

# Annual Program Assessment Report

Academic Year: 2017

Department: Sociology and Anthropology

**Program(s) Assessed:**

**Indicate all majors, minors, certificates and/or options that are included in this assessment:**

Assessment reports are to be submitted annually by program/s. The report deadline is September 15<sup>th</sup>.

The use of this template is optional, however, any assessment report submitted must contain the required information provided in template.

Majors/Minors/Certificate	Options
Anthropology	

## Annual Assessment Process

1. Data are collected as defined by Assessment Plan
2. Population or unbiased samples of collected assignments are scored by at least two faculty members using scoring rubrics to ensure inter-rater reliability.
3. Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.
4. The scores are presented at a program/unit faculty meeting for assessment.
5. The faculty reviews the assessment results, and responds accordingly.
  - a. If an acceptable performance threshold **has not been met**, possible responses:
    - o Gather additional data to verify or refute the result.
    - o Identify potential curriculum changes to try to address the problem
    - o Change the acceptable performance threshold, reassess
    - o Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome
  - b. If acceptable performance threshold **has been met**, possible responses:
    - o Faculty may reconsider thresholds
    - o Evaluate the rubric to assure outcomes meet student skill level (example – classes with differing learning outcomes based on student level)
    - o Use Bloom’s Taxonomy to consider stronger learning outcomes
    - o Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome
6. **Demonstrate the impact of the assessment response in next assessment cycle.**
7. Submit Assessment reports annually to report assessment activities and results by program. The report deadline is September 15<sup>th</sup>.

## **ANTY 337 Sex, Gender and Sexuality in Japan**

**Professor: Tomomi Yamaguchi**

**September 6, 2018**

The purpose of this course is to introduce students major themes, both historical and current, in the study of sex, gender and sexuality in Japan. Students will learn about the dominant constructions of sex, gender and sexuality in since Meiji Restoration (1868) to the present, and how such constructions are reinforced, contested or resisted by people in Japan. Students will critically examine the various discourses of “normalcy” and “deviance,” and pay special attention to the interactions with race, ethnicity, class and other social and historical factors (such as colonialism and globalization) in discussing gender and sexuality.

While the class as a whole has the goal that “students shall learn to analyze multi-cultural and global issues,” the major research project, as a research paper (8-10 pages) or a poster, on a topic of students’ own choice (related to the topic of sex, gender and sexuality in Japan), is designed for students to demonstrate their skills to conduct their own research and analyze issues related to sex, gender and sexuality in Japan.

### **1. What Was Done**

a) What learning outcomes were reviewed? (Please include the description of the learning outcomes from assessment plan)

**“student shall learn to analyze multi-cultural and global issues”**

b) Include planning table – inform if there are changes to the assessment plan.

No changes

### **2. What Data Were Collected**

a) What was collected to assess learning outcomes listed above? (If multiple programs/minors are included, please indicate if different criteria was used).

Research paper required for the course (100 points out of 500).

The assignment is: “Write a research paper (8-10 pages) or a poster on a topic of your own choice (related to the topic of sex, gender and sexuality in Japan.) You are required to do an outside research for this paper.”

The purpose of this course is to introduce to students’ major themes, both historical and current, in the study of sex, gender and sexuality in Japan. Students critically discuss ethnographic strategies used in anthropological work, and the place of gender and sexuality in such inquiries. This specific assignment access students’ skills to critically examine the issues related to gender and sexuality and represent the result as a research paper. The students enrolled in the course, therefore, learn to analyze multi-cultural and global issues surrounding Japan and its neighboring countries.

b) How were data collected?

NOTE: Student names must not be included in data collection. Totals of successful completions, manner of assessment (publications, thesis/dissertation, or qualifying exam) may be presented in table format if they apply to learning outcomes.

The grades for the project are:

A (94~) 7  
A- (90~) 4  
B+ (87~) 5  
B (84~) 2  
B- (80~) 2  
C+ (77~) 0  
C (74~) 1  
C- (70~) 2  
F 1 (no submission)

Total students: 24 . 23 students successfully completed the assignment, and the learning outcome was met.

### **3. Explain how Data Were Analyzed**

a) Explain the assessment process. Who participated in the process, the nature of the rubric utilized (or other norming methods), and the threshold outcome desired.

In addition to the instructor (Tomomi Yamaguchi)'s evaluation of the papers, Dr. Jack Fisher of Anthropology also assessed some samples of students' research papers.

