General Education Annual Course Assessment Form

Course Number/Title ANTH/ASIA 115 Emerging Global Cultures    GE Area: SJSU Studies Area V

Results reported for AY 2018-2019    # of sections 8  # of instructors 5

Course Coordinator: Jan English-Lueck    E-mail: Jan.English-Lueck@sjsu.edu

Department Chair: Roberto Gonzalez    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 GELO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?

GELO 1: Students shall be able to compare systematically the ideas, values, images, cultural artifacts, economic structures, technological developments, or attitudes of people from more than one culture outside the U.S.

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

Five faculty taught this course in AY 18-19: Drs. Jennifer Anderson, Gisele Bousquet, Jan English-Lueck, Quincy McCrary and Jay Ou. Bousquet and Ou were teaching the course for the first time. Drs. McCrary and Anderson taught the courses in person and online. Hence, we had one section of online activity in this course in Fall 2018 and in Spring 2019. This shift constituted the major experiment of the year. We had created a 3rd edition of the common reader for the class, Emerging Global Cultures, with Pearson, but they are discontinuing textbook production next year.

We used a variety of activities to imbed questions to assess student learning on GELO 1. Dr. Anderson employs a set of readings and PowerPoint-based lectures the draw on cross-cultural comparisons. Students answer questions on the readings and lectures in exams; and these answers are the basis of assessment. Students in the online class showed greater proficiency than her in person class. Dr. Anderson attributes this fact to the greater difficulty of getting in to an online course without having priority registration. So the students in her online course were a priori higher performers. As in other sections, the main project of the course is a commodity chain exploration and paper. In this assignment, also called the global alternative project, students form groups to do collective research on global commodities and examine the environmental, health, and labor issues associated with the commodity. Although a team project, each student writes an individual paper, often based on a particular part of the world. For example, students examining tobacco production might look at China, Brazil, and Indonesia, exploring the social context for production in each place. In this project students often produce multiple drafts incorporating peer and professorial feedback in producing their papers. Students are approaching proficiency in this task. Students engage in team efforts to do a team presentation comparing the social contexts for the production of the
commodity under review. In this task, Dr. Anderson points out that they are producing excellent commodity chain presentations, both individually and collectively. Online students produce individual presentations with PowerPoint but must choose another online medium for group presentation such as a Facebook page, Prezi presentation or blog. Dr. Bousquet used reading-based discussion questions, and an essay that asked which global communities were experiencing climate change. Dr. Bousquet asked the students to consider the impact of climate change on indigenous communities, and uses the text, *Fierce Climate, Sacred Ground: An Ethnography of Climate Change in Shishmaref, Alaska* as a starting point for discussion. The students engage in comparative discussion, examining the impact of climate change in diverse indigenous cultures, including Papua New Guinea, Samoa, and the countries containing the Amazon rain forest. Dr. Bousquet indicated that by the end of her module the students showed a good grasp of the key concepts. Dr. English-Lueck also uses the global alternative project as a way to engage students in secondary research on particular commodities’ production, use, and disposal. Students create a list of potential commodities, which must be global in scope, produce an identifiable harm (environmental, health, or labor), and suggest a plausible alternative. As with Dr. Anderson, individual students produce multiple drafts of secondary research papers based in different parts of the world. They create a collective video which is shown on the last day of class in a global alternative film Festival. Particularly with ample peer and professorial feedback most students are approaching proficiency in being able to engage in comparative analysis. In addition, the students read three ethnographic case studies: a study of consumption in China; a comparative analysis of instant noodle production and consumption in Japan, the United States, and Papua New Guinea; and an examination of tourism in the global sapphire trade out of Madagascar. Essay questions make it clear that most students are able to engage in comparative analysis at a good level. Dr. McCrary also uses the commodity chain analysis project and embeds essay questions to highlight the relationship between the core and the periphery in the global world system. This year he includes such embedded questions earlier than the final so that he can give ample feedback in the midterm. As a result of this new practice he sees better performance in articulating comparative cultural analysis and being able to communicate such analysis effectively by the end of the class. Dr. Ou used the common reader, but also used a short textbook on globalization, and an ethnography on shipping and global infrastructure. He also asked students to articulate a global commodity chain and document it in a paper. He was not able to provide data assessing the performance of the students on this comparative task.

**Dr. Anderson does not intend to change her format for assessing cross-cultural comparisons. The group is reviewing alternative texts for use in the course is a common framework, now that the Pearson textbook is not available. Dr. Bousquet was satisfied with the arc of student learning in her course. She comments that they were able to consider “the varying effects of climate change on people’s and conditions historically and geographically different from their own and express their growing understanding in the discussions and on the final exam.” Similarly, Dr. English-Lueck found the overall structure of inquiry to be effective. Students used the Canvas learning environment effectively. Statistics for accessing readings and video lectures indicated that students were using their resources to prepare for exams. Given that the Pearson reading collection will not be available, and she found the students to be challenged to read three ethnographies in addition to the core readings, she will revise some of the modules to make more room for policy issues such as immigration and responses to climate change, and take away some of the examples presented from business anthropology. Dr. McCrary would like to continue teaching the course, especially the online course, in the same way to ensure that the improvements in student learning are an artifact of the structure of the course rather than a distinctive population. No information is available from Dr. Ou.**
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?
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.

None of the sections had enrollments exceeding the recommended maximum enrollment by more than 10%.