Annual Assessment Report
Academic Year: 2016-17
Department of Sociology & Anthropology

Assessment Report for Sociology major, including Criminology option
Assessment Report for Sociology minor
Assessment Report for Anthropology major

May 15, 2017

Assessment: Maggie Thorsen and David Eitle
Learning Outcomes: Sociology as a Discipline

SOCI 499 is an upper division course whose state learning objectives are: (1) think about and apply what you have learned in Sociology to study a specific topic of interest to you from a sociological perspective; (2) develop a theoretically informed sociological research question; (3) situate the research question in the relevant literature; (4) find relevant data to the research question and empirically examine the data; (5) produce a research paper project; and (6) present the paper/proposal to faculty and peers in a poster session to be held at the end of the semester.

We used all 13 papers for our assessment of the learning objective as sociology as a discipline. As identified in our assessment plan, the learning outcome sociology as a discipline is defined as: "Our students will demonstrate an understanding of the discipline of sociology and its role in contributing to our understanding of society and changes in society." According to the assignment, students were asked to develop a cover letter that accompanies a resume for a specific job/organization or field. Students were required to present themselves as an accomplished sociologist who would bring the characteristics of the field of sociology to this position/field.

We constructed a scoring rubric (below) independent of the paper assignment itself, since the purpose of the assessment is to determine whether learning outcomes are being met. We defined two elements of successful writing about sociology as a discipline (demonstrating an understanding of the discipline and content) and two elements of successful writing more generally (organization and writing skill). It is important to note that the goals of this paper assignment need not be consistent with the assessment of this particular learning outcome.

'A' papers:
As a group, the A papers, which were few in number (1-2 depending upon the reviewer's assessment score), clearly separated themselves from the rest of papers in that they provided a comprehensive presentation of disciplinary concepts and related skills in building a cogent argument for hiring a sociologist into the advertised position. These papers were well written, and the papers provided a good discussion of how the sociological imagination allows for a more objective approach and a consideration of diverse viewpoints. In short, these couple of papers appeared to represent the only efforts to seriously follow the charge of the assignment.

'B' papers:
As a group, the B paper (only 1 identified by the assessment reviewers), wrote a solid, if incomplete cover letter. While this paper did a very good job of using major sociological tenets and perspectives, the author failed to make a clear and convincing connection of how such

assets would translate into a successful candidate for the job. Like the A papers, this paper is fairly well written and organized.

'C' papers:
As a group, the C papers (3-5, depending on the reviewer), were clearly weaker than the A and B papers on each of the four criteria that were assessed. The clearest distinguishing characteristic of these papers is the lack of depth in discussion of the sociological perspective and discipline. None of these papers expressed a clear understanding of how sociology as a discipline can empower the applicant and advantage them in hiring process. Most provided only a very cursory mention of sociology, the sociological perspective, or some of the most basic/fundamental concepts, yet they failed to demonstrate how these would be relevant to the job/organization. These papers tended to be written and organized at an acceptable level, albeit it brevity becomes a major limitation in assessing the overall strength of these artifacts.

Below Average papers:
Unfortunately, the modal category for the assessed papers (5-8 depending upon the reviewer) were categorized as below average in meeting the learning outcome. The typical cover letter in this category simply failed to provide any application of sociological concepts, perspectives, and skills in writing their cover letters—they simply mentioned that they had earned a degree in sociology. Again, these artifacts suffered from brevity, but as a group, they largely failed to address the charge given to them by the instructor.

Recommendations:
It is clear from this assessment that students struggle with making clear and obvious connections between sociology as a discipline and its utility in the marketplace. We would encourage faculty to consider devoting more attention to making these connections explicit for students in all courses (not just the capstone). Similarly, recurrent discussions about sociology as a discipline and its importance should be broached with students throughout the curriculum—not just at the introductory level. Beyond these recommendations, we (again) must recognize the diversity in writing ability among our students. This diversity extends beyond grammar and spelling; the lack of providing a comprehensive and thoughtful response to instructor cues is an issue that we have noted in prior assessments. The authors of such brief and superficial essays are typically those that are unprepared and often have poor attendance and poor performance on other evaluation measures.