### **4. What Was Learned**

a) Results:

To quantify the research outcomes of this course, I have used the scores on Exams and Research Project as the data source and aligned the outcomes with the proposed scoring method.

That scoring method as defined in the document that outlines the anthropology learning outcomes is:

Scale:

Unacceptable	1	(for graded assignments = D, D-, or F)
Minimally acceptable	2	(for graded assignments = D+/C-)
Acceptable	3	(for graded assignments = C/C+)
Exceeds expectation	4	(for graded assignments = B's or A-)
Exceptional	5	(for graded assignments = A/A+)

Research Project:

23 out of 24 students submitted the assignment.

Exceptional 7  
Exceed Expectation 13  
Acceptable 1  
Minimally acceptable 2  
Unacceptable 1 (no submission)

For all the written assignments, the majority of students (20 out of 24) fall into Exceptional and Exceed expectation categories, while a few students are in “acceptable,” “minimally acceptable” and “unacceptable” ranges. Therefore, assessment on the major assignment in class demonstrates that the class as a whole exceeds learning outcomes for learning to analyze multi-cultural and global issues b) Describe how results were communicated to the department and used to develop plans for improvement.

## **5. How We Responded**

a) Based on assessment, are there any curricular plans for the following year? (Such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes).

No. But I plan to work more closely with the Writing Center, to improve students’ writing skills, and their knowledge on citation formats.

b) When will the changes be next assessed?

## **6. Closing the Loop**

a) Do any of the outcomes this year represent improvements based on assessment from previous years (show multi-year use of progress).

Submit report to [programassessment@montana.edu](mailto:programassessment@montana.edu)

Assessment by: Dr. John W. Fisher, Jr.

Learning Outcome: “Student shall learn to analyze multi-cultural and global issues.”

The syllabus states clearly that students are required to carry out a research project, pertaining to sex, gender and sexuality in Japan, culminating in either a written paper or a poster. This project could be carried out individually or working as a pair or a larger group. Both a written paper and a poster are appropriate formats for students. A written paper provides students with the opportunity to enhance their skills in a format that is an essential form of communication in graduate school and professionally in many career paths. Posters are used widely at anthropological conferences (and in other disciplines and also outside of academia) ranging in scope from state-level to international.

For this assessment, I examined four written papers chosen by Prof. Yamaguchi to represent the range in quality of the 23 papers that were submitted. All were authored by a single student. The stronger papers were well researched, examined the topic in depth, presented a clearly articulated argument and supported it well, had a strong introduction and were otherwise well organized, and were well written.

Weaker papers showed one or more of the following shortcomings: less depth in research (i.e., could have consulted additional sources) and in the content of the paper, a somewhat weak introduction to the topic and to the paper, minor deficiencies in writing (misspelling of words, awkward wording), presentation of weakly supported or unsupported claims, failure to cite sources in the body of the paper, and somewhat shallow conclusions.

In sum, I believe that the research paper that was required for this course provides an excellent means to assess students' abilities to "learn to analyze multi-cultural and global issues". Twenty of the 23 papers that were submitted are either "exceptional" or "exceeds expectations". All in all, therefore, as reflected by the research papers, this course does an excellent job of meeting the learning outcome stated above.

## **ANTY 357: Foragers of Sub-Saharan Africa**

**Professor: John W. Fisher, Jr.**

**September 5, 2018**

This course improved students' understanding of the foraging (hunting-and-gathering) way of life that was a milieu in which crucial human institutions developed and evolved. Students learned about forager peoples from an anthropological perspective that includes archaeology, sociocultural anthropology, and biological anthropology. Various theoretical perspectives guiding anthropological research were examined. The readings for this class were primarily from professional journal articles. The students were required to design and carry out an effective research project on a topic pertaining to foragers of Sub-Saharan Africa, including finding and reading relevant articles in professional journals and other publications, critically assessing and evaluating these primary sources, and synthesizing these materials in a written research paper.

### **1. What Was Done**

a) What learning outcomes were reviewed? (Please include the description of the learning outcomes from assessment plan)

The learning outcome reviewed for ANTY 357 for 2017-2018 is: **Students shall show the ability to write in an organized and logically consistent manner.**

b) Include planning table – inform if there are changes to the assessment plan.

### **2. What Data Were Collected**

a) What was collected to assess learning outcomes listed above? (If multiple programs/minors are included, please indicate if different criteria was used).

The data that were collected to assess the above learning outcome consist of 22 research papers written by students. These papers present a major research project undertaken by the students.

b) How were data collected?

