Discipline	Course Number	Title
Anthropology	265	ANT 265 02/14/2019- Introduction to Forensic Anthropology
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Social Science	Christopher Barrett
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

   No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

   3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

   5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify what Forensic Anthropology is, how it differs from other disciplines, and how it has impacted the Forensic Sciences.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Exam

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2017

    o Course section(s)/other population: All sections

    o Number students to be assessed: All students

    o How the assessment will be scored: Rubric

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will provide correct responses on 75% or more of the exam questions.

- o Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
25	25

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

All of the students enrolled in the course completed the exam.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Students took the exam during scheduled class time.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

This outcome was measured on Exam 1, which consisted of 50 multiple choice questions. The exam was graded using a grading key.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The class average for Exam 1 was 83.4%; only three students received a grade of less than 75% (87.5% of students received a 75% or higher). Of the multiple-choice questions on the exam which students missed at a frequency of 60% or greater, one question dealt with decomposition and estimating time since death, one question dealt with skeletal biology, and one dealt with dental anatomy. None of the questions regarding the discipline of forensic anthropology and its impact on the forensic sciences were missed at greater than a 60% frequency.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

> Students were able to define Forensic Anthropology, explain what the discipline does, and identify specific contributions that are made to forensic investigations by Forensic Anthropologists.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

> Student responses on questions that deal with the nature of Forensic Anthropology on the Mid-Term indicated that they understood what Forensic Anthropology is (and isn't). If anything, many students have trouble understanding why it is considered a type of Anthropology and not another kind of forensic science. This is a minor fault, and one that might be addressed by contrasting Forensic Anthropology with other sub-disciplines within Anthropology.

Outcome 2: Identify the methods used to determine the post-mortem interval (time since death) and identify appropriate methods for scene investigation/recovery.

- Assessment Plan

   o Assessment Tool: Group Lab Activity

   o Assessment Date: Fall 2017

   o Course section(s)/other population: All sections

   o Number students to be assessed: All students

   o How the assessment will be scored: Rubric

   o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher

   o Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
25	21

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Four students enrolled in the class did not submit a completed assignment.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

Instructions for each Lab and for the Group Project were provided to students on Blackboard at the beginning of the semester. Students were responsible for submitting section 1 and 2 of the Group Project to Blackboard on separate due dates throughout the semester.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Both the 1st and 2nd parts of the Group Project were graded using a rubric.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>

For the initial assessment (what was essentially a rough draft) 73.6% of students received a score of 75% or better on their description of a scene recovery and discussion of the postmortem interval. For the final project 90.9% of students received a score of 75% or better on the section that pertained to post-mortem interval and scene investigation / recovery. The results for the initial assessment also include several students who failed to submit a summary of recovery. Looking at just those students who completed that portion of the assignment, 82.3% received a 75% or better.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Based on the results of the mid-term exam, lab activities, and project, students understood the sequence of post-mortem stages, the physical indicators associated with each stage, and some of the limitations inherent in the estimation of post-mortem interval.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

> There are two areas that have room for improvement. Many students were overly confident in their estimates, despite demonstrating at least some understanding of the limitations of these methods. Students also tended to ignore the results of their estimates of post-mortem interval when it did not agree with other aspects of their analysis. A lab (or online activity) which involved estimating postmortem interval for a number of different sites and situations might provide the added exposure to these concepts necessary to improve performance.

Outcome 3: Identify human skeletal and dental elements used in the construction of a Biological Profile and differentiate human skeletal and dental elements from non-human skeletal and dental elements.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Lab Activity

    o Assessment Date: Fall 2017

    o Course section(s)/other population: All sections

    o Number students to be assessed: All students

    o How the assessment will be scored: Rubric

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher

    o Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
25	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One student had dropped the course prior to the 2nd lab. Other students failed to submit Labs 3-6.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All students enrolled in the course and who submitted a completed lab were included in the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Student labs were scored based upon completeness, ability to apply a method correctly, and the accurateness of their conclusions. Labs 2-6 of the course addressed cranial and skeletal anatomy, dental anatomy, and the application of methods for constructing a biological profile. Labs consisted of a pre-lab, to be completed before coming to class, and an in-class portion that involved identifying and measuring skeletal elements, as well as reaching conclusions about aspects of a decedents identity.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The class average for the five (5) labs in the course that dealt with identification of skeletal and dental elements was 87.6%. The majority of students demonstrated correct identification of skeletal and dental elements and features important to methods for construction of a biological profile. The only students not meeting the standard for success failed to complete part of the lab (either the pre-lab or the in-class portion).

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students demonstrated the ability to differentiate the major skeletal elements one from the other, identify important morphological features on these elements, and were capable of correctly identify teeth using the methods discussed in the course textbook.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students did very well on the labs that dealt with bone and teeth. If these is any area that might need improvement, it is the tendency of many students to rely too heavily on the pictures in their textbooks and not the text. This is already addressed in the pre-lab questions (which force students to find specific information relevant to each lab in the text). It might be improved by adding several questions.