Finally, we must recognize that the assignment that we used for this evaluation was far from ideal (for fulfilling our assessment plan) and that the instructor was not originally chosen to provide any artifacts for this assessment. It is imperative that the assessment committee work in advance with faculty so that more appropriate artifacts can be collected and evaluated in the future.

Criteria	Excellent 10 points	Approaching Excellence 9 points	Above Average 8 points	Average 7 points	Below Average 6 points	Poor 5 points
Disciplinary Understanding	Successful and original application of disciplinary concepts to topic. Author clearly illustrates an understanding of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.	Successful application of disciplinary concepts to topic. Author illustrates an understanding of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.	Solid application of disciplinary concepts. Author alludes to an understanding of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.	Adequate application of disciplinary concepts. Minimal discussion of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.	Proper use of disciplinary terms, but no application of concepts. No discussion of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.	No attempt to use disciplinary concepts in analysis. No discussion of how the discipline of sociology may be applied to solve "real-world" problems.
Content	Content demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of society and societal change. Analysis is supported by many details or examples.	Content demonstrates a clear understanding of society and societal change. Analysis is supported by one or two examples.	Content demonstrates an understanding of society or societal change. Analysis is supported by many details or examples.	Content demonstrates a moderate understanding of society or societal change. Analysis is supported by one or two examples.	Content demonstrates limited understanding of society or societal change. Minimal examples or support.	Content demonstrates no understanding of society or societal change. No examples or support.
Organization	Organization is unified and logical, with excellent transitions.	Organization is unified and logical, with effective transitions.	Organization is unified and coherent and transitions are used.	Organization is clear enough to follow without difficulty.	Organization may lack clear movement or focus, making the writer's ideas difficult to follow.	No organizational structure.
Writing Skill	There are minimal errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics. An outstanding command of language is apparent.	There are very few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics. An outstanding command of language is apparent.	While there may be a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, a good command of language is apparent.	A competency with language is apparent, even though there may be some errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics.	Numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics show poor control of language and may at times impede understanding.	Severe problems with grammar, usage, or mechanics show very poor control of language and may significantly impede understanding.

Assessment: Maggie Thorsen and David Eitle
Learning Outcomes: Sociological Concepts

SOCI 303 is an upper division course whose state learning objectives are: 1) demonstrate an understanding of social psychology theories from a sociological perspective; 2) demonstrate an understanding of how individuals both affect and are affected by their social environment; 3) analyze the social construction of the self and the social world; and 4) analyze and assess research literature including primary source research materials related to sociological social psychology.

We sampled ten papers—4 'A' papers, 3 'B' papers, and 3 'C' papers for our assessment of the learning objective sociological concepts. As identified in our assessment plan, the learning outcome sociological concepts is defined as: "Our students will demonstrate a knowledge, comprehension, and relevance of core sociological concepts." According to the assignment, students were asked to use terminology from Goffman and other course readings, and to discuss the components of impression management exercised by an actor in a context of their choosing. This could be a role they have played, watched someone play, or anticipate playing at some point. Students were instructed to use the Goffman terminology in their analysis. The papers were required to be between 750-1000 words.

We constructed a scoring rubric (below) independent of the paper assignment itself, since the purpose of the assessment is to determine whether learning outcomes are being met. We defined two elements of successful writing about sociological concepts (critical thinking and content) and two elements of successful writing more generally (organization and writing skill). It is important to note that the goals of this paper assignment need not be consistent with the assessment of this particular learning outcome.

'A' papers:
As a group, the A papers demonstrate strong-to-above average understanding of Goffman's impression management and largely provides adept applications of important concepts of Goffman. However, one reviewer noted that while papers in this range demonstrated that students could define and provide examples of some of these key concepts, they often failed to provide a *comprehensive* presentation of Goffman's concepts. Instead, they limited their analysis to only a couple of concepts. As a group, these papers were well written and more comprehensive than other papers. Students in this group also did a better job incorporating sociological concepts throughout their writing and analysis.

