

GEC Learning Outcomes (GLOs) Assessment: Civic Engagement

Assessment Type: GEC

Year: AY19

Course: ANTH 201

Learning Outcome: Civic Engagement

Assessment Method/Tool: Anthropology/Sociology Program
Rubric (aligned with GEC Rubric)

Measurement Scale: 3-1

Sample Size: 10

	Proficient (# of students %)		Adequate (# of students %)		Developing (# of students %)	
Identifies real world problems through research & civic engagement.	3	30%	5	50%	2	20%
Analyzes real world problems through research & civic engagement.	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%
Addresses real world problems through research & civic engagement.	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%
Evaluates critically research & field experience to suggest sound solutions.	9	71%	1	9%	1	10%
Means % (based on 10 student sample size)		61%		26%		12%

Benchmark:

85% Institutional benchmark goal for median percentage of students to meet “Proficient” or “Adequate” levels in the GEC

% Achieving Benchmark:

87% percentage of students meeting “Adequate” or “Proficient” levels

Closing the Loop:

1) Summarize the results.

The four criteria were evaluated from three separate assignments: criteria one from a reflection conducted after archaeological fieldwork completed in the first third of the term, criteria 2 and 3 from a reflection following a guest speaker from the CTUIR in the second third of the term, and criteria 4 from an essay question on the final exam. As you can see, a number of students moved up between rankings as the term progressed and they learned more about civic engagement. By the final exam question, when they were asked to evaluate everything they had learned from field work, lab work, the guest speaker, and classroom activities to solve a problem, 81.82% of them were able to do so effectively. This clearly shows an increase in awareness and ability to address, evaluate and solve real world issues as students move through the activities designed to foster this development throughout the term.

2) Account for Results

A) Strengths:

Students performed well in this assessment due to the scaffold approach to measuring their competencies in civic engagement. It is unsurprising that the first measurement [criteria one] taken from an assignment completed at the beginning of the term (week three) had the lowest percent scored as proficient. In contrast, the last measurement [criteria four] taken from the last assignment of the course, had the highest percentage of students scoring proficient. These results show that as students progressed throughout the class, they became more capable in not just identifying real world problems, but critically assessing and considering solutions to them. In each subsequent assignment, students had the advantage of instructor feedback as well as independent research assignments and group discussions to use in their consideration of real world problems associated with archaeology.

B) Challenges: Account for any dips in performance, even if meeting the Target: Was there a dip in any given criterion? Why?

When using multiple assignments, it is expected that a perfect correlation between assessment and outcome will not be feasible. Students perform differently on different assessments for reasons other than their abilities. For example, misunderstanding the directions or the differential pressure felt on final exams (the source of evaluation for criteria 4) versus take-home reflections (the source of evaluation for criteria 1-3) may have influenced student performance. Because of this, students might not have progress in a linear fashion for reasons other than ability to assess civic engagement. The students who scored “developing” under each of the four criteria were not the same student(s). Consequently, rather than 1 or 2 students consistently scoring low on all criteria measured throughout the term, different students struggled with one of the criteria on different assignments. Likewise, in criteria 1-3, one student did not submit the assignment used for criteria 1 and a *different* student did not submit the assignment used for criteria 2 and 3. Consequently, not all students could be evaluated progressively, as they moved through these three assignments used to monitor their

overall growth in civic engagement. Ultimately, these are challenges in interpreting these results.

Action Plan (Academic Program):

The structure of the ANTH201 class, which routinely includes public engagement through active archaeology, works well in assessing student competencies in civic engagement. Larger classes might allow for a more robust analysis but, in my opinion, this course is achieving what it intends to achieve. Not only does it introduce archaeology students to civic engagement concepts important for them to consider throughout their studies, it also provides non-archaeology students with a broad understanding of how different social sciences address civic engagement in unique ways. Since I am a Visiting Assistant Professor I cannot personally carry through a commitment to continue building this course; however, I will share these results with the rest of my department and the faculty member who routinely teaches this class.

AY20 Civic Engagement Improvement Plan Recommendation

(Office of the Vice Provost for Academic Quality)

ANTH/SOC's programmatic approach to Civic Engagement should be used as a model for all programs in terms of effective assignment design and sequencing of steps, with a clear, thorough, insightful analysis of results, indicating how the program's Civic Engagement outcome aligns well with its Civic Engagement outcome and criteria in this General Education course.

The AY20 ANTH/SOC Gen Ed Civic Engagement Improvement Plan: The program should develop a common approach to "Identifies real world problems through research & civic engagement" in order to improve student performance where the dip is most noticeable in the criteria. The AY20 Gen Ed CE Improvement Plan should report on the results of this effort and provide data on a course where the improvements have been operationalized.