**General Education Annual Course Assessment Form**

Course Number/Title: ANTH 160 Reconstructing Lost Civilizations  
GE Area: R

Results reported for AY 2012-2013  
# of sections: 9  
# of instructors: 5

Course Coordinator: Marco Meniketti  
E-mail: marco.meniketti@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Chuck Darrah  
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, 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?

   **Student Learning Objective #2:** Within the particular scientific content of the course, a student should be able to distinguish science from pseudo-science.

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

   Our assessment instruments for this SLO included essays, objective exam questions, and term papers with pseudoscience vs. science as a targeted topic.

   We noticed a marked improvement over the previous assessment of this particular SLO in two areas: recognition of pseudoscience and ability to articulate the concept. We feel this was in part due to our increased focus on discussions of scientific method implemented on the basis of an earlier assessment cycle. Students in the past lacked sufficient ability to distinguish science from pseudoscience for a general lack of sufficient scientific background. Instructors have increased attention to scientific methods in lectures and in assigned readings. Quantitative skills, however, remain poor.

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.)

   We feel that based on our assessment that continuing to focus on scientific method through readings and class discussion is warranted. We are also discussing finding closer alignment among the principal textbooks used in the course. Instructors also note that more students need to focus more on awareness of their own assumptions—possibly addressed through a specific assignment. A final minor modification agreed on is to increase quantitative reasoning in the curriculum as this appears to be the weakest skill point of students taking the course. There will be no change in the
assessment cycle. Each instructor will implement an assignment or modify an existing assignment to increase quantitative reasoning in a manner consistent with the three SLOs for the course. One instructor will experiment with a new quantitative oriented lesson during the summer session and report back the results.

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?

All sections are in alignment with course goals for Area R. The course coordinator meets regularly with the instructors and is himself a regular instructor. The department builds in considerable time at faculty meetings to discuss assessment in its eight GE courses and all instructors are committed to offering a consistent course. However, the course coordinator notes that there is considerable variance from the GE proficiencies for Area R. The three proficiencies (Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Quantitative Literacy) are unevenly addressed by core course content. The weakest area is Quantitative Literacy, with Critical Thinking the strongest; Information Literacy is addressed through the culminating term paper. We will be addressing this variance during 2013-2014.