'B' papers:
The students who wrote these papers also wrote solid essays with an above average understanding of key concepts. However, what differentiated these papers from the A papers was either a more limited discussion of concepts overall or the failure to define/discuss the

overarching notion of impression management. These papers, relative to the A's, lack the depth and sophistication of their counterparts. The authors of the B papers also struggled somewhat with providing exemplar examples to illustrate concepts. Nonetheless, these papers do demonstrate a competency in defining Goffman's key concepts.

'C' papers:
Although these papers were clearly weaker overall than the A and B papers, they still demonstrated a rudimentary competency in defining key sociological concepts. Again, the issue of brevity begins to become salient in these papers, with papers that struggle to connect the definitions to the examples, fail to discuss impression management, and/or fails to provide detailed and comprehensive discussion of Goffman concepts. Authors of these papers used more space describing examples rather than analyzing and applying sociological concepts. At times their discussion strayed from the sociological into the anecdotal. Additionally, the papers suffer more from basic writing skills, including a lack of organization.

Recommendations:
All of the papers demonstrated at least a basic competency in defining some sociological concepts. The biggest distinction across the papers was the degree of sophistication in understanding and applying sociological concepts. The papers with the B and C grades seemed more focused on application/example than on the concepts themselves, and there was overall a poorer integration of concepts into the papers. Further, papers at the C level seemed to make few inferences/connections to the readings, which was a requirement of the assignment. Among the recommendations that we would forward would be to continue to emphasize the integration of sociological concepts into writing assignments, emphasizing that examples should not drive analyses, and helping students understanding the difference between simple definitions of concepts and the application of concepts. Students should also be reminded of the importance of discussing organizing principles (in this case, impression management) before the discussion/application of specific concepts.

Finally, we should note that it is important that we assess student command of sociological concepts in courses that emphasize social structure, such as social stratification, so that we can evaluate to what extent students can apply concepts that concern social structure and organization and larger social forces, in addition to social psychological and concepts that are more micro-oriented.

Criteria	Excellent 10 points	Approaching Excellence 9 points	Above Average 8 points	Average 7 points	Below Average 6 points	Poor 5 points
Critical Thinking	Successful and original application of course concepts to topic. Demonstrates a clear and sophisticated understanding of how concepts are interrelated.	Successful application of course concepts to topic. Demonstrates a clear understanding of multiple, related concepts.	Solid application of course concepts. Demonstrates understanding of several, related concepts.	Adequate application of course concepts. Demonstrates adequate understanding of a concepts, but not how they are interrelated.	Proper use of terms, but inadequate application of concepts. Does not demonstrate a very clear understanding of concepts.	No attempt to use course content in analysis.
Content	Content directly and logically relates to the main topic. Analysis is supported by many details or examples	Content directly relates to the main topic. Analysis is supported by several details or examples	Content clearly relates to the main topic. Analysis is supported by 1-2 details or examples	Content generally relates to the main topic. Analysis is mostly supported by details or examples.	Content deviates from main topic. Analysis is weakly supported by details or examples.	Content rarely relates to the main topic. Analysis is not supported by details or examples.
Organization	Organization is unified and logical, with excellent transitions.	Organization is unified and logical, with effective transitions.	Organization is unified and coherent and transitions are used.	Organization is clear enough to follow without difficulty.	Organization may lack clear movement or focus, making the writer's ideas difficult to follow.	No organizational structure.

Writing Skill	There are minimal errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics. An outstanding command of language is apparent.	There are very few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics. An outstanding command of language is apparent.	While there may be a few errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics, a good command of language is apparent.	A competency with language is apparent, even though there may be some errors in grammar, usage, and mechanics.	Numerous errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics show poor control of language and may at times impede understanding.	Severe problems with grammar, usage, or mechanics show very poor control of language and may significantly impede understanding.

Learning Outcomes Summary for Fall 2016-Spring 2017

The Sociology Assessment Committee met and reviewed two different courses: SOCI 499 Senior Thesis Capstone and SOCI 303 Society and the Individual (Spring 2017). This assessment report targeted two learning outcomes: a) sociological concepts—demonstrate a knowledge, comprehension, and relevance of core sociological concepts; and b) sociology as a discipline—demonstrate an understanding of the discipline of sociology and its role in contributing to our understanding of society and changes in society. Our review procedures entail using constructed rubrics designed (prior to using) to evaluate the learning outcomes with samples of student coursework.

