

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Anthropology	290	ANT 290 03/31/2025- International Studies in Anthropology
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Social Sciences
Faculty Preparer		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 the methods and theories employed by anthropologists in the undertaking of fieldwork and explain their relevance to the discipline of Anthropology.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Outcome-related departmental exam questions
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2025
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 70% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental 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)
		2023

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
13	12

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 elected to audit the course after the beginning of the semester and chose not to take Quiz 2.

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 from the Summer 2023 section 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 Learning Outcome 1 was assessed using Quiz 2, which dealt entirely with archaeological theory and methods. Each student received five (5) random questions from a pool of eighteen (18) possible questions.

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: No
Of the 12 students who took Quiz 2, 8 out of 12 (66%) answered at least 4 out of 5 questions correctly. The standard of success was not met.

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

Students demonstrated that they understood the very basic fundamentals of archaeological theory; most students could identify the correct definition of a site and the limitations of dating methods, like carbon-14.

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 were less successful identifying the specific methods used in archaeological excavation, and many students struggled to correctly identify the various phases of excavation and the specific methods used.

Outcome 2: Analyze how your travel and participation affected your understanding of the local culture.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Outcome-related departmental exam questions
 - Assessment Date: Spring/Summer 2025
 - Course section(s)/other population: All
 - Number students to be assessed: All
 - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 70% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental 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)
		2023

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
13	11

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.

Eleven out of 13 students completed the Reflective Paper, with one student deciding to audit the course rather than complete the course assignments and one who failed to submit the paper by the due date and received a zero.

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 from the Summer 2023 section 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 Learning Outcome 2 was assessed using Question #1 from the Reflective Paper instead of the exam questions listed in the assessment plan, as the paper better addressed this outcome. This outcome was assessed separately from the grading rubric used for the course. Student responses were evaluated on a scale from 1-10, with 1 being unacceptable, and 10 exceeding all expectations.

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

Of the 11 students who completed the paper, 9 out of 11 received a 7 or higher (81.8%), which exceeded the standard of success.

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

In general, students were able to identify a number of pre-conceived expectations about Italian culture and were able to critique their own cultural biases regarding food, transportation, housing, and communication. Most of the students expressed at least some sense of "culture shock" and described the various steps they took to mitigate these feelings while traveling abroad.

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 many students spent a significant amount of time discussing superficial aspects of Italian culture, few students connected these experiences back to concepts of relevance to Anthropology.

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.

This course has never been assessed.

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?

ANT 290 provides an opportunity for students to travel internationally, experience cultural immersion, and participate in fieldwork relevant to Anthropology. On these three points, the course can be judged as an overwhelming success. While the majority of students took the course seriously, a number of students seemed to view the course as superfluous to shopping and having a good time. While we did not discourage students from enjoying themselves, several viewed it as more important than the objectives of the course. This was especially problematic at the archaeological site, where several students were reluctant to follow directions and put in the hard work required when excavating.

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

This information will be shared with departmental faculty when requested.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Course Assignments	Students need additional assignments that connect them back to the course objectives and emphasize that this is a college-level course rather than just a vacation. These assignments should focus on the academic nature of	Poor performance on Quiz 2, which did not meet the standard of success.	2025

	research and fieldwork.		
Assessment Tool	Update the tool for Outcome #2 from “Outcome-related departmental exam questions” to “Reflective Paper.”	The Reflective Paper is a better tool to assess this outcome.	2025
Prerequisites	Consider adding additional requirement and prerequisites, such as completion of at least two in-person courses with each instructor, completion of an application with questions focused on travel, cohabitation with others and what the student hopes to accomplish on this trip.	To better vet students who register for this course so that the instructors can know how students work with others and how they perceive the academic side of this trip.	2025

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

As with any study abroad course, the success (or lack of success) is based on a number of factors, some of which can be controlled and some of which cannot. In the case of our trip, there were some students who approached the trip with positive attitudes and maturity. These students, in every case, reported that they felt the trip (and respective courses) contributed in a meaningful way to their education and future career goals. We had other students who seemed rather indifferent to much of the cultural and hands-on work but nevertheless contributed. Unfortunately, we had several students whose lack of maturity, indifference to the course objectives, and lack of cooperation made the three weeks we spent in Italy difficult for both the instructors and other students.

In the future, we need to do a better job of vetting the students who want to register for such a trip. At the very least, we need to know (as instructors) how well students work with others and how seriously they treat the academic side of such a trip. To that end, future trips should have additional requirements and prerequisites. These should include completion of at least two (2) in-person courses with each instructor, completion of an application that includes questions

focused on travel, cohabitation with others, and what (specifically) the student is hoping to accomplish by taking such a trip. Future assignments for such trips should focus on students demonstrating an advanced understanding of the concepts and methods relevant to the trip.

III. Attached Files

[ANT290 SLO1 Results](#)

[ANT201 SLO2 Results](#)

Faculty/Preparer:	Christopher Barrett	Date: 03/31/2025
Department Chair:	Christopher Barrett	Date: 03/31/2025
Dean:	Anne Nichols	Date: 04/01/2025
Assessment Committee Chair:	Jessica Hale	Date: 07/18/2026