General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title ANTH 25 Human Lifecourse GE Area E

Results reported for AY 2018-2019  # of sections 5  # of instructors 3

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 2: Students shall recognize the interrelation of the physiological, social/cultural, and psychological factors on their development across the lifespan.

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

Two of the three course instructors assessed GELO 2 through a series of assignments directed toward choosing a major and an alternative major, assessing their own attraction to and skills for that major, checking out two majors in terms of requirements, locating advising, and interviewing someone with their “dream” job. The purpose of the assignment is to encourage students to recognize the alternative paths offered to them and analyze their personal goals and aptitudes. Students were also given a series of readings pertinent to different stages in life, associated study questions, and exams. The central theme of the readings and lectures was "authoritative knowledge." Students were taught to look at the way people in different cultures respond to different forces in the decision-making process. For Fall 2018, the two course instructors reported a median midterm and final grades ranging from 84 to 92 percent.

A third course instructor took a broadly holistic approach to assessing GELO 2, in the sense that virtually all course assignments and instructional materials were relevant to it. The course text was one of the few that addresses human development from a multicultural perspective and lectures about stages of human development (e.g. childhood, adolescence, early to late adulthood) follow a common template of presenting physical, cognitive, emotional, and social characteristics typical of each stage (primarily in the U.S.). Students also read
anthropological/ethnographic studies of childhood, adolescence as experienced by a Somali girl, and the choices made by nine Indians (South Asians) about their religious careers. Exams included both objective and essay questions about all assigned materials and students also conduct a life history with a person of their choice and then analyze it using basic concepts of human development. Five portfolio assignments throughout the semester required students to describe: influences on and turning points in their life; activity settings in which they have participated; optimistic and pessimistic future scenarios; identifying transferable skills and their preferences for using specific ones; and influences throughout their lives that are shaping their career plans.

The instructor reports that "My assessment is accordingly based on a web of assignments that require (in some cases) students to apply the concepts developed in class to their own lives, although more often they are asked to analyze the lives of others in order to develop sensitivity to the factors that have been, are, and will shape their own lives. . .Based on my careful reading of assignments there is ample evidence that all students who complete the course are leaving it with a set of concepts that they are able to apply to decision making in their own lives. I do not, however, require students to demonstrate their mastery of these concepts by directly applying them to all facets of their own lives because (1) I personally would not reveal deeply personal information to a professor and (2) even the most benign of prompts can elicit student responses that require therapeutic expertise that I lack. It is also worth noting that assessment results in this class are probably biased by its composition since most assignments are sensitive to the maturity of the students. In spring 2018, for example, the majority of students were juniors or seniors, while in spring 2019 the majority were freshmen and sophomores. As an Area E Core GE class ANTH 25 is intended for students at the start of their academic careers yet over two semesters only 50% of enrolled students are in that target constituency."

(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.

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.