Learning Outcomes: Sociological Concepts

As noted in the above assessment, the differences between the A papers and the others were varied but included the degree of sophistication in understanding (and illustrating) sociological concepts, the comprehensiveness of the essays, the discussion and recognition of the organizing principles that unite the concepts discussed, as well as basic writing and organization skills. We discuss some options to improve the application and use of sociological concepts in the Action plan (below).

Learning Outcomes: Sociology as a Discipline

As is the case with our assessment of sociological concepts, the quality artifacts were comprehensive in their response to the instructor charge. Furthermore, the quality papers made a sophisticated argument for how and why being trained as a sociologist advantaged them in the marketplace. The biggest issue was that few students actually responded to the instructor's prompt and made connections between sociology as a discipline and its usefulness in marketing oneself as an applicant for a particular position. Indeed, our assessment was that the modal category of student response was devoid of any presentation of the power of sociology, concepts, theories, and associated skills, and was largely limited to the mere mention

of having obtained a degree in sociology. Again, we discuss some options to improve student understanding of the power and application of sociology as a discipline.

Action Plan

Based upon the assessment, we have decided on the following actions:

1. Promote faculty conversations with students about the power of sociology and how to discuss the advantages of a sociology degree with employers, beyond broaching the topic in the capstone.

2. Continue to consider a writing intensive course to promote writing in the discipline.

3. Continue to promote providing peer models of successful work to fellow students so that they can model their papers accordingly.

4. Work with faculty at the beginning of the academic year to identify assignments/exercises that can provide suitable assessment products.

Learning outcomes reviewed in Anthropology for 2016-2017:

(1) Students shall engage in field or laboratory research and carry out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections.

(2) Students shall learn to read, understand, and critique anthropological works.

Two classes were reviewed for the academic year 2016-2017 following the established review procedures. A summary of the review procedures, outcomes, and new strategies follows the review of each class.

<div align="center">

ANTY 454: Lithic Technology
Professor: Michael Neeley

</div>

Assessment by: Dr. Michael Neeley
Learning Outcome: *Students shall engage in field or laboratory research and carry out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections.*

This course provides students with a better understanding of ancient stone technology. The majority of the prehistoric archaeological record is comprised of stone artifacts making it particularly relevant and important to understand the processes of manufacture, analysis, and interpretation associated with stone technology. Over the course of the semester students engaged in a combination of hands-on activities and theoretical discussions regarding the manufacture, use, and discard of lithic implements culminating in the analysis of an archaeological collection. Specific course outcomes for students include defining the mechanics of stone tool manufacture and distinguishing the various characteristics of the manufacturing process, demonstrating a minimal level of proficiency in flintknapping, comprehending how archaeologists use stone artifacts to reconstruct behavior, and applying these outcomes and themes to analyze and interpret a collection of stone artifacts.

The course material was presented through a combination lecture and discussion. The discussions followed topical readings from selected archaeological journals and book chapters. These readings and subsequent discussions gave students an opportunity to explore the archaeological topics that fall within the parameters of the lithic analysis and interpretation.

Assignments for the class included two short assignments involving the analysis and description of lithic materials. These serve as an introduction to the types of analyses performed by lithic analysts in archaeological contexts. Students were also required to assemble an illustration notebook in which the illustrations adhere to standard illustration conventions. There were also six practicums designed to provide students with some basic experience with lithic analysis. These serve as training exercises for the final project. The final project for the class consisted of a poster presentation on a lithic dataset or collection. Alternatively, this could be an experimental project involving stone artifacts. This project can be carried out individually or jointly with one other student.

