high level of success can be attributed to the detailed feedback we (myself and TAs) provided at every stage of the writing process, beginning with the outline, through the rough draft and into the final revision. This was a time-consuming and labor-intensive task that we undertook based on the English Department’s strong commitment to improving writing in all classes.

(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 major modifications are planned. However based on GE SLO #1 data, I intend to design some new assignments and activities for teaching advanced reading/critical thinking skills.

**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?