

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025

Potter College of Arts and Letters	Department of Society, Culture, Crime, and Justice Studies
608 Anthropology Major	
Kate Hudepohl, Anthropology Program Coordinator	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☒ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Program Student Learning Outcome 1

Program Student Learning Outcome	Describe key concepts, methods, and theories in anthropology and its four subdisciplines (cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and archaeology).
Evaluation	Based on reflection of the last three assessment cycles, we are satisfied that Program Student Learning Outcome 1 is still relevant and is measurable. There are no plans to make changes to this outcome in the next assessment cycle. As discussed below, we may decide to modify the criterion for success and/or targets based on review of results after the next assessment cycle.
Measurement Instruments	The measurement instrument for Program Student Learning Outcome 1 is the written essay exam submitted by anthropology majors as part of the mandatory exit experience. The exam is anonymized and evaluated by program faculty as passing on first attempt with a score of at least 2 based on a rubric developed and revised in previous assessment cycles. We are satisfied that the measurement instrument of the written exam is accurately measuring the student learning outcome. The specific questions which students must address on the exam demonstrate broad and detailed knowledge of the discipline. Due to the process by which students draft, hone, and finalize the written exam in the ANTH 499 Senior Seminar, the rise in AI should have minimal if any effect on the validity of results. A rubric for evaluating exams was developed and subsequently revised during previous assessment cycles. The rubric coupled with anonymization of exams allows for a more nuanced and objective evaluation of student performance related to Program Student Learning Outcome 1.
Criteria & Targets	Criteria for success, and the rubric by which it was measured, changed over the 2021/22 – 2023/24 assessment cycle considered in this report. From 2021/22 – 2022/23, the exit exam rubric included only three categories, and the criteria for success was that 80% pass on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better. The criteria for success were increased in the 2023/24 assessment cycle to 100% of students passing the exam on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better, and 30% of students passing with a score of 3 or better. The revised scoring rubric, which added a fourth category, was implemented in the 2023-2024 cycle. We met the target measures of success in all three years with one caveat - in the 2021-22 assessment cycle four students did not submit exit exams. The revised scoring rubric with four categories is relatively new, so we will use the current criteria for success again in the 2025-2026 cycle (100% passing on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better; 30% passing with a score of 3 or better). Based on results from this year and next year, we will discuss whether to revise the criteria and/or target for success starting in the 2026-2027 cycle.

Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> In the three-year review period relevant to this report, no students failed the exam on the first attempt. We are pleased that students met the criteria for success with the first target (80% passing on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better in the 2021/23 assessment cycles; 100% passing on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better in the 2023/24 assessment cycle). We are gratified that when a second target was added in the 2023/24 assessment cycle (30% achieve a score of 3 or better), students slightly exceeded that goal (50%). <u>Conclusions:</u> Several factors contributed to strong student performance. First, the exam submission procedure for students in the ANTH 499 Senior Seminar class was adjusted to include submission of drafts of the four major parts of the exam with opportunity for revisions prior to the final deadline. Second, the ANTH 499 Senior Seminar class went from being an elective class in the major to a major requirement for students declaring the major in and after Fall 2020. Students who completed the seminar performed better on the exit exam. Finally, implementation of anonymized exams and the use of revised rubric reduced unintentional bias and allowed for a more nuanced assessment of student performance. Based on patterns in student exam results, some key anthropological concepts (e.g. relativism) may need additional emphasis in anthropology courses. Part of this performance issue might be explained by inconsistencies in staffing such as delays in replacing faculty and use of adjuncts and visiting faculty to teach core classes. Review of results from past exams will be used to identify core concepts that need additional emphasis in anthropology classes. A significant challenge included the schedule for the completion of the culminating exit experience requirements, including the exit exam, relative to the timeline faculty have to review and assess student work. Another related challenge was scheduling of the exit conversation in which individual students meet separately with the faculty as a whole. Most of the 30-minute conversation is spent reviewing and providing detailed feedback on the student's exit exam. We will continue to explore strategies to balance the needs of students to complete their work and the needs of faculty to have time to assess the work prior to the exit conversation.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	<u>Relevant to Program Student Learning Outcome 1:</u> The revised scoring rubric with four categories is relatively new, so we will use the current criteria for success again in the 2025-2026 cycle (100% passing on the first attempt with a score of 2 or better; 30% passing with a score of 3 or better). Based on results from 2024/25 and 2025/26, we will discuss whether to revise the criteria and/or target for success starting in the 2026-2027 cycle. Program faculty will review results of past exams to identify key anthropological concepts that are consistently misunderstood by students (e.g. relativism). We will use that information to strategize ways to emphasize those core concepts in anthropology courses. As part of this review process, we will consult the curriculum map as both a resource and a means to identify changes that may need to be made to that document. <u>Relevant to all of the Program Student Learning Outcomes:</u> The culminating exit experience, largely housed within ANTH 499 Senior Seminar, is a core part of all three Program Student Learning Outcomes. The timeline for student completion of the exit experience, particularly the exit exam, relative to the faculty review period and individual faculty-student exit conversations is tight. We will continue to explore strategies to balance the needs of students to have time to complete their work and the needs of faculty to have time to assess the work prior to the exit conversation. The anthropology program faculty will begin discussing possible revisions to SLOs and instruments to consider input from a new faculty member in applied cultural anthropology.