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+

A total of 6 projects were submitted by the 11 students (five of the projects were joint projects and one was an individual one—note one student did not submit a project). All of the projects involved either the analysis of an archaeological collection of stone artifacts or the design of an experiment using stone artifacts. The average score for the submitted projects was 86% (or 4.6 on a 5 point scale). Using the above scale, this suggests that the class **"exceeds expectations"** for the learning outcome of "engaging in field or laboratory research and carrying out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections." This appears to be solidly in the upper range of the measure and certainly exceeds the acceptable standard. On a student by student basis, all of the 11 students who submitted projects were in the exceeds expectations range.

In assessing the projects, all of them were successful in identifying a question or theme around which the analysis or experiment focused. The projects were a little more variable in establishing a methodology that would enable them to adequately address the question of interest. Perhaps, the greatest shortcoming of the analyses was linking the results to larger, more interesting behavioral aspects of the projects. This involves thinking about the results beyond positive/negative or significant/ non-signficant and envisioning the broader implications of the project results to the larger fields of archaeology and anthropology. Students are certainly exposed to this bigger picture thinking in the class readings and discussion, but I think the process by which one applies this to their own work is a gradual, on-going process and not likely to be achieved instantaneously at the undergraduate level.

In sum, I believe the assessment indicates that students who take this class (and put forth an honest effort) are successful in meeting the learning outcomes of engaging in field or laboratory research and carrying out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections.

Assessment by: Dr. Jack Fisher
Learning Outcome: *Students shall engage in field or laboratory research and carry out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections*.

The syllabus for ANTY 454 (Lithic Technology) states clearly that a final research project is required, and that this project should either analyze a stone artifact collection or dataset, or should take the form of an experimental project using stone artifacts. The final project could be carried out individually or in a team of two students. The project was to be submitted as a poster. A poster is an appropriate format for students to become familiar with, because poster presentations are used widely at archaeological conferences ranging in scope from state-level to international.

For this assessment, I examined all six posters that were submitted. Five of these were done by two students working together, and the sixth was by a single student. Some projects were experiments and others analyzed a lithic artifact collection. All the projects included a hands-on component of working with stone artifacts. This is appropriate to the goals of this course, since the field of lithic technology is very much a hands-on enterprise. The grades for the projects all fell within the **exceeds expectation** category, and ranged from B- through A-. In reading each poster, I found that the posters at the lower end of the grade range exhibited one or more common problems. These included (1) some lack of clarity in defining the question or problem being addressed; (2) some lack of clarity in describing concepts or experimental procedures; and, (3) drawing conclusions that were somewhat narrow in scope. Those posters at the higher end of the grade range generally were conceptually more challenging, and described goals, concepts, and methods clearly. Some of these posters gave thoughtfully discussion to methodological difficulties that were encountered, and presented interesting

insights that resulted from the research.

In sum, I believe that the research project served as an excellent means to assess students' abilities to: (a) carry out a well-designed and meaningful research project pertaining to lithic technology; and (b) present their research clearly and effectively in a poster format. The sample of papers from ANTY 454 (Lithic Technology) demonstrates that the course on average "exceeds expectations" with regard to the learning outcome stated above.

ANTY 327: Medical Anthropology
Professor Laurence M. Carucci

Assessment by Dr. Laurence Carucci
Learning Outcomes Reviewed: *Students shall learn to read, understand, and critique anthropological works.*

Medical Anthropology provides students with a survey of some critical recent works in the expanding field of Medical Anthropology. This field has come to be positioned on the cutting edge of anthropological enquiry since it sits at the interface of individual human experience – and particularly transformative experiences -- cultural ontology, and various domains of social formulation and control. In addition to reading five monograph-length original works in the field along with a set of supporting articles and writing essays on what they learned from these materials, students had the opportunity to conduct their own field research investigations. Course outcomes for ANTY 327 include enhancing students' abilities to analyze and discuss cultural theories of illness, medical epistemology, and healing among several different cultures and cultural groups; providing students with the ability to explain how human bodies are culturally fashioned, the power relations that differentially shape those bodies, and the experiential realities that are an integral part of inhabiting such distinct bodies; assisting students as they learn how to explain the differences between/among theories of illness and health that rely solely on principles of physical causation and theories grounded in social accord, in balanced relations among beings in an animate view of nature, and in non-corporeal causation; and teaching students how to apply sound ethnographic and interpretative methods in a community-based field research project in medical anthropology.

