**Appendix for Step II of Anthropology PRP submission February 11, 2014 by Philip de Barros**

**Step II. Evaluation of Program and SLOAC Data [this appendix follows the PRP format]**

1. Program Data

Provide an Analysis of the past 6-years of your discipline’s data. Consider trends in the data and what may be causing them. (Three sets of data to analyze PLUS we asked for Course level data—enrollment data, load & success/retention & degrees/certificates.

Describe your analysis and observations.

ENROLLMENT AND WSCH DATA TRENDS:

**Enrollment (see Table 1 below)**

 ***College Level***

**1) Palomar College has seen an important decline in enrollment since its peak year of 2009-10 due to the major economic changes in the United States and California. After rising after the crash of 2008-09 from 85,421 in 2007-08 to 89,494 in 2009-10, there followed a sharp dip to 84,379 in 2010-11, a rise to 87,392 in 2011-12, and then a sharp decline to 81,797 for 2012-13.**

**2) Weekly Student Contact Hours (WSCH) have declined from 280,723 to 262,534 for the same period after reaching a peak of 297,833 in 2009-10.**

**3) Census enrollment load has held up relatively well since rising from 75.1% in 2007-08 to 92.8% in 2009-10, declining slightly to around 89.5-90% during 2010-12, and then rising to 91.0% in 2012-13.**

**TABLE 1: Trends in Enrollment, WSCH and Census Load**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2007-08** | **2008-09** | **2009-10** | **2010-11** | **2011-12** | **2012-13** |
| **Census Enrollment** | **College** | **85,421** | **86,044** | **89,494** | **84,379** | **87,392** | **81,797** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **6,913** | **7,288** | **7,820** | **7,750** | **7,922** | **7,837** |
|  | **ANTH** | **1,114** | **1,265** | **1,333** | **1,353** | **1,352** | **1,332** |
| **WSCH** | **College** | **280,723** | **285,012** | **297,833** | **281,346** | **276,866** | **262,534** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **21,520** | **22,590** | **24,314** | **24,003** | **24,716** | **24,069** |
|  | **ANTH** | **3,487** | **3,937** | **4,193** | **4,212** | **4,237** | **4,170** |
| **Census Load** | **College** | **75.1%** | **86.6%** | **92.8%** | **89.5%** | **89.9%** | **91.0%** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **89.5%** | **97.5%** | **104.6%** | **103.1%** | **100.5%** | **98.4%** |
|  | **ANTH** | **87.4%** | **97.6%** | **102.5%** | **102.7%** | **99.6%** | **96.2%** |

**Overall these patterns may be due to the gradual recovery of the economy. However, Anthropology faculty conversations with students over the past couple of years suggest that the sharp cuts in classes at Palomar College, especially in 2011-12, have led students to enroll at Mira Costa College instead (whose tax base spared them of such major cuts) due to high frustration levels at not getting the classes they need. One would hope to see some recovery in 2013-14.**

***Behavioral Sciences Department (BSD) and Anthropology (ANTH)***

**Interestingly enough, again looking at Table 1 above, the enrollment figure trends are somewhat different for the Behavioral Sciences Department (BSD) and the discipline of Anthropology (ANTH). For the BSD, enrollment climbed from 6,913 in 2007-08 to 7,820 in 2009-10 and reached a peak of 7,922 in 2011-12; only in 2012-13 was there a decline to 7,714 which is still near 2010-11 levels. For ANTH, we see a somewhat better trend with a steady climb from 1,114 in 2007-08 to 1,353 in 2010-11, which held steady in at 1,352 in 2011-12, and then declined in 2012-13 to 1,332.**

**WSCH figures also show a different trend from the college as a whole for both the BSD and ANTH. For the BSD, WSCH rose steadily from 21,520 in 2007-08 to 24,314 in 2009-10, peaked at 24,716 in 2011-12, and declined in 2012-13 to 24,069. ANTH showed an even better trend with a steadily rising WSCH from 2007-08 through 2011-12, from 3,487 to 4,237, followed by a slight decline to 4,170 in 2012-13.**

