General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title: ANTH 11 – Cultural Anthropology          GE Area D1

Results reported for AY 2018-2019 # of sections 9 # of instructors 7

Course Coordinator: Roberto Gonzalez E-mail: roberto.gonzalez@sjsu.edu
Department Chair: Roberto Gonzalez College: Social Science

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?

GELO 1: Place contemporary developments in cultural, historical, environmental, and spatial contexts

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

From a departmental perspective, it was challenging to staff ANTH 11 during the AY 2018-19. Late in summer 2018, Academic Advising and Retention Services asked our department to add additional Fall 2018 sections of this course, and we were able to do so on short notice. We added additional instructors for Spring 2019. As a result, we hired several new lecturers, several of whom used texts different from the book Conformity & Conflict (by James Spradley and David McCurdy) that most instructors have used as a standard text in recent years. The alternative textbooks (Essentials of Cultural Anthropology by Ken Guest, Cultural Anthropology by Conrad Kottak, and Cultural Anthropology: An Applied Perspective by Gary Ferraro) provided an opportunity for instructors (and the GE coordinator) to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each text.

Course instructors assessed GELO 1 through examinations, ethnographic projects, and (in the case of one instructor) a "gendered space assignment" focused on the ways in which physical spaces are shaped and influenced by culturally defined notions of gender. Instead of giving a full account of how all 7 course instructors assessed their individual sections, here I will discuss briefly a representative instructor who taught 3 out of the 9 sections of ANTH 11.
The instructor, who taught ANTH 11 both in-class and online during the period under review, assessed GELO 1 through a specific assignment: an ethnographic interview with a classmate regarding their ethnic background and traditions. Students also wrote a research paper in sections which included choosing a culture to write about. They wrote sections on the culture’s production methods, domestic life, political organization, and supernatural beliefs. The students also had a series of lectures on these subjects and others. The online students reviewed the PowerPoint online. The in-class students had the lectures in the classroom. The students in both classes read the Ferraro text. They also read an ethnography by Yamazaki. The students were provided with a series of study questions to prepare for the midterm and final. There were questions in each module. Preparing these study questions and taking the examinations required placing contemporary development in historical, environmental and spatial contexts. On the midterm for the in-class section, the median grade was 36 out of 50. The median grade on the final exam was 40 out of 50. On the final paper, the median grade was 19 out of 20. The average Final grade in the class was 77%. For the online class, the median grade was 46 out of 50. The median grade on the final exam was 46 out of 50. On the final paper, the median grade was 19 out of 20. The average Final grade in the class was 80%.

The instructor, after consulting with the GE coordinator, has decided to not change the assignments or content of this class because it appears to be providing students with a good general overview of cultural anthropology. She reports that requiring the research paper to be submitted in sections with proper citations and references prepares them for other classes. It also allows the instructor to give feedback on their writing in a way they can respond to in future assignments.

(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 modifications are planned for this course for the upcoming year, though we will continue comparing competing introductory textbooks with the aim of selecting a single standard text in future.

**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?

Yes.

(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—all sections of ANTH 11 had enrollment that was less than 44.