Course materials were presented through a combination of lecture and discussion including not only the topics covered in readings, but supplemented by guest lectures and topically-complementary films. Discussions allowed students to begin to grapple with ideas that would be of assistance to them as they dealt with the written assignments required for the course.

Assignments included five short essays (5-7 pages each), one for each of the assigned books that each dealt with core theoretical concepts in the field and with the central themes of each book. These assignments serve not only to ensure that the students have read and understood the relevant materials, but also provide a forum for students to display their respective abilities to deconstruct the core concepts covered in each work and to re-frame those materials given the discussion of broader analytic frameworks in anthropology. Combined with participation, which accounts for 20% of the grade in this seminar-style course, the field project (30% of grade) then offers students the opportunity to explore a topic of personal interest within medical anthropology. The selected topics included everything from interactions with dementia residents in a local long-term care facility, to people's feelings about and engagement with medical marijuana, to anxiety disorders in contemporary America, to the social and cultural positioning of Sweat Lodge practices. As with all hands-on field research projects, each student research project had to be reviewed by the IRB, requiring students to learn not only about their respective research topics and reinforce that field research-grounded knowledge with comparative "library" research, but also to learn about the research process, how to write a proposal,

how to follow-through with operationalizing a research agenda, how to analyze the resultant research materials, and how to then synthesize what each student has learned in a cohesive research report or analytic essay.

To quantify research outcomes for the course, the scores from the final project were used as a data source and aligned with the outcomes of the scoring method approved by the members of the Anthropology Program. That scoring method, as outlined in 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+

A total of 22 field research projects were submitted by students enrolled in the class. Three pairs of students elected to work on joint research projects, though each member of the team completed their own analysis and submitted their own analytic field research essay. One of the essays involved plagiarism and that student received a "0" for the assignment. Since that project did not involve any gradable original work, I exclude it from the average of all scores. The average score for the remaining 21 completed projects was 85.48%, suggesting that the class **"exceeded expectations"** for the learning outcome requiring them to "read, understand, and critique anthropological works". In this case, the students generated their own primary sources and used the original research of scholars in the field to contextualize and frame their research outcomes.

In addition to the research projects, I averaged the scores on the five essay exams for the 21 students (not including the one cited for plagiarism) who completed that work. (The student who had plagiarized the project also had submitted plagiarized work on the essay exams.) The average score for the five exams is 84.5%, again suggesting that the class **"exceeded expectations"** for the learning outcome requiring them to "read, understand, and critique anthropological works". In this case, the students analyzed original works of well-respected scholars in the field of medical anthropology and used theoretical materials that serve as critical analytic tools in social and cultural anthropology more generally to critique those works.

In sum, the assessment indicates that the students enrolled in Anthropology 327, including anthropology majors along with other students pursuing medicine and health-related degrees were successful in meeting the analytic learning outcomes under review by Anthropology for the 2016-2017 academic year. The 5 critical essays and the dedicated field research project provided ample ground to assess the positive student outcomes in each of these domains. As for the single student who plagiarized both venues, essays and project, I have agreed to help mentor that student so that any such future problems may be avoided.

Assessment by: Dr. Tomomi Yamaguchi
Learning Outcomes Reviewed: *Students shall learn to read, understand, and critique anthropological works.*

The class (ANTY 327 Medical Anthropology) requires students to work on a field project that offers them the opportunity to explore a topic of personal interest within medical anthropology. The topics of the sample assignments that I assessed range widely depending on students' interests, from dementia, anti-anxiety drugs, and voodoo, all related to medicine and medical practices. In addition to the field research and writing phases, each student research project had to be reviewed by the IRB, requiring students to learn the research processes and ethics that are essential for research on human subjects.

Students also did library research to support their ethnographic research. Conducting research in the field and at the library, analyzing the data and writing into an ethnography are the skills that students of sociocultural anthropology need in their upper-division classes, and this class provides those components. This assignment prepares students for their future careers in Anthropology and other related fields, and exceeded expectations for the above learning outcome.