**Finally, the Census Enrollment Load for the BSD has consistently outperformed the college with a low of 89.5% in 2007-08 continued by a steady rise to 104.6% in 2009-10. The >100% load continued in 2010-11 and 2011-12 (103.1% and 100.5%) with a decline again showing up in the 2012-13 year to 98.4%, compared to 91.0% for the college as a whole. The figures are very similar for ANTH with peak census enrollment load in 2010-11 with 102.7%, a slight decline to 99.6% in 2011-12, and then a steeper decline as for almost all variables in 2011-12 to 96.2%. This latter is still above the college average (but below the BSD).**

**There have been rising enrollments in Anthropology nationwide for the last decade and this appears to be reflected in the relatively steady rise in enrollments at Palomar College in Anthropology. Palomar College’s Archaeology Program, American Indian Studies Program, and, especially the combined lecture and lab program in Biological Anthropology, as well as its wide diversity of offerings in Anthropology, probably explain this.**

COURSE SUCCESS AND RETENTION RATES: **Table 2 below summarizes course pass and retention rates for day, evening, distance education, and for all courses at the college, BSD and ANTH levels:**

TABLE 2: PASS AND RETENTION RATES (with key data points in gray)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | **2007-08** | **2008-09** | **2009-10** | **2010-11** | **2011-12** | **2012-13** |
| **Pass Rates** | **College** | **Day** | **70.3%** | **71.1%** | **71.9%** | **73.5%** | **73.4%** | **71.8%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **72.8%** | **73.0%** | **73.4%** | **76.3%** | **74.7%** | **72.5%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **56.0%** | **60.3%** | **61.0%** | **63.9%** | **66.8%** | **62.0%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **69.8%** | **70.6%** | **71.3%** | **73.2%** | **73.1%** | **70.9%** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **Day** | **67.0%** | **69.3%** | **71.1%** | **73.3%** | **73.6%** | **70.2%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **71.3%** | **67.9%** | **72.6%** | **74.0%** | **75.0%** | **70.2%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **55.8%** | **61.8%** | **62.1%** | **64.9%** | **64.6%** | **64.3%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **65.8%** | **67.8%** | **69.6%** | **71.8%** | **72.2%** | **69.1%** |
|  | **ANTH** | **Day** | **71.0%** | **74.3%** | **73.6%** | **75.2%** | **76.1%** | **69.0%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **71.6%** | **61.2%** | **78.1%** | **75.0%** | **82.1%** | **83.6%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **58.2%** | **63.8%** | **63.8%** | **64.7%** | **61.9%** | **61.5%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **68.5%** | **71.4%** | **71.7%** | **72.7%** | **73.4%** | **68.1%** |
|  |  |  | **2007-08** | **2008-09** | **2009-10** | **2010-11** | **2011-12** | **2012-13** |
| **Retention Rates** | **College** | **Day** | **93.3%** | **94.7%** | **95.0%** | **94.9%** | **95.0%** | **93.0%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **93.5%** | **94.2%** | **94.8%** | **94.9%** | **94.4%** | **91.3%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **86.9%** | **87.9%** | **89.1%** | **89.5%** | **90.0%** | **84.4%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **92.9%** | **94.0%** | **94.4%** | **94.4%** | **94.4%** | **91.8%** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **Day** | **93.0%** | **95.1%** | **95.6%** | **95.8%** | **95.4%** | **93.9%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **91.8%** | **93.1%** | **93.0%** | **94.5%** | **95.8%** | **90.5%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **85.9%** | **90.4%** | **91.4%** | **91.5%** | **90.7%** | **84.4%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **91.6%** | **94.0%** | **94.4%** | **94.7%** | **94.6%** | **91.6%** |
|  | **ANTH** | **Day** | **93.9%** | **95.7%** | **97.5%** | **97.0%** | **95.4%** | **94.8%** |
|  |  | **Eve** | **94.1%** | **91.8%** | **92.2%** | **91.1%** | **94.9%** | **90.9%** |
|  |  | **DistEd** | **88.6%** | **91.7%** | **90.9%** | **95.6%** | **90.5%** | **85.8%** |
|  |  | **Overall** | **92.8%** | **94.7%** | **95.8%** | **96.4%** | **94.3%** | **92.7%** |

