General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title ___ Stat 95: Elementary Statistics ___ GE Area ___ B4 __________________________

Results reported for AY ___ 2017-18 ______ # of sections ___ 18 ________ # of instructors ___ 10 ________

Course Coordinator: Erin Woodhead and David Schuster E-mail: david.schuster@sjsu.edu__________

Department Chair: ___ Clifton Oyamot ________________ College: ______ CoSS ________________________

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

   SLO2: Mathematical concepts courses should prepare the student to demonstrate the ability to use mathematics to solve real life problems.

   Other, specific to Area B4, SLO6: Focus on applications of mathematics to everyday life.

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

Assessment was accomplished using two methods: (1) class-based; and (2) a standardized post-test exit exam given during final exams. The table below presents the results of each assessment method for SLOs 2 and 6. For the class-based assessment, instructors were asked to provide information about assignments given each semester that assessed SLOs 2 and 6, as well as student performance on those assessments. Instructors reported that they assessed these SLO through homework assignments and in-class assignments linked to these SLOs. These included a presentation, written report and study proposal. For example, an assignment related to the resale value of concert tickets applying concepts of variables and levels of measurement was used in one class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Number of Students Assessed</th>
<th>Percent who mastered SLOs 1 and 4 at a high level</th>
<th>Percent who mastered SLOs 1 and 4 at an average level</th>
<th>Percent who mastered SLOs 1 and 4 at a low level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class-Based</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment data post-test suggests that the majority of students mastered these SLOs at average levels. As with prior year assessments, the class-based assessments suggest a higher level of mastery.
Instructors’ reflection on lessons learned from the assessment centered around scaffolding:

“As the concepts increased in complexity, the students’ performance declined, even though I spent more time covering the more complex concepts. One solution may be to spend even more time on the more complex concepts, or embed more principles related to those concepts in earlier course lessons.”

“Students need targeted scaffolds for the project. One possible solution is to hand out a scaffolded assessment 1 week earlier and create deadlines for different components broken up by skills (non-tech and tech) and conceptual application. Additionally, the rubric could have better expectations such as: vocabulary used to describe data, conceptual connections and connecting key findings to driving question. Lastly, I think providing structured in-class project time to touch base with groups that are struggling will be a useful strategy that I will apply in the future.”

(2) 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 will continue to monitor the impact of EO 1110 and work with other units on campus to ensure that Stat 95 students are appropriately supported. Other than small changes intended to further streamline the assessment participation for instructors, no major modifications are planned.

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 (GELOs), Content, Support, and Assessment? If they are not, what actions are planned?

Sections continue to be aligned with the GE criteria. Although we continue to monitor how students in Statway and Stat 95 are supported and successful in the Psychology major, no major actions are planned at this time.

(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 GELOs for writing.

Not applicable.