The data were collected in the form of 22 individual research papers that were written and submitted by the students taking this course. Each paper was assessed on criteria that are specified below.

### **3. Explain how Data Were Analyzed**

a) Explain the assessment process. Who participated in the process, the nature of the rubric utilized (or other norming methods), and the threshold outcome desired.

The quality of the research papers was evaluated by two anthropology professor. Prof. Fisher, who taught this class, evaluated all 22 papers. Prof. Yamaguchi evaluated 4 papers that were chosen by

Fisher to represent highest to lowest evaluated papers. The papers were assessed with respect to their substance (content & depth), organization, proper use of citations & associated bibliography, clarity of writing, use of proper grammar, and correct spelling.

#### 4. What Was Learned

a) Results:

To quantify the research outcomes for this course, I used the scores from the final project as a data source and aligned the outcomes with the proposed scoring method. The scoring method as defined in the document that outlines the anthropology learning outcomes is:

Scale:		
Unacceptable	1	For graded assignments = D, D-, or F
Minimally acceptable	2	For graded assignments = D+/C-
Acceptable	3	For graded assignments = C/C+
Exceeds expectation	4	For graded assignments = B's or A-
Exceptional	5	For graded assignments = A/A+

The scores on the 22 research papers ranged from 95%-75%, with an average of 88% (or 4.4 on a 5-point scale). Using the above scale, this suggests that the class “exceeds expectations” for the learning outcome of “the ability to write in an organized and logically consistent manner.”

In assessing the research papers, all students successfully identified an appropriate research question or topic. The strongest papers showed depth in research and content, and were well written. Other papers were more variable in depth and substance, with the weakest papers being somewhat superficial. The weakest papers also suffered from one or more writing issues, including organization, clarity of expression, grammar, word choice, and failure to cite sources appropriately. Some papers did not use the bibliographic format that had been specified in the description of this assignment.

b) Describe how results were communicated to the department and used to develop plans for improvement.

This assessment indicates that all in all the students are successful in meeting the learning outcome of showing the ability to write in an organized and logically consistent manner. However, some students probably require additional guidance, in the future, with respect to improving deficiencies in the depth (substance) of their research, improving their writing (organization, clarity of expression, etc.), and in the proper use of citations.

## 5. How We Responded

a) Based on assessment, are there any curricular plans for the following year? (Such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes).

There are no curricular plans at this time.

b) When will the changes be next assessed?

## 6. Closing the Loop

a) Do any of the outcomes this year represent improvements based on assessment from previous years (show multi-year use of progress).

Submit report to [programassessment@montana.edu](mailto:programassessment@montana.edu)

Assessment by: Tomomi Yamaguchi

Learning Outcome: **Students shall show the ability to write in an organized and logically consistent manner.**

There is a detailed instructional sheet for the research paper assignment that Dr. Fisher distributes to the students, and it clearly states that the topic or issue for the project should be tightly focused, and students need to frame their papers as “problem-oriented” research, that is, they have to identify a key question/problem /issue that their research will investigate or address. Students are also required to consult professional anthropological and other academic journals and books in researching their topics. This assignment, requiring “problem-oriented research,” is clearly designed to assess students’ ability to conduct academic research, and “write in an organized and logically consistent manner.”

For this assessment, I examined four research papers given by Dr. Fisher, to present the quality of the 22 papers submitted, with the range of A to C-quality papers. The stronger papers framed the problem to be addressed much more clearly, conducted critical and comparative examinations of various perspectives presented by scholars, or past practices in anthropologists and others on the issue. The better paper also presented the author’s argument in much more logically persuasive manner. Weaker papers also presented good evidence that the students conducted thorough research based on secondary sources, and their writing skills are organized and logical enough to meet the expectations, though some had troubles in presenting the problem that they address in their paper clearly for the readers, and just introduced the content of scholarly articles and books without much examination and analyses. The weaker papers also had some issues with writing (especially incomplete sentences), and had some troubles with the citations (they did not follow the instruction for the citation method.)

Dr. Fisher writes that 22 research papers ranged from 95%-75%, with an average of 88% (or 4.4 on a 5-point scale). With this data, the class “exceeds expectations” for the learning outcome, and even the weakest papers that I read met expectations, and most papers exceed expectations, or exceptional. Thus, the course did a great job in meeting the learning outcome: “**Students shall show the ability to write in an organized and logically consistent manner.**”