**The trends in the above data can be summarized and explained as follows:**

**PASS RATES**

**1) Pass rates have generally risen between 2007-08 and 2011-12 at the college, BSD and ANTH levels, then declined significantly in 2012-13. This combined decline in enrollment and pass rates in 2012-13 may be due to the loss of students due to cutting classes, leading some of the most enterprising and brightest students moving disproportionately to Mira Costa and elsewhere.**

**2) Evening students consistently passed at higher rates than day students at the college, BSD and ANTH levels. This is not surprising as evening students are often people returning to college while working during the day and they tend to me more highly motivated.**

**3) Distance education students clearly pass at much lower levels, although at the college level the pass rate has steadily increased between 2007-08 and 2011-12, with a decline again in 2012-13, which is hopefully temporary. Pass rates for BSD and ANTH are generally higher than for the college as a whole.**

**4) Overall pass rates for the BSD is somewhat lower than for the college as a whole, but ANTH has often exceeded college pass rates (see Table 2).**

**RETENTION RATES**

**1) College and BSD retention rates have held steady from 2008-09 through 2011-12 at around 94+%. ANTH has had slightly higher retention rates ranging from 94.3 to 96.4% during the same period. All levels declined in 2012-13 to ca. 92% with ANTH remaining highest at 92.7% for reasons that are probably similar to those described under pass rates above.**

**2) At all levels, day students generally have somewhat higher retention rates than do evening students. This is probably because evening students also have students taking a class or two now and then without particular goals, leading to some of these students later dropping their class(es).**

**3) Retention rates for ANTH students during the day are significantly higher than at both BSD and college levels, reaching 97.5 and 97.0% during the 2009-11 time period.**

**4) At the college level, distance education classes have significantly lower retention rates compared to day and evening students, often 4-7% points lower. The differences are somewhat less for the BSD and especially ANTH courses, reaching 95.6% in 2010-11.**

FTEF AND WSCH: **Table 3 presents data on WSCH/FTEF, full-time FTEF, and Part-time as % of total FTEF.**

TABLE 3: WSCH and FTEF (with key data points in gray)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2007-08** | **2008-09** | **2009-10** | **2010-11** | **2011-12** | **2012-13** |
| **WSCH/FTEF** | **College** | **453** | **487** | **511** | **503** | **494** | **483** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **480** | **520** | **567** | **554** | **562** | **543** |
|  | **ANTH** | **493** | **552** | **577** | **574** | **567** | **500** |
| **Full-time FTEF** | **College** | **222.15** | **211.49** | **212.00** | **202.04** | **203.42** | **185.53** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **19.40** | **17.60** | **16.20** | **16.80** | **13.73** | **13.00** |
|  | **ANTH** | **3.80** | **3.80** | **2.80** | **3.80** | **2.80** | **2.80** |
| **Part-time/(Total FTEF)%** | **College** | **64.13%** | **63.87%** | **63.60%** | **63.85%** | **63.70%** | **65.88%** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **56.71%** | **59.47%** | **62.61%** | **62.23%** | **68.81%** | **70.68%** |
|  | **ANTH** | **46.23%** | **46.73%** | **61.47%** | **48.18%** | **62.50%** | **66.39%** |

**The following trends and their probable explanations are noted below:**

**WSCH/FTEF**

**1) The overall trend for the college, BSD and ANTH show steadily increasing WSCH/FTEF ratios between 2007-08 and 2009-10, then some decline for 2010-12, and a more abrupt decline in 2012-13, especially in ANTH. The former decline is in part due to the retirement of Dr. O’Neil in June 2011. The latter decline is due to the absence of Dr. de Barros due to heart surgery and a Fulbright to Africa. Dr. O’Neil as a full-time staff member taught many Biological Anthropology classes which have the highest average number of students per class. Dr. de Barros regularly teaches six classes per semester, including Biological Anthropology.**

