General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title _ChAD/Kin 67: Development of Human Potential_  GE Area E

Results reported for AY 2012/213  # of sections _14_  # of instructors _7_

Course Coordinator: _Maureen Smith_  E-mail: __Maureen.Smith@sjtu.edu_

Department Chair: __Toni Campbell__  College: __Education__

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?
   F2012: SLO #1 - Students will be able to recognize the interrelation of the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors on their well-being.

   S2013: SLO #2: Students will be able to recognize the interrelation of the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors on their development across the lifespan.

   NOTE: The course is co-taught, with KIN responsible for 8 weeks and ChAD responsible for 8 weeks. Assessment data is collected from each member of the teaching team for every section whenever possible.

(2) What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?
   In Fall 2012, eight sections of the course were taught by six faculty (three in KIN and three in ChaD). Most faculty in KIN and ChAD used the research based term paper to assess SLO #1. The exceptions are that one KIN faculty used the following assignment - “Creation of a Personal Stress Reduction Plan” - and one ChAD faculty member used a midterm short answer question to assess SLO#1. Additionally, KIN data from two sections are missing for F12.

   Assessment of Responses for the midterm question (2 sections) indicated that of 82 students, 81 received a C or better on the exam question.

   Assessment of the Personal Stress Reduction Plan assignment indicated that 38 out of 38 students received a C or better on the assignment.

   Assessment of SLO #1 from students’ term papers indicated that in the ChAD half of the sections, 138 students out of 164, received a C or better on the term paper.

   Assessment of SLO #1 from students’ term papers indicated that in the KIN half of the sections, 112 students out of 118, received a C or better on the term paper.
In Spring 2013, six sections of the course were taught by six faculty (three in KIN and three in ChaD). Most of the faculty used the term paper to assess SLO #2. However, one faculty member used a short answer question on the final exam and the co-teacher in that same section used the following assignment for assessment purposes: The Free Hugs Activity and Self-Reflection. In this section, the data from these two assessment activities were averaged; hence, it is not possible to tease out any more detailed information about student learning from the two individual assessment activities. Additionally, assessment from one section (both KIN and ChaD halves) was not reported.

Assessment of the average final exam question with the “free hugs” assignment indicated that out of 40 students, 37 received a C or better.

Assessment of SLO #2 from students’ term papers indicated that in the ChAD half of the sections, 137 students out of 157, received a C or better on the term paper.

Assessment of SLO #2 from students’ term papers indicated that in the KIN half of the sections, 156 students out of 161, received a C or better on the term paper.

(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 significant modifications are planned with respect to the course materials or content. The course coordinator will be exploring ways to encourage faculty to use the same assignment for assessment purposes or, if that is not feasible, to ensure that the assessment metrics are equivalent in rigor and criteria.

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, all sections use the same syllabus with the same SLOs, same texts, etc. All faculty new to teaching the course meet with the course coordinator before starting so that the continuity of alignment is unbroken. The faculty meet periodically to discuss changes to be made to the course.