--	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Critically synthesize anthropological information and theories in a logical, well-supported, well-written, and appropriately documented paper.
Evaluation	Based on reflection of the last three assessment cycles, we are satisfied that Program Student Learning Outcome 2 is still relevant and is measurable. There are no plans to make changes to this outcome in the next assessment cycle. We plan to increase the program success target to require a higher level of student success in the next assessment cycle.
Measurement Instruments	The measurement instrument for Program Student Learning Outcome 2 is the paper portfolio submitted as part of the mandatory exit experience. The papers are evaluated by program faculty as passing without need of revision with a score of at least 3 based on a rubric developed and revised in previous assessment cycles. We are satisfied that the measurement instrument of the paper portfolio is accurately capturing performance on the student learning outcome. We conclude that anthropology faculty are offering adequate opportunities for students to prepare and receive detailed feedback on researched written assignments of substantial length across a wide range of courses, including those required in different major concentrations. A rubric for evaluating the paper portfolio was developed and subsequently revised during previous assessment cycles in a way similar to the rubric for the exit exam used as the measurement instrument in Program Student Learning Outcome 1. The use of AI may affect the assignment and measurement of this instrument in two ways. First, students may use AI to inappropriately assist in completion of research papers. Second, as one strategy to combat unsanctioned use of AI, faculty may defensively assign fewer papers or alternative assignments. In the upcoming assessment cycle we will need to discuss strategies and alternatives for measuring the existing SLO, adding an additional instrument to offset the effects of AI, or changing this SLO.
Criteria & Targets	The rubric by which the paper portfolio was measured changed over the 2021/22 – 2023/24 assessment cycle. A fourth category was added to the rubric, parallel to the change made to the rubric for Program Student Learning Outcome 1. However, the criteria for success remained constant across the review period with a target of 80% pass without revisions (3 score) and 10% pass with distinction (4 score). We met the target measures of success in all three years. In the next assessment cycle we will increase the program success target to require a higher level of student success: 100% pass without revision (score of at least 3) and 20% pass with distinction (score of 4). We will also discuss the feasibility of requiring three papers. These changes are contingent in part on discussions related to the impact of AI on the measurement instrument as noted above.

Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> Students met the program success target. The results were expected and were comparable across the assessment cycles considered for this report. <u>Conclusions:</u> We conclude that anthropology faculty are offering adequate opportunities for students to prepare and receive detailed feedback on researched written assignments of substantial length across a wide range of courses, including those required in different major concentrations. As noted in a previous section, one challenge we need to address is the effect of AI on the validity of the paper portfolio as a measurement instrument for SLO 2. In the upcoming assessment cycle we will need to discuss strategies and alternatives for measuring the existing SLO. Possible solutions include adding an additional instrument to offset the effects of AI or changing the rubric. If none of those seem feasible, we may need to change Program Student Learning Outcome 2. As with the exit exam (Measurement Instrument 1 for Program Student Learning Outcome 1), a significant challenge included the schedule for the completion of the culminating exit experience requirements, including the paper portfolio, relative to the timeline faculty have to review and assess student work.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	<u>Relevant to Program Student Learning Outcome 2:</u> In the next assessment cycle we will increase the program success target to require a higher level of student success: 100% pass without revision (score of at least 3) and 20% pass with distinction (score of 4). We will also discuss the feasibility of requiring three papers. One challenge we will address in the upcoming cycle is the effect of AI on the validity of the paper portfolio as a measurement instrument for SLO 2. We will discuss strategies and alternatives for measuring the existing SLO. Possible solutions include adding an additional instrument to offset the effects of AI or changing the rubric. If none of those seem feasible, we may need to change Program Student Learning Outcome 2. <u>Relevant to all of the Program Student Learning Outcomes:</u> The culminating exit experience, largely housed withing ANTH 499 Senior Seminar, is a core part of all three Program Student Learning Outcomes. The timeline for student completion of the exit experience, particularly the exit exam, relative to the faculty review period and individual faculty-student exit conversations is tight. We will continue to explore strategies to balance the needs of students to have time to complete their work and the needs of faculty to have time to assess the work prior to the exit conversation. The anthropology program faculty will begin discussing possible revisions to SLOs and instruments to consider input from a new faculty member in applied cultural anthropology.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Apply anthropological concepts, methods, and theories in anthropology-related high-impact practices (e.g., research, service learning, experiential learning, study abroad/away, conference presentation).
Evaluation	Based on reflection of the last three assessment cycles, we are satisfied that Program Student Learning Outcome 3 is still relevant and is measurable. There are no plans to make changes to this outcome in the next assessment cycle. We do plan to implement grading rubric for Measurement Instrument 1 (exit conversation) and develop a more systematic way to collect data for Measurement Instrument 2 (high-impact practices).
Measurement Instruments	There are two measurement instruments for Program Student Learning Outcome 3. Measurement Instrument 1 is the exit conversation that is part of the mandatory exit experience (a direct instrument). Measurement Instrument 2 is numbers of students completing different types of high-impact practices beyond those offered in regular-load courses (indirect instrument). We are satisfied that the measurement instruments are accurately measuring the student learning outcome. We plan to develop a rubric for faculty evaluation of the exit conversation (Instrument 1) that will include a four-point scoring system similar to that used for evaluating exit exams (SLO 1) and exit paper portfolios (SLO 2). In addition, we will discuss how to more efficiently and systematically collect reporting about student participation in high-impact practices (Instrument 2). We will also consider increasing the criteria (one high-impact practice) and/or target (50%) for Instrument 2.
Criteria & Targets	The Criteria for Student Success of Measurement Instrument 1, which has remained the same across all three years considered for this reporting period, was the description and self-assessment of a high-impact practice presented orally to program faculty during the exit conversation. Students were asked to pick one experience and describe how it enriched their educational experience in anthropology and/or their anthropological perspectives, and how they anticipated applying that experience in the future. The target for success of Instrument 1 was 80%. The Criteria for Student Success of Measurement Instrument 2, which has remained the same across all three years considered for this reporting period, was the percentage of students completing at least one high-impact practice outside regular-load courses. The target for success of Instrument 2 was 50%. With the exception of the 2021/22 assessment cycle when exit conversations were not scheduled due to ongoing stress related to the pandemic, students exceeded the program success target for Instrument 1 (oral description and self-assessment during exit conversation of high-impact practice). Students also exceeded the program success target of 50% for Instrument 2 (percentage of students completing at least one high-impact practice outside regular-load courses). As noted above, we plan to develop a rubric for faculty evaluation of the exit conversation (Instrument 1) that will include a four-point scoring system similar to that used for evaluating exit exams (SLO 1) and exit paper portfolios (SLO 2). In addition, we will discuss how to more efficiently and systematically collect reporting about student participation in high-impact practices (Instrument 2). We will also consider increasing the criteria (one high-impact practice) and/or target (50%) for Instrument 2.

Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> The results are as expected. Due to continued stress from COVID, the exit conversation was not held in 2021/22; therefore Measurement Instrument 1 was not assessed in that cycle. However, in 2022/23 and 2023/24 students exceeded the program success target of 80% (100% and 94% respectively). Students have consistently exceeded the program success target for Measurement Instrument 2 in all three years of this reporting period (2021/22 – 2023/24) with scores of 75%, 69%, and 94% respectively. <u>Conclusions:</u> We conclude that anthropology faculty are successful in helping students identify opportunities to participate in anthropology-related high-impact practices outside of regular-load courses, even during years when opportunities were more limited due to the pandemic. The Kentucky Archaeological Survey, the applied service unit that is part of the department, has helped to create additional engagement opportunities for our majors. One challenge related to Measurement Instrument 1 is the need for a more objective way to measure student performance in their description and self-assessment of high-impact practice presented orally to program faculty. We plan to develop a rubric for faculty evaluation of the exit conversation (Instrument 1) that will include a four-point scoring system similar to that used for evaluating exit exams (SLO 1) and exit paper portfolios (SLO 2). A challenge related to Measurement Instrument 2 is the need for a more efficient and systematic way to compile reporting about student participation in high-impact practices. Program faculty will discuss possible solutions and choose one to implement.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	<u>Relevant to Program Student Learning Outcome 3:</u> We plan to develop a rubric for faculty evaluation of the exit conversation (Instrument 1) that will include a four-point scoring system similar to that used for evaluating exit exams (SLO 1) and exit paper portfolios (SLO 2). A rubric will allow a more objective and nuanced assessment of student performance. We will also discuss and implement a more systematic way to collect data for measurement instrument 2 (high- impact practices). <u>Relevant to all of the Program Student Learning Outcomes:</u> The culminating exit experience, largely housed withing ANTH 499 Senior Seminar, is a core part of all three Program Student Learning Outcomes. The timeline for student completion of the exit experience, particularly the exit exam, relative to the faculty review period and individual faculty-student exit conversations is tight. We will continue to explore strategies to balance the needs of students to have time to complete their work and the needs of faculty to have time to assess the work prior to the exit conversation. The anthropology program faculty will begin discussing possible revisions to SLOs and instruments to consider input from a new faculty member in applied cultural anthropology.