**2) From 2007-08 through 2011-12, ANTH had the highest WSCH/FTEF ratio when compared to the college and the BSD, reaching 577 in 2009-10. The latter high figure can in part be explained by the taking of sabbaticals in the fall and then in the spring by Professors de Barros and Mobilia, respectively.**

**Full-time FTEF**

**1) At the college and BSD levels, and less so for ANTH, there has been a general decline in full-time FTEF due to budgetary problems which led to few or no hires for 2-3 years, especially from 2010 onwards. The FTEF figure dropped from 212.0 to 202.04 from 2009-10 to 2010-11, and then again abruptly from 103.42 in 2011-12 to 185.53 in 2012-13. Much of the latter drop was due to the cutting of many class sections.**

**2) BSD saw similar declines especially from 16.80 in 2010-11 to 13.73 in 2011-12 and then to 13.00 in 2012-13. ANTH held steady at 3.80 from 2007-08 through 2010-11, except for 2.80 in 2009-10 due to sabbatical leaves. Class cuts and the retirement and/or absence of Drs. O’Neil and de Barros explain a return to 2.80 from 2011-13.**

**Part-time/(Total FTEF)%**

**1) For the college as a whole, the percentage remained relatively stable from 2008-09 through 2011-12 at ca. 63.5%. It then increased sharply to 65.88% in 2012-13 due to lack of hiring.**

**2) For BSD, the percentage steadily grew from 56.71% in 2007-08 to 62.23% in 2010-11 and then jumped significantly to 68.81% in 2011-12 and 70.68% in 2012-13. New hires in sociology and psychology should have reduced that percentage for 2013-14.**

**3) For ANTH, the percentage started relatively low from 2007-09 at around 46-47%, but grew rapidly to 61.47% in 2009-10 due to sabbatical leaves, and then returned to 48.18% in 2010-11. However, it jumped significantly in 2011-12 to 62.50% and to 66.39% in 2012-13. These higher figures are due in part to the absence of Philip de Barros due to health and load bank leaves, and to a health leave and retirement by Dr. O’Neil. Dr. de Barros has returned but the percentage will probably be in the 50-55% range in 2013-14 due to lack of hires. Nonetheless, these figures are a long way from A.B. 1725’s requirement of 75% taught by full-timers and 25% by part-timers.**

TABLE 4: TOTAL AWARDS BY TYPE

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **2007-08** | **2008-09** | **2009-10** | **2010-11** | **2011-12** | **2012-13** |
| **Certificates >18+ units** | **College** | **573** | **1,002** | **1,082** | **1,249** | **1,665** | **1,471** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **31** | **36** | **27** | **33** | **27** | **40** |
|  | **ANTH** | **7** | **12** | **6** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
| **A.A. Degrees** | **College** | **1,496** | **1,625** | **1,742** | **1,766** | **1,866** | **1,620** |
|  | **B.S.D.** | **8** | **12** | **15** | **8** | **22** | **51** |
|  | **ANTH** | **4** | **2** | **4** | **1** | **2** | **1** |

**Table 4 provides data on student certificates and A.A. Degrees at the college, BSD and ANTH levels. The following trends and their probable explanation are presented below:**

**CERTIFICATES >18+ Units**

**1) College-wide the number of certificates earned by students increased dramatically between 2007-08 and 2008-09 (nearly doubling) and then the increase continued to 2011-12 with a peak of 1,665. As with all other statistics, however, the number declined sharply to 1,471 due to enrollment declines, in part due to cutting classes, and the recovering economy which usually results in enrollment declines.**

**2) Certificate numbers remained relatively steady for BSD, ranging between 27-36 from 2008-08 and 2011-12 with an increase to 40 in 2012-13, countering the college trend. This may be due to in part to the creation of the AODS and Women Studies programs.**

**3) ANTH certificate numbers in Archaeology have ranged from 6 to 8 in all years except in 2008-09 when it was at 12. Higher numbers were expected in 2013-14 and 2014-15 due to better promotion of the importance of obtaining the certificate and due to significantly higher enrollments in our feeder class, ANTH 120, in the fall of 2013. However, current data do not show that many of the excavation students are signing up for the spring 2014 archaeological surveying class. This may be due to the intense focus on Education Plans and the taking math and English classes in the first year, which was expected to lead to a temporary (hopefully not permanent) drop in enrollment in programs like ours which are technical but not strictly vocational certificate programs.**

