**General Education Annual Course Assessment Form**

Course Number/Title:  METR 113/Atmospheric Pollution  GE Area:  R

Results reported for:  AY 12-13  # of sections: 1  # of instructors: 1

Course Coordinator:  Alison Bridger (as dept chair)  E-mail: Alison.Bridger@sjsu.edu

Department Chair:  Alison Bridger  College:  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**, 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 SLO(s) were assessed for the course during the AY?**

   SLO3: “A student should be able to apply a scientific approach to answer questions about the earth and environment”. Raw data is stored in the chair’s office/assessment data shelf (COADS).

   This is the first time that SLO#3 has been assessed.

2. **What were the results of the assessment of this course? What were the lessons learned from the assessment?**

   In a department assessment retreat in January 2012, faculty discussed assessment at all levels, including in GE. Faculty decided to have an “assessment week” in which assessment activities would be conducted in all GE classes in one week. During AY 12-13, this was the week of 22-26, 2013. In the meeting, faculty developed a set of questions to assess the SLOs. We designed a question to address SLO#3 in our SJSU Studies class MET 113 (Pollution).

   In MET 113, the following question was posed: “What is the evidence that humans have had anything to do with pollution changes over the past 50 years?” Faculty also discussed the elements that would be needed in a student’s response in order to qualify as “meeting” the SLO.

   Data was gathered in one section of MET 113 during Spring 12. Answers were graded in three categories: “meets expectations”, “does not meet expectations”, or “partial” (typically indicating that the student had an incomplete understanding, but was not clueless). In the class (30 responses), 14 met expectations (47%), 11 partially met expectations (37%), and only 5 (17%) did not meet expectations. In other words, 25 of 30 students responding had at least some (correct) sense of the answer, whereas only 5 of 30 did not satisfy this learning outcome. Thus a majority of students *did* meet the learning outcome, at least partially. Further, the largest group was those students who fully met expectations (14-11-5).
In summary, we believe that our teaching of this course continues to be successful in teaching students how to use the scientific approach to answer questions about the earth and environment (in this case about atmospheric pollution).

(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.)

The faculty will discuss the above results above in an assessment meeting this fall. Based on the statistics reported above, other classes will need more attention than this one.

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?

The chair is satisfied that this course is being delivered with full and appropriate attention to all area “R” goals, SLOs, content, support, and assessment.