## Assessment Overview

**Discipline/Program Name:** Anthropology  
**Assessment Year:** 2009-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strength of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding of Anthropology</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test; Ground vs. On Line Comparison</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>This is the first year this outcome has been assessed.</td>
<td>Students who completed both pre and post-tests will show an 80% maintained or improved score.</td>
<td>91.0% avg. pre-test score; 95.4% avg. post-test score; 4.4% avg. improvement; 5.6% GND-ONL improve</td>
<td>Strong; Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Methodologies and Applications</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test; Ground vs. On Line Comparison</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>This is the first year this outcome has been assessed.</td>
<td>Students who completed both pre and post-tests will show an 80% maintained or improved score.</td>
<td>43.3% avg. pre-test score; 68.5% avg. post-test score; 25.2% avg. improvement; 5.3% GND-ONL improve</td>
<td>Weak; Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Diversity and Global Awareness</td>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>Pre-Post Test; Ground vs. On Line Comparison</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>This is the first year this outcome has</td>
<td>Students who</td>
<td>55.1% avg. pre-test score;</td>
<td>Weak; Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Description of Learning Outcome That You Have Measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Education</th>
<th>Pre-Post Test; Ground vs. On Line Comparison</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>This is the first year this outcome has been assessed.</th>
<th>test score; 74.0% avg. post-test score; 18.9% avg. improvement; 1.7% GND-ONL improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Recommendation
Complete this Assessment Overview Table **after** you have completed your Assessment Summary in the following template.
**Program / Discipline Assessment Report**

**Program/Discipline:** Anthropology  
**Responsibility:** Preparer, Adjunct Instructor of Anthropology, Deirdre E. Huff  
Supervisor: Program Coordinator of Anthropology, Lori Tigner

---

**Program/Discipline's Mission Statement:**

Anthropology is a multi-cultural discipline that introduces students to ways of life from all parts of the world, compares principles of culture, and continuously assesses students’ comprehension of human behavior. Therefore it is the mission of this program to present learning centered courses which: 1) prepare students for transfer (Core Curriculum Program), 2) meet the needs of the community for life-long learning, and 3) explain diversity and strategies for tolerance in the world today.

---

**Program/Discipline's Assessment History:**

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?

There are two main areas where the evaluative technique has shown improvement needs in both curricula and teaching strategies:

1. To apply basic disciplinary Anthropological concepts and terms more frequently in class with multiple examples and in various discussions in order for students to more clearly comprehend them effectively to raise Anthropology’s highest academic standard.

2. To focus more on the concept of Diversity and Global Awareness and more specifically on concepts of Ethnocentrism and Cultural Relativism in order to encourage the free exchange of ideas in an open environment that embraces honest, respect and to foster trusting relationships and respectful communication based upon students’ understanding of differing world views.

---

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?

While emphasis on the two afore mentioned needs are a continuing effort of the Anthropology program, students are showing an overall improvement in these areas throughout the assessed semester. More specifically, they are using disciplinary Anthropological terms more frequently in class discussions and in assignments. Further, as the semester progresses students become more obviously aware of their personal biases and make appropriate adjustments in their discussions.

This year the program has began comparing data between ground and online courses to determine if there are any noticeable differences in student learning associated with differing teaching techniques and learning styles. And while there is a slight difference between the two, further analysis as well as closer long-term evaluation will be conducted to define the reason for this outcome. Please see section outcomes for more details and data.

---

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?
Historically the Anthropology Program has utilized three measurable student outcomes related to three disciplinary outcomes in the assessment process. However, due to new requirements of the Assessments Committee that participating programs assess at least two General Education and at least two Disciplinary/Program outcomes, the Anthropology Program has complied by developing the outcomes reflected in this report.

Further, the Anthropology Program has historically utilized two assessment techniques to evaluate course related knowledge and skills. The first, and continually successful is the Pre-Post Test technique. Due to that, we will continue to utilize and improve upon that tool. However, it is important to note that a new pre-and post-test was designed this academic year with new questions reflecting the new program outcomes which will result in differing data than historically reported.

A second change made to historical assessments techniques is the elimination of the course-end student survey as it has proved ineffective in clearly assessing course related knowledge and skills. So for 2008-2009 the Program Coordinator has decided to abandon that technique. For 2009-2010, new classroom assessment techniques based upon current best practices will be explored that will better serve program assessment needs. Please see Current Academic Year Assessment Plan for more information.

Because of the changes made to the Anthropology Programs Assessment requirements mentioned above, no historical data will be traced due to the fact that any similar data that may exist will be ineffectively tracked.