The grades for the papers I reviewed were: A, B and B-/C+ and C. The C paper reviewed the field research that the student had conducted in a detailed fashion, but was somewhat disorganized and did not use the student's library research to maximum advantage. The B-/C+ paper conducted good library-based research but failed to present any field research data in the paper; therefore, while it was well-written, it did not fulfill the field research component of the assignment, nor did it fully complete the field component for this learning outcome. The rest of the papers reflect the successful achievement of the learning outcome, and the A paper accomplished this end in an exemplary fashion. The average score for the 21 completed projects (except for one plagiarized paper) was 85.48%, which demonstrated that the students successfully met the above learning outcome.

For the second set of assignments, the instructor assigned five short essay exams (5-7 pages each), one for each of the assigned ethnographies that dealt with core theoretical concepts and applied research applications in the field of medical anthropology. These assignments are important for developing students' skills in learning how to read, understand, and critique anthropological monographs.

The three essay exams that I assessed represented the full range of student scores on one of the five essay assignments. To maintain some equivalence in my comparison of the students' work, each essay I reviewed was based on the same book (Margaret Lock's *Twice Dead,* a monograph on the theme of organ transplants and brain death in Japan and the U.S.). The range of grades on the assignment were A/A-, B and C/C-. The lower grade for the C/C- essay was based predominantly on students' poor writing skills, although the student did demonstrate their understanding of the assigned text (with the writing issue fixed, the paper would be of B quality.) The A essay not only demonstrated the student's understanding and critical analysis of the required text, it was a much more comprehensive essay that utilized external sources to support the argument. The average scores on the five essays for the 21 students (not including the one cited for plagiarism) who completed that work was 84.5%, again successfully demonstrating that the course exceeded expectations for the learning outcome.

Learning Outcomes Summary for Fall 2016-Spring 2017
ANTHROPOLOGY FACULTY RESPONSE

The faculty of the Anthropology Program met to review the assessment plan for the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 terms. The reviews were of two upper division courses. The first of these was Anthropology 454, Lithic Technology, which was assessed to ascertain the success in accomplishing the learning outcome to *"engage in field or laboratory research and carry out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections."* The second course was Anthropology 327, Medical Anthropology, which was assessed to measure the learning outcome that "*students shall learn to read, understand, and critique anthropological works*." The enrollments for these courses were 12 students (Lithic Technology) and 22 students (Medical Anthropology). Our review procedures involve having the instructor use the relevant criteria to review his/her own course and have the second specialist in this sub-discipline (archaeology or cultural anthropology) read a subset of the materials submitted by the students to see if the relevant criteria has been met.

For Lithic Technology, the instructor (Dr. Neeley) determined that the course, on average, exceeded expectations (4 on a scale of 5) in meeting the learning outcome. The second reviewer (Dr. Fisher), reading a sub-set of the student exams and projects, agreed that the course exceeded expectations in

providing students with an opportunity to *"engage in field or laboratory research and carry out preliminary analyses of materials from primary materials and/or collections."*

For Medical Anthropology, the professor (Dr. Carucci) found that the course, on average, exceeded expectations (4 on a scale of 5) in meeting both of the assessed learning outcomes. The second reviewer (Dr. Yamaguchi), reading a sub-set of student research projects and exams agreed that the course exceeded expectations in meeting both learning outcomes. That is, students "*learned to read, understand, and critique anthropological works*."

While we agree that the courses under review here are successful in meeting the learning outcomes, there are typically a handful of students who are unsuccessful in the course. As part of our assessment, this is an opportunity to reflect upon the methods and strategies used and suggest ways in which the student outcomes can be improved. One concern with student projects is the rush to complete the project at the last minute. These projects generally are under-researched and tend to fail to meet the desired learning outcome. One way to force students to engage in the research process is to require them to submit project ideas, outlines, and drafts at selected times during the semester in order to provide critical feedback for the success of the project. While these benchmarks are often used in lower level anthropology classes with project assignments, implementing them more consistently at the upper level will ensure that students are moving toward their final research goals in a timely manner.