**A.A. DEGREES**

**1) College-wide the number of A.A. Degrees has been steadily rising from 1,496 in 2008-08 to 1,866 in 2011-12 with a decline to 1,620 in 2012-13, again due to lower enrollments, in part due to class cutting, and the recovering economy.**

**2) BSD A.A. Degree numbers fluctuated between 8 and 15 between 2007-08 and 2010-11 and then jumped to 22 in 2011-12 and to 51 in 2012-13. This rapid rise, especially in 2012-13, is due in part to the approval of the TMC for A.A. Transfer degrees in Psychology and Sociology. Anthropology will kick in 2013-14.**

**3) ANTH A.A. Degrees were relatively high in the 1990s and early 2000s but have declined in recent years to 2-4 from 2008-08 through 2010-11 and then declined again during the last three years. There are two reasons for this. First, the Archaeology Program has not promoted the A.A. Degree as much as it should. And, more importantly, the transformation of community colleges into transfer colleges with the rise of the TMC has diminished the significance to many students of getting the A.A. Degree in Archaeology if they already have a A.A. Transfer Degree in General Studies and soon in Anthropology. Interestingly enough, however, many students take the two courses that are required for the A.A. Degree beyond those fulfilling Certificates, i.e., Historical Archaeology (ANTH 225) and Cultural Resource Management (ANTH 121), even if they do not actually file for the A.A. Degree.**

**The Archaeology Program plans to promote the degree in the spring of 2014 with posters, a web page, and program stations during campus events. Our Archaeology Club has also resulted in increased enrollment in our feeder class, ANTH 120 (Archaeological Excavation). We plan to emphasize the major advantages in transferring to Cal State San Marcos where 9 units of Archaeology classes can count for Upper Division Credit toward the major there. We are also talking with the Counseling Department and to Bonnie Bade, head of the Anthropology Department at CSUSM, for ways to promote the Archaeology Certificates and Degree. CSUSM created their anthropology major with the idea that Palomar College would provide most of the archaeology classes, so it would be in their self-interest to help promote the certificates and A.A. Degree in order to bolster attendance in those classes. We also plan to develop an Archaeology TMC transfer degree starting with CSUSM which should be in favor of this and then branching out to a few other CSU campuses which also have archaeology programs, such as CSLA, CSLB, and San Diego State.**

Does this data reflect your planning goals and activities? If not, why?

**Much of the news is good for Anthropology and shows we are doing many things right that produce growing enrollments, good census loads, good pass and retention rates, WSCH/FTEF ratios, and the like. These data also provide information for new goals regarding 1) the promotion of certificate and A. A. Degree completion; 2) an examination of evaluation procedures for Distance Education courses as implemented in our discipline; 3) a review of class scheduling in terms of day-evening-distance ed course balance to achieve higher retention and pass rates overall in Anthropology; 4) the need to hire 2 new faculty to reduce the overall part-time FTEF, to restore the faculty we once had, and to maintain the Archaeology Program in the future given that Dr. de Barros will retire in a few years; and, 5) develop a multi-pronged strategy to improve enrollments in the Archaeology Program in the face of a major realignment of the mission of community colleges, including the development of an A.A. TMC Transfer Degree in Archaeology.**

1. SLOACs

Using comprehensive SLOAC reports and faculty discussions for the questions below.