Outcome 4: Apply methods for determination/estimation of the Biological Profile, including sex, age, stature, ancestry, and identification of infectious and non-infectious disease.

- Assessment Plan

    o   Assessment Tool: Lab Activities

    o   Assessment Date: Fall 2017

    o   Course section(s)/other population: All sections

    o   Number students to be assessed: All students

    o   How the assessment will be scored: Rubric

    o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher

    o   Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
25	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One student had dropped the course prior to the 2nd lab. Other students failed to submit Labs 3-6.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All students enrolled in the course and who submitted a lab were included in the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Student labs were scored based upon completeness, ability to apply a method correctly, and the accurateness of their conclusions. Labs consisted of a pre-lab, to be completed before coming to class, and an in-class portion that involved identifying and measuring skeletal elements, as well as reaching conclusions about aspects of a decedents identity.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

The class average for the five (5) labs in the course that dealt with application of methods for construction of a biological profile was 87.6%, with only students failing to complete part of the lab (such as the pre-lab) not meeting the standard for success. While the students were successful in being able to correctly determine sex and estimate age, stature, and ancestry, many seemed to "rush" through the lab sections. It would be worthwhile in future course offerings to expand the in-class portions of the lab to include more and varied samples (although this is somewhat limited by the actual specimens available to the class).

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students demonstrated the ability to sex skeletal elements based on both morphological and metric variation, and to utilize "best practices" for estimating stature, age, and ancestry.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

While every student demonstrated the ability to use the methods discussed in lecture and in the labs, many did not provide an estimate of error in their final work, despite this being a separate lecture, an extra credit assignment, and something that was talked about during the class lecture on preparation of the forensic case report. It might be useful to make error estimate a required section of the final report.

Outcome 5: Test hypotheses regarding the identification of an individual from skeletal and dental remains and document conclusions reached through the application of methods.

- Assessment Plan

    o   Assessment Tool: Group Project

    o   Assessment Date: Fall 2017

    o   Course section(s)/other population: All sections

    o   Number students to be assessed: All students

    o   How the assessment will be scored: Rubric

    o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 75% of students will score 75% or higher on the group project

    o   Who will score and analyze the data: Department Faculty

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2018		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
25	23

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

    One student had dropped the course before the due date for the 2nd part of the Group Project and another student failed to submit a completed assignment.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

    All students who submitted work for the 2nd part of the Group Project were included in the assessment.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

The 2nd part of the Group Project was evaluated using a rubric.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>

This was assessed by evaluating the portion of the Group Project that focused on the biological profile and the ability of the student to make a well supported argument for which persons could (or could not) be eliminated from the missing persons list. For the biological profile, 82.6% of students provided an answer that demonstrated competence; 91.3% of students correctly identified the decedent on the missing persons list. Students demonstrated that they understood the process of constructing a biological profile, though many had minor errors in their conclusions and application of methods. The fact that so many students (greater than 90%) were able to arrive at a valid conclusion demonstrates that students were able to test multiple conclusions against their analyses and eliminate those conclusions not supported by evidence.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

The vast majority of students were able to successfully identify the decedent (greater than 80%). Many students, in fact, provided a conclusion in the final report that closely mirrored the answer key.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Some students were overly cautious about the application of methods. A few students interpreted a result that had lower confidence to mean that a particular aspect of the biological profile was indeterminate. This also might be improved (somewhat) by adjusting the Group Project to focus on error estimates and confidence intervals.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

Two changes are warranted by these results. The first is more involved lab work, both in the pre-lab portion of each lab (more questions that force students to better

utilize the text). The second is the chance to work with a greater number of skeletal and dental elements in class. This would give students a better "feel" for the limitations of methods used in the Group Project and Final Practical Exam.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

This course fulfills the academic needs of students fulfilling their MTA social sciences course requirement (the class deals with both human biological variation, but also with the political and legal implications of forensic work). The course also meets requirements of criminal justice and law enforcement majors who require the course for completion of their associates degree.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

This information will be made available to all interested parties in the Department of Social Sciences and the WCC Division of Arts and Sciences.

4.
Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Assignments	I plan on adding additional pre-lab quesitons about post-mortem interval for several of the labs. I also plan to make post-mortem interval and error estimates for aspects of the biological profile required sections of the Group Project.	While each learning outcome met the criteria of success, both post-mortem interval and the application of error estimates for the biological profile were areas that could improve.	2019

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

6.

III. Attached Files

[ANT265 Assessment Grades for FA18](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Christopher Barrett **Date:** 02/17/2019
Department Chair: Gregg Heidebrink **Date:** 03/01/2019
Dean: Kristin Good **Date:** 03/04/2019
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 03/21/2019