General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: HPRF 135 Health Issues in a Multicultural Society

GE Area: S

Results reported for AY: AY 14-15  # of sections: 7 (combined terms)  # of instructors: 5 (combined terms)

Course Coordinator: Ms. Billie Jo (BJ) Grosvenor  E-mail: billiejo.grosvenor@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Dr. Anne Demers  College: CASA

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 SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

SLO 3: Students will be able to describe social actions which have led to greater equality and social justice in the U.S. (i.e. religious, gender, ethnic, racial, class, sexual orientation, disability, and/or age).

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

There were two different measures used to assess outcomes. Recommendations related to direct measures are discussed below.

The first measure came from pre-identified questions on exams (both mid-term and final)

Mid-term – aggregated data results are as follows: nine percent of students were in the excellent category on this SLO – receiving “A’s.” Twenty nine percent achieved a grade of “B.” Forty-three reached a grade level of “C” and sixteen percent achieved a below average grade.

Final-exam – Students’ scores improved with the final exam. Thirty-one percent achieved an “A”; fifty percent demonstrated above average competence reaching a “B” level; and nine percent achieved a “C” grade.

Aggregate scores for both multiple-choice and short answer/essay questions on the final exam were markedly higher than the midterm. The mid-term exam included only multiple choice questions, and it is suggested that future exams in AY 15-16 include both essay and multiple choice questions to allow students to expand on topics not necessarily addressed in a multiple choice exam format.

A second form of assessment was based on a current topic – research based assignment. Students (in groups) identify a current social issue (e.g., immigration reform), research their topic, and discuss their findings in the classroom in small learning groups. Group members synthesize their findings, which include all sides of the issue, and then present their findings to the entire class. A large class discussion follows each group presentation, emphasizing current legislation and discussions in Congress. Competence is graded on a credit/no credit basis.
Results of data presented 95% achieved a grade of an “A.” Five percent demonstrated lower than expected effort and competence – receiving a “D.” grade. No group was graded in the “B” or “C” range. Overall, students demonstrated enthusiasm, engagement, and depth of discussion, including all sides of the issues. Although faculty and students find this assignment to be meaningful to learning, faculty will discuss the value of this assignment in assessing SLO 3, specifically the reliability of a credit/no credit group assignment.

(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.)

A new textbook will be explored. The authors of the current text provide a broad overview of multicultural health issues; however, the data presented in the text are from 2000 and out of date. Given the nature of the course, and the constantly changing social, political, and economic environment of healthcare in the U.S., it may be better to develop a reader instead of, or in addition to, an updated text.

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?

Faculty who teach this course are dedicated to the annual assessment process and are clear on the GE objectives. It is noted that a more formalized sharing of results and suggestions for changes should be re-initiated through the assignment of a faculty anchor.

(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 SLOs for writing.

No action is required in this area. One section had been inaccurately schedule above the required maximum enrollment. This situation was rectified at the start of the term and all sections were re-set to the maximum enrollment level. There is no modification of pedagogy to report.