1. **Summarize your SLOAC activities during the ’12 – ’13 academic year.**

**Due in part to the absence of Discipline Coordinator, Dr. de Barros, for the entire 2012-13 year, during a time when the Anthropology TMC had to be finalized and a detailed request for faculty hire document had to be processed, the assessment of SLOs was put on the back-burner this past year. However, we are currently assessing SLOs in our major classes, ANTH 100, 101 and 105, including one SLO each this semester and the same is planned for spring 2014. The results of the fall 2103 assessments are already entered in TracDat.**

**In addition, a second review of the Archaeology Program is planned for February 2014 with a focus on improving curricular materials and field teaching methods. Last year we did implement significant changes in the archaeology excavation classes (ANTH 120 and 205), which included more time spent on explaining and supervising feature excavation, Munsell soil profile recordation and artifact identification in a systematic way for each work group.**

**These changes are continuing in spring 2014 semester in the form of revised guides and forms for students for ANTH 210/220 on archaeological surveying. We also plan to put together and/or update field and lab manuals for 215 (Lab Analysis) and 225 (Historic Archaeology) to be ready for spring 2015 and fall 2014, respectively. The new manuals will be based on putting together updated handouts that we used to distribute individually into a manual with Table of Contents grouped by activity or skill. The manuals for ANTH 120/205 (excavation classes) will be available for fall 2014. These manuals will provide greater coherency and organization to materials provided to the students and will be all in one place instead of being scattered, often losable, documents.**

**We are also implementing a review of GE/ILO learning outcomes to be sure that the ones selected for each course do indeed fit what we are doing in the classroom. This will begin in spring 2014. Some of the outcomes were checked quickly a few years ago based on an intuitive understanding of their outcomes, only to find out that the rubrics developed by the Learning Outcomes Council (LOC) did not always correspond to what we were doing, particularly with regard to written assignments related to critical thinking, information literacy, and the like.**

**In addition, for courses in Anthropology taught by a single instructor, such as ANTH 107 (Linguistics), 137 (Medical Anthropology), 121 (Cultural Resource Management), 125 (Evolution, Science and Religion), 126 (Cultures of Africa), 215 (Prehistoric Lab Analysis) and 225 (Historical Archaeology), additional SLOs are or will be assessed based on recent essay and/or exam performances.**

1. **Course SLOACs: What did you learn from your course assessments? What will you maintain or change because of assessment results?**

**See #1 above.**

1. **Program SLOACs: What did you learn from your program SLO assessments? What will you maintain or change because of assessment results?**

**See #1 above.**

C) Other Relevant Data and Information

 1) Describe other data and/or information that you have considered as part of the
 assessment of your program.

 **See answer for #1 and #2 below.**

 2) Given this information, how are your current and future students impacted by
 your program and planning activities?

**The main issue has been the development of the Transfer Model Curriculum A.A. Degree in Anthropology. This reflects the push to turn community colleges into transfer institutions. The result is more pressure for students not to bother with having an A.A. Degree in Archaeology as they will already have one in Anthropology in order to transfer to CSUs and UCs. Before, the A.A. degrees available were general in nature and students felt it was useful to have one that specifically said A.A. Degree in Archaeology. With the TMC Anthropology A.A. Transfer Degree, it often appears that the Archaeology Degree is unnecessary, even though the students often take the two additional courses required for the degree, i.e., ANTH 121 (Cultural Resource Management) and 225 (Historical Archaeology).**

**As noted above, one of our goals is to promote the Archaeology Program in the
context of this new environment created by State legislation, including issues of repeatability, the taking of English and Math classes in the first year, and the A.A. Anthropology Transfer Degree, which initially are having the effect of crowding out other choices in the rush to get students transferred. Frankly, it is appalling that community college students are forced to determine a major in their first two years while four-year colleges often have a year longer to make such choices. It is also essential to develop a TMC Transfer Degree in Archaeology.**

D) Labor Market Data:

FOR THE ARCHAEOLOGY PROGRAM SPECIFICALLY

**While it was not required to examine this data for archaeology, as it is not officially part of vocational education, it was felt it might contain some useful data. In particular, we are concerned that the image of “archaeology” and “anthropology” is still stuck in stereotypes of 30 years ago about job and salary potential. Dr. de Barros, who was Director of Archaeology at an Environmental Services/Cultural Resources Management firm in Orange County for nine years, and who also has his own CRM firm, can testify to the importance of the job market in this field, though it has been difficult for a few years after the 2008 crash do the slumping housing market. It is now well on the road to recovery.**

