Annual Assessment Report 2021-2022

BS Anthropology: Applied Anthropology, Archeology, General Anthropology

Geography & Anthropology

College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences

CONTACT
Name of Program Assessment Lead Lin Wu & Katherine Kinkopf
Name of Person Completing Report Lin Wu & Katherine Kinkopf

DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION No

DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES
How were the program's SLOs developed? (select all that apply)
- o We do not have disciplinary accreditation but drew from our disciplinary/professional organizations, and developed our SLOs as a program/department.
- o We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

Other than the CPP Catalog and the Office of Assessment and Program Review website, where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.
- Department Website - provide URL: https://www.cpp.edu/class/geographyanthropology/docs/anthropology-program-andstudent-learningoutcome1.pdf
- Published in alternative place. Please specify: Printed SLOs department entrance flyer rack near Bldg. 5-150

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2021-2022

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2021-2022.** This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?

- 1

How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2021-2022?

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2021-2022

Please list the SLOs examined

- SLO #1: SLO 4a: Students will be able to organize data in a paradigm. SLO 4b: Students will be able to use model to evaluate

Student Learning Outcome (SLO): SLO 4a: Students will be able to organize data in a paradigm. SLO 4b: Students will be able to use model to evaluate

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
• Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)		
• Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.) • Scored direct evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meanings of findings for direct evidence	• Portfolio/E portfolio of student work • Assignment/exam/paper as part of regular coursework • Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc)	• Used rubric or scoring guide
• Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.) • Scored indirect evidence of student learning • Interpreted and made meanings of findings for indirect evidence	• Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement • Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self assessment) on their SLO achievement)	
• Discussed assessment results to make program decisions to improve SLO achievement (e.g., design new course, modify assignments, etc.)		
• Implemented closing the loop improvement strategies to improve SLO achievement		

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
16	Proportion of reaching M, D, I levels with each criterion	Yes	Our students are meeting the expected level of Developing Mastery (D) as outlined in our curriculum matrix; we developed a rubric to score our artifacts by adapting the American Association of Colleges and Universities rubrics for problem solving and critical thinking, which are closely related to our Anthropology SLO 4(a,b). We found that a majority of our students artifacts met the criteria for Mastery in the lower order learning outcomes (e.g., "Define and identify sources of archaeological data"), however in the higher order aspects of the learning outcomes, such as articulating a hypothesis or research question and proposing appropriate methods for data collection and analysis, the scored artifacts were uniformly distributed across Mastery, Development, and Introductory level achievement. We interpreted this as having two roots, (1) the preparation of students across all three options to think about an archaeological dataset in a complex manner, and (2) the textbook and pedagogical approaches that could accommodate students at all these levels. In particular, we noticed that preparation for this SLO is strongest in courses that are not necessarily required of all students (courses in the major options). We agreed that including a greater emphasis on assignments that work towards Mastery in SLO 4 in additional courses would be ideal, and that this should be communicated also to temporary instructional faculty, not only tenure track faculty. We also recognized that SLO4 is not supposed to achieve Mastery level in the course that is used for assessment, and we look forward to comparing our results to courses where Mastery is expected for SLO4. The two faculty who teach the course used for SLO4 assessment, also agreed that changing the textbook and altering the pedagogical techniques employed would be a generative exercise and implemented these changes for the Fall 2022 semester.

IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2021-2022? Select all that apply.

- Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum matrix, rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)
- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)
- Program curricular changes (e.g., course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)

Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.

- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee
- College curriculum committee
- College assessment committee
- Students

The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2021-2022 so that others may learn from your experiences.

We found that using Canvas to collect assignments that were used as artifacts for analysis in our assessment plan was ideal because they could easily be exported and anonymized for faculty evaluation. Canvas is also an ideal environment for sharing and using complex rubrics for course assessment and SLO assessment. Implementing high quality rubrics during courses, where they closely align with SLO assessment rubrics is ideal and improves student understanding of rubric criteria and we believe would improve outcomes for students' work and achievement of SLOs.

CPP's GI2025 goals What assessment-related efforts do you already implement, or would implement to support the campus' diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts? (e.g., planned or current disaggregation of assessment data by race/ethnicity, etc.) Undergraduate programs may wish to refer to CPP's GI2025 goals. (Not Mandatory)

Tenure-track faculty teaching courses with higher-than-expected equity gaps are implementing strategies to reduce and improve equity gaps and DFW rates in courses with high impact (number of students enrolled, higher rates of DFW). We plan to consider equity gaps in our assessment of SLOs and PLOs next year (if we have the access to the data). In general, our major-required "Mastery" courses have very small equity gaps between URM/Non- URM, Pell/Non-Pell, and First-Gen/Non-First Gen groups. Most courses with equity gaps larger than 0.25 are GE courses with higher enrollment and in the Area B.

Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?

- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found <u>here</u>. To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

Assessment Plan

Yes

Curriculum Matrix

Yes

If you would like us to review other assessment documents such as your evidence (e.g., assignment, survey, interview questions etc.) or scoring rubric, please upload/provide them. (Select all that apply)

- Rubric