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)

These results will be shared with all Anthropology faculty, including full-time and part-time Anthropology instructors, as well as the Social Sciences Department Chair and the Assessment Committee. At this juncture, there are no plans to make alterations to who is informed of this programs’ assessment in the future.
Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary
Previous Academic Year: 2008-2009

Please duplicate or remove the tables on the following pages for each outcome you have assessed. If there are five outcomes in the last year, use/create five tables. (For your convenience, four tables have been generated, two Discipline/Program related and two General Education related.)

(To select an entire table, hover over part of the table; an icon should appear with four arrows in the table’s upper-left corner ... click on it. You can also drag over all the cells of the table to select it.) Once selected, choose Edit>Copy, click in the space immediately following the table, and choose Edit>Paste.
### Outcome #: 1

**Outcome Type**: General Ed; Other

**Outcome Title**: Disciplinary Understanding of Anthropology

**Outcome Description**:
Students will understand the discipline of Anthropology is the study of humanity from its origins to its current worldwide diversity.

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

**Description of assessment process**

1. Pre/Post Test and Ground and Online Course Score Comparison
2. Improvement in the score of individual questions addressing this outcome between the pre and post test. Ground and Online Comparison to determine what noticeable differences exist associated with differing teaching techniques and learning styles.
3. Each Semester (Spring); Based upon Committee recommendations and historical success of program’s assessment process.
4. 51 students made up the sample size.

**Results**

SPSS for Windows was used to compare specifically designated Learning Objective #1 pre- and post-test student responses in a repeated-measures design. Data from both pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis, yet only when scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both pre- and post-tests were collected from 51 students. For this learning outcome, the average percentage score of the post-test was 95.4% and the average percentage score of the pre-test was 91.0%. Therefore, pre-post-test results for Outcome #1 showed a 4.4% improvement in student understanding of the outcome concept. Comparison of Ground and Online Courses improvement rate showed a difference of 8.3%. Please see graphs.

**What did the department learn?**

1) Overall student performance exceeded the 80% benchmark by a margin of 11 to 15.4% between the pre-and post-tests, with an improvement of individual student performance of 4.4%. Ground and Online Course score differences are significant enough to examine, however, to what end is undeterminable at this point.
2) This outcome has not been historically measured. Please see Assessment History for more information.
3) Multiple measures were not used.

**Student performance summary**

1) The program rates student performance related to these outcomes as strong.
2) Although the results of this outcome were strong, the program will reevaluate and most likely alter its benchmark for success to one more realistic and more accurately measurable as well as
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? one that is more closely linked to the learning outcome. Best practices in assessment techniques will be evaluated to better measure comparison between ground and online course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome #:</strong> 2</th>
<th><strong>Outcome Title:</strong> Methodologies and Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding):</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline/Program:</strong> General Ed; Other</td>
<td>That students understand how Anthropologists utilize the techniques and theories of the discipline to problem solving within academia and applied fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>General Education</strong> outcome (choose by bolding): Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark for success</strong></td>
<td>1) Students who completed both pre and post-tests will show an 80% maintained or improved score in performance of specific pre and post-test questions designated to measure this learning outcome. This result would confirm that students grasped an understanding of what Anthropologists and how they study humanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark. 2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?</td>
<td>2) Historically this has been the benchmark set by Program Coordinators for similar outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of assessment process:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)? 2) How do these methods show students are learning? 3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why? 4) How many students made up the sample size?</td>
<td>SPSS for Windows was used to compare specifically designated Learning Objective #1 pre- and post-test student responses in a repeated-measures design. Data from both pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis, yet only when scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both pre- and post-tests were collected from 51 students. For this learning outcome, the average percentage score of the post-test was 68.5% and the average percentage score of the pre-test was 43.3%. Therefore, pre-post-test results for Outcome #2 showed a 25.2% improvement in student understanding of the outcome concept. Comparison of Ground and Online Courses improvement rate showed a 5.3% difference. Please see graphs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What did the department learn?</strong></td>
<td>1) Overall student performance fell below the 80% benchmark by a margin of 36.7 to 11.5% between the pre-and post-tests. However, there was an improvement of individual student performance of 25.2%. Ground and Online Course score differences are measurably important, however, to what end is undeterminable at this point. 2) This outcome has not been historically measured. Please see Assessment History for more information. 3) Multiple measures were not used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark? 2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable? 3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student performance summary</strong></td>
<td>1) The program rates student performance related to these outcomes as weak based upon the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?  
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? | benchmark set, yet are encouraged by the improvement rates of both assessments.  
2) Due to the results of this outcome, the program will reevaluate and most likely alter its benchmark for success to one more realistic and more accurately measurable as well as one that is more closely linked to the learning outcome. Best practices in assessment techniques will be evaluated to better measure comparison between ground and online course. |
### Outcome #: 3