**It is important to note that 40-50% of anthropologists/archaeologists who get graduate degrees go on to work in applied archaeology as opposed to teaching at a community college or university. Indeed, 80% of the funds spent on archaeology in the United States are spent in CRM archaeological research, not in the academic sector. Many of our students have gotten jobs with CRM firms or started their own firm; with government agencies, such as Caltrans, the BLM and the Forest Service, as well as the San Diego County Planning and Development Services department; and with museums, such as the San Diego Archaeological Center.**

Labor Market Data

**The Labor Market Data indicate that the median hourly wage for anthropologists and archaeologists in California is $28.48/hr (range $22.36-$40.64). Annual salaries average $58,500 and range from $39,300 to $90,200 [Source: California Occupation Wages; Employment Development Department (EDD), Labor Market Information Division 2013].**

**For those who go into teaching, 65% of the jobs are at the community college level and 35% are at the university/college level. For those who pursue career goals outside of teaching, most work for management and technical consulting firms or scientific research and development firms. On the O-Net Online resource accessed through the Labor Market Data web page, it notes that good training in archaeology is as important as degrees based on lecture courses. A person who obtains an A.A. Degree in Archaeology at Palomar College will be better trained in archaeology than someone attending virtually any four-year undergraduate institution in Southern California. This is because the 4-yr institutions emphasize a degree in Anthropology, not specifically in Archaeology. Dr. de Barros can testify to this during his nearly 18 years running the Palomar College Archaeology Program.**

**Wages and employment trends indicate that job growth in the field of
anthropology and archaeology is projected to be faster than average, between 20-28% from 2010-2020 [see** [**www.online.org/details/19-3091.02#Tasks**](http://www.online.org/details/19-3091.02#Tasks)**, p. 17], for a total of 3,800 new jobs. 46% are projected to be in professional, scientific, and technical services; 32% with government agencies; and 12% in the self-employed sector (*ibid.*).**

E) Discipline/Program Assessment

1) Strengths: one of the top archaeology programs at the community college level in the United States

**a) quality of instructors and student workers/teaching assistants;**

**b) quality and depth and breadth of courses, many unique to Palomar college, especially in archaeology;**

**c) quality of computer technology, software programs, and instructional aids in both biological anthropology and archaeology;**

**d) diversity of course offerings;**

**e) partnerships with local communities in archaeological excavation courses
 (County Parks), survey courses (State Parks), and lab classes (San Diego
 Archaeological Center and the Museum of Man), as well with local specialists
 in archaeology (local CRM firms);**

**f) internships at the San Diego Archaeological Center, Palomar Lab, Museum of
 Man; and internships in archaeology for the Palomar GIS Certificate Program;**

**g) biological anthropology field exercises at Safari Park and the San Diego Zoo
 and the Museum of Man.**

**h) program graduates working with various federal, state, and local
 governments, museums, and private firms (e.g., Cleveland National Forest,
 BLM, Caltrans, San Diego County Planning and Development Services, local
 CRM firms, San Diego Archaeological Center, Museum of Man, etc.)**

2) Weaknesses:

**a) declining interest in the A.A. Degree due to the A.A. TMC in Anthropology;**

**b) insufficient full-time instructors, especially for Biological Anthropology**

**c) lack of Teaching Assistants for Biological Anthropology Lab courses**

3) Opportunities:

**a) Internships in the Cultural Resource Management industry and with
 government and private agencies**

**b) American Indian Studies, Indian Reservations (developing new program with
 local reservations, working with Patti Dixon)**

**c) development of an A.A. TMC Transfer Degree in Archaeology**

4) Challenges:

**a) insufficient full-time faculty;**

**b) finding part-timers who can teach the Biological Anthropology lab classes
 and archaeology classes;**

**c) low pay for part-timers compared to our neighbor Mira Costa College;**

**d) staying current in our field with all the additional administrative burdens
 associated with SLOs, SLO assessment, PRPs, adapting to change in state
 laws regarding the role of community colleges; course repeatability and
 standardization issues; and the lack of travel funds to seminars and
 conferences (see below)**

**e) insufficient travel money to attend conferences and seminars for updating
 our knowledge and skills**