

PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: ANTR

Division: ALSS

Date: 10/7/15

Writer(s): L.W. Hasten

SLO/SAO Point-Person: L.W. Hasten

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
 - 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
 - 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by _____.
-

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

The last Program Review Update was submitted for AY 2011-2012; all statements made in this document use that update as a baseline.

At the time of our last PRU, the ANTR Program was offering 14 sections; now we are offering 16 to 17. Our FTEF allotment has grown from 2.5 to 2.9 and we have consequently filed our first Full Time Faculty Position Request.

The Program has brought its curriculum into compliance with the C-ID system and now offers an AA-T in Anthropology.

The Anthropology Program at Las Positas College is remarkable for its extensive and invaluable collection of physical assets, which continues to grow into a storehouse rivaling that of any other community college. We are in possession of tens of thousands of dollars worth of osteological reproductions and genuinely ancient stone tools. The Program has recently more than doubled, through the generous donations of Professor Jayne Smithson, its collection of cranial replicas. It's a shame that such a fabulous collection is hidden behind the opaque doors of a classroom cabinet when it should be on display and visible to all in a dedicated teaching space.

While the Program has always been fortunate to have excellent instructors, the recent addition of Professor Kweku Williams has been instrumental in moving our instruction in archaeology from the classroom to field. We are grateful to him for obtaining the dedicated outdoor space we have requested in previous Program Reviews. Professor Williams has also introduced, at his own expense, the lessons in flint-knapping that are typically provided during the course of an undergraduate major in archaeology. He lacks, however, the appropriate space in which to teach this and other laboratory techniques. It is time to move this course (ANTR 2) into a dedicated laboratory classroom along with the others that demand it (ANTR 1L, ANTR 13).

In Fall 2015, the Anthropology Program offered 5 sections of ANTR 1; there were a total of 176 additional enrollment attempts once they were closed - enough to justify the eventual addition of two to three sections. We also offered 2 sections of ANTR 1L, each capped at 25 students, and had 70 additional attempted enrollments; this led to the addition of a third section at the last minute. That section should be a permanent addition to the schedule, soon to be followed by another. We also offered 3 sections of ANTR 3 which saw an additional 78 enrollment attempts after closing. In sum, the Program could easily fill four to five more sections than it currently offers.

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

The last Program Review Update was submitted for AY 2011-2012; all statements made in this document use that update as a baseline.

The only objective achieved by the Program since our last review is the acquisition of dedicated outdoor space in which to conduct instruction in archaeology.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

The Program's goals and plans have not been prioritized. We have had a consistent plan for growth for the past decade which has been specified in each Program Review but we have achieved only those objectives which did not require funding.

D. What are your most important plans (either new or continuing) for next year?

To quote directly from the AY 2011-2012 Program Review Update:

"The Program would like to see action on the three unmet objectives from the previous Program Review (AY 2010):

1. Establish a genuine wet laboratory classroom. The room must be scheduled in a manner that separates classes by a minimum of ½ hour in order to allow instructor-only access.

2. Fully stock a laboratory classroom with microscopes, models, computers, and other necessary equipment for teaching anthropology.”

Additionally, “The Program would appreciate the College or Division taking action on its ongoing need to identify a budget for disposable laboratory classroom supplies.”

We need to add several more sections of ANTR 1 and 1L while expanding our DE offerings to meet increasing demand.

We need to hire a full-time instructor to manage the archaeology and laboratory side of the Program, as well as to be a second point-person for our growing body of students.

We have the potential to become the pre-eminent California community college for teaching anthropology and archaeology. We already have an impressive body of physical assets and the experienced, dedicated staff necessary to building out the Program.

The Program would like to design and offer a summer certificate program in archaeological technology. We’d like to follow the model of Cabrillo College, whose successful ArcTech program qualified students to participate in archaeological fieldwork; this ended only recently when its directors retired. This would bring students from across the state to Las Positas College for the training they need but is so difficult to find.

E. Do plans listed under question (D) connect to this year’s planning priorities (listed below)? If so, explain how they connect.

Planning Priorities for 2015-16

- ***Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards***
- ***Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance***
- ***Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes***
- ***Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.***

Plans listed above are a perfect example of the need for the College to meet the second Planning Priority: “Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance.”

F. Instructional programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion? _X_ yes _no

(This data can be found here: <http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt>)

If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests.

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

Students have seen an increase in course sections, the addition of new adjunct faculty, and the addition of new physical assets to aid teaching and learning.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

- A. Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.**

During AY 2014-2015, an average of 79.3% of students enrolled in ANTR 1 demonstrated proficiency in their ability to deconstruct the biological concept of race. There is no greater service the College can do than to provide its students with the intellectual tools necessary for making their world a wiser and more just place; fundamental to this is a science-based understanding of our common humanity.

- B. Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.**

As the Program regularly sees proficiency rates at 70% or better in all courses, there appears to be little need for specific improvement. We could, however, likely move a considerable number of students in ANTR 1 and 1L courses from proficiency to mastery if provided with a dedicated laboratory classroom that would facilitate more instructional time and more hands-on learning.

- C. Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result of SLO assessment results.**

Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.

The Anthropology Program is moving toward acquiring dedicated laboratory space which, once in use, would have a profound impact on pedagogy.

- D. Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.**

- E. Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compare to face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance education courses.)**

Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services compare to face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)

While the Anthropology Program does offer DE courses, the instructors who teach these courses are adjunct professors who have not been compelled to complete SLO training or conduct SLO-based assessments. Therefore, no SLO data is available for these sections.

F. Did your program discover the need for additional resources (for AY 15-16 or 2016-17) based on the assessment results? YES NO

If yes, please explain.

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (*NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year).*)

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

From a practical point of view, it bears stating that the content of a course's SLOs is directly related to the Program's available resources. No Program will purposely define an SLO that simply cannot be met; therefore, a Program's SLOs are as modest or as ambitious as its budget allows. As we are blessed with excellent instructors, we can easily design and succeed in helping our students master SLOs that involve information literacy. Once we are set up with a dedicated laboratory classroom, however, we can implement SLOs that are geared toward technical proficiency as well.

2. Have your assessment results shown a need for new/revised SLO/SAOs? YES NO

If yes, complete the table below:

Estimated number of courses for which SLOs will be written or revised:	0
Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:	0

- a. What courses or SAOs will your program assess during this academic year (2015-16)?

1, 1L, 2, 3, 4, 5, 12, 13

- b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)	
Fall 2015	0
Spring 2016	3