**Outcome Type** (choose by bolding): Discipline/Program; **General Ed**; Other

If **General Education** outcome (choose by bolding): Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; **Diversity and Global Awareness**; Leadership and Teamwork

---

**Outcome Title:** Diversity and Global Awareness

**Outcome Description:**

Diversity and Global Awareness is defined where students will demonstrate knowledge, appreciation and understanding of individual and social responsibility, good citizenship, and diverse cultural customs, beliefs, traditions and lifestyles.

As a note, the Anthropological concept of, *Cultural Relativism*, is very closely related to Diversity and Global Awareness and as such, is explored within the General Education outcome data. In the future, Anthropology will designate this concept as a new disciplinary outcome and measure its data as such. The program defines cultural relativism as where students will understand the approach that stresses the importance of analyzing cultures in their own terms, rather than in terms of the their own culture.

---

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) Students who completed both pre and post-tests will show an 80% maintained or improved score in performance of specific pre and post-test questions designated to measure this learning outcome. This result would confirm that students grasped the concept of how differing cultures are from one another and coexist peacefully despite those differences.
2) Historically this has been the benchmark set by Program Coordinators for similar outcomes.

---

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1. Pre/Post Test and Ground and Online Course Score Comparison
2. Improvement in the score of individual questions addressing this outcome between the pre and post test. Ground and Online Comparison to determine what noticeable differences exist associated with differing teaching techniques and learning styles.
3. Each Semester (Spring); Based upon Committee recommendations and historical success of program’s assessment process.
4. 51 students made up the sample size.

---

**Results**

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

SPSS for Windows was used to compare specifically designated Learning Objective #1 pre- and post-test student responses in a repeated-measures design. Data from both pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis, yet only when scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both pre- and post-tests were collected from 51 students. For this learning outcome, the average percentage score of the post-test was 74.0% and the average percentage score of the pre-test was 55.1%. Therefore, pre-post-test results for Outcome #3 showed an 18.9% improvement in student understanding of the outcome concept. Comparison of Ground and Online Courses improvement rate showed a 1.7% difference. Please see graphs.

---

**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?

1) Overall student performance fell below the 80% benchmark by a margin of 24.9 to 6% between the pre-and post-tests. However, there was an improvement of individual student performance of 18.9%. Ground and Online Course score differences are not significant enough to measure differences in
| 2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable? | teaching and learning styles. |
| 3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other? | 2) This outcome has not been historically measured. Please see Assessment History for more information. |
| | 3) Multiple measures were not used. |

| **Student performance summary** |
| 1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)? | **1)** The program rates student performance related to these outcomes as weak based upon the benchmark set, yet are encouraged by the improvement rates of the pre-post test assessments. |
| 2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? | **2)** Due to the results of this outcome, the program will reevaluate and most likely alter its benchmark for success to one more realistic and more accurately measurable as well as one that is more closely linked to the learning outcome. Best practices in assessment techniques will be evaluated to better measure comparison between ground and online course. |
### Outcome #: 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type (choose by bolding):</th>
<th>Discipline/Program; <strong>General Ed</strong>; Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If <strong>General Education</strong> outcome (choose by bolding):</td>
<td>Communication; Critical Thinking; <strong>Quantitative Reasoning</strong>; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Title: Quantitative Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historically reported as <em>Critical Thinking</em>, based upon a less mathematical approach and a more conceptual one to its definition where students will develop the skills necessary to understand and apply mathematical concepts and reasoning and to analyze and interpret various types of data, <em>Quantitative Reasoning</em>, a more accurate term is measured where students will demonstrate the ability to analyze, synthesize, evaluate, make decisions, think critically and creatively, solve problems effectively; and apply and extend knowledge to new environments and situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark for success

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.  
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

| 1) Students who completed both pre and post-tests will show an 80% maintained or improved score in performance of specific pre and post-test questions designated to measure this learning outcome. This result would confirm that students will be able to evaluate differing concepts and outcomes and how to best to apply knowledge learned from them.  |
| 2) Historically this has been the benchmark set by Program Coordinators for similar outcomes |

### Description of assessment process:

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?  
2) How do these methods show students are learning?  
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?  
4) How many students made up the sample size?

| 1. Pre/Post Test and Ground and Online Course Score Comparison  |
| 2. Improvement in the score of individual questions addressing this outcome between the pre and post test. Ground and Online Comparison to determine what noticeable differences exist associated with differing teaching techniques and learning styles.  |
| 3. Each Semester (Spring); Based upon Committee recommendations and historical success of program’s assessment process.  |
| 4. 51 students made up the sample size. |

### Results

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

| SPSS for Windows was used to compare specifically designated Learning Objective #1 pre- and post-test student responses in a repeated-measures design. Data from both pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis, yet only when scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both pre- and post-tests were collected from 51 students. For this learning outcome, the average percentage score of the post-test was 78.8% and the average percentage score of the pre-test was 75.2%. Therefore, pre-post-test results for Outcome #4 showed a 3.6% improvement in student understanding of the outcome concept. Comparison of Ground and Online Courses improvement rate showed a -0.8% difference. Please see graphs. |

### What did the department learn?

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?  
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?  
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

| 1) Overall student performance fell below the 80% benchmark by a margin of 4.8 to 1.2% between the pre-and post-tests. However, there was an improvement of individual student performance of 3.6%. Ground and Online Course score differences are not significant enough to measure differences in teaching and learning styles.  |
| 2) This outcome has not been historically measured. Please see Assessment History for more information.  |
| 3) Multiple measures were not used. |

### Student performance summary

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate

<p>| 1) The program rates student performance related to these outcomes as weak based upon the benchmark set and the improvement rates of both assessments. 2) Due to the results of this |
| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?</td>
<td>2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? The program will reevaluate and most likely alter its benchmark for success to one more realistic and more accurately measurable as well as one that is more closely linked to the learning outcome. Best practices in assessment techniques will be evaluated to better measure comparison between ground and online course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

- Your program may wish to examine how retention differs among sections of an important course or you may choose to do an analysis of grade inflation across courses within your program/discipline. Such items aren’t truly student outcomes, but they certainly affect learning. As such, these outcomes will be classified as "Other" in the summary you create next year. (Measuring such outcomes is purely optional.)

- Two or more instruments of measuring an objective may provide greater clarity and validity, but only one is required. The department or program makes the decision. The Program Assessment committee and deans are available for consultation.

- In the past, some programs have been identified purely by prefix or in some cases by the type of section offered. Sometimes, a very limited pool of students have been available for such a program to assess, or the program lacks full-time faculty to plan, assess, and report outcomes. If your program has such difficulties, please contact either the Program Assessment committee’s chair or your School’s Program Assessment committee representative. We will work with you to find a solution.

- CTE programs with external accreditation may use the accreditation report to in addition or in lieu of these forms, please contact the Program Assessment committee representative if this format is desired. In absence of this contact, these forms are expected.

- Outcomes are to be measured annually. Exceptions are made with VPI approval for outcomes that clearly need a less (or more) frequent review.

**Outcome minimums**

- At least two outcomes are to be program/discipline-related.
- At least two outcomes are to be General Education in nature. One General Education outcome must be continued from the prior year to develop a historical trend. General Education outcomes need to be assessed and reported annually, regardless of the frequency of reporting for other outcomes.
- Both outcomes above are classified as "student learning" outcomes, requiring benchmarks and analysis. It is strongly recommended that you use the table provided in Part 1 of this report for this function. Definitions and examples of these outcomes are provided in Appendix A at the end of this document. Your Program Assessment committee is available to assist.
- An assessment report is requested annually. Such a report may only consist of a report on General Education outcomes and a plan summarizing where your program is in an assessment with multi-year frequency.
Current Academic Year: 2009-2010

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
   The four current learning outcomes outlined in part 1 will remain the same. However, the Program Coordinator will evaluate other possible General Education and Disciplinary outcomes based upon current best practices to possibly add to these.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
   The pre-and post-test assessment technique will remain for the four current learning outcomes outlined in part 1. However, as noted in the Assessment History the Program Coordinator will evaluate other possible assessment techniques based upon current best practices to better measure student performance and improvement. Further, best practices in assessment techniques will be evaluated to better measure comparison between ground and online course.

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)
   As indicated in part 1, the historically standard 80% benchmark will be reevaluated and replace with those more realistic and that more accurately measure student performance as well as ones that are more closely linked to the learning outcomes.

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)
   Yes. Please see attached budget worksheet.

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Cheyne Bamford: cheyne.bamford@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.