

Annual Program Assessment Report

Academic Year Assessed: 2020-2021

College: Letters and Science

Department: Sociology & Anthropology

Submitted by: Michael Neeley

Assessment reports are to be submitted annually by program/s. The report deadline is October 15th.

Program(s) Assessed:

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

Majors/Minors/Certificate	Options
Anthropology	

Annual Assessment Process (CHECK OFF LIST)

1. Data are collected as defined by Assessment Plan
 YES NO
2. Population or unbiased samples of collected assignments are scored by at least two faculty members using scoring rubrics to ensure inter-rater reliability.
 YES NO
3. Areas where the acceptable performance threshold has not been met are highlighted.
 YES NO NA
4. Assessment scores were presented at a program/unit faculty meeting.
 YES NO
5. The faculty reviewed the assessment results, and responded accordingly (Check all appropriate lines)
 - Gather additional data to verify or refute the result.
 - Identify potential curriculum changes to try to address the problem
 - Change the acceptable performance threshold, reassess
 - Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome
 - Faculty may reconsider thresholds
 - Evaluate the rubric to assure outcomes meet student skill level
 - Use Bloom's Taxonomy to consider stronger learning outcomes
 - Choose a different assignment to assess the outcome
- OTHER: Develop a curriculum map.
6. Does your report demonstrate changes made because of previous assessment results (closing the loop)? YES NO

2. What Was Done

a) Was the completed assessment consistent with the plan provided? YES ___ ___ NO X ___

If no, please explain why the plan was altered.

Made some changes with regard to which PLO was assessed and the data source. Instructor submitted a paper artifact so data source was modified to fit the artifact. Also, we were hoping to evaluate PLO #3, but the artifact submitted was better suited to PLO #2, so change was made and PLO #3 will be assessed in next assessment cycle.

b) Please provide a rubric that demonstrates how your data was evaluated.

PLO #2: Students will identify the biological principles and historical contingencies that explain and govern the deep history of humanity as revealed by the findings of human paleontology and archaeology.					
Indicator	Level 1: Not yet competent	Level 2: Fairly Competent	Level 3: Highly Competent	Level 4: Sophisticated	Threshold Values: 80% of students will meet or exceed Level 3 competency
Relevance of Answer to the Question	Essay did not answer the question	Answer is incomplete; excessive discussion of unrelated issues and/or significant errors in content	Answer is brief with insufficient detail; unrelated issues were introduced and/or minor errors in content	Answer is complete; sufficient detail provided to support assertions; answer focuses only on issues related to the question; factually correct	
Thoroughness of Answer	None of the relevant details were included	Serious gaps in the basic details needed	Most of the basic details are included but some are missing	Deals fully with the entire question	
Organization and Logic of Answer	Weak organization; sentences rambling; ideas are repeated	Minor problems of organization or logic; needs work on creating transitions between ideas	Clear and logical presentation; good development of an argument; transitions are made clearly and smoothly	Clear and logical presentation; good development of an argument; transitions are made clearly and smoothly	
Mechanics of Writing	Major problems with mechanics of language; awkward sentence construction; poor or absent transitions; frequently difficult to understand	Frequent problems with mechanics of language; occasional awkward sentences and poor transitions; reduce readability	Clear, readable prose; good use of transitions; no problems with spelling, punctuation or grammar	Clear, readable prose; good use of transitions; no problems with spelling, punctuation or grammar	

<p>PLO #1: Students will develop an appreciation for the diversity of human cultures and languages and the principles and methods that anthropologists employ for studying them.</p>
--

	Level 1: Not yet competent	Level 2: Fairly Competent	Level 3: Highly Competent	Level 4: Sophisticated	Threshold Values: 80% of students will meet or exceed Level 3 competency
Depth of Analysis	Paper does not address the assignment. Paper is inconsistent with anthropological principles (e.g., it makes or fails to challenge ethnocentric assumptions)	Paper does not address some aspects of the assignment. Paper demonstrates a somewhat shaky grasp of anthropological principles.	Paper fully meets the parameters of the assignment but does not exceed them. Paper demonstrates a good grasp of anthropological principles but has some awkwardness in applying them.	Paper goes beyond the assignment to explore the implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts or in particularly thoughtful, insightful, and/or original ways. Paper shows a nuanced grasp of anthropological principles and the ability to apply these principles with facility.	
Grasp of Readings	Paper badly misrepresents the authors' arguments, evidence, and/or conclusions.	Paper represents the authors' arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately though not sufficiently clearly. There are minor inaccuracies.	Paper represents the author's arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately.	Paper represents the authors' arguments, evidence and conclusions accurately, fairly and eloquently. Demonstrates a firm understanding of the implications of the author's arguments.	
Thesis Paragraph	Thesis paragraph does not have a discernable central argument. The argument is not demonstrable.	Thesis paragraph identifies a central argument that is demonstrable, though not stated sufficiently clearly. Does not guide the reader into the body of the paper.	Thesis paragraph clearly identifies a demonstrable central argument. Gives the reader a reasonably good sense of the nature of evidence that will follow.	Clearly and eloquently identifies a demonstrable and nuanced central argument. Provides the reader with a clear sense of the nature of evidence that will follow. Reveals the organizational structure of the paper. Guides the reader smoothly and logically into the body of the paper.	
Evidence	Evidence used does not clearly support the main argument. (Where applicable) Important opposing evidence is ignored, thereby weakening the central argument.	Connection between argument and evidence is not clearly articulated in all cases. (Where applicable) Consideration of opposing evidence is cursory or the evidence is not convincingly refuted.	Evidence used to support the central point is well chosen, though not particularly rich or detailed. The connection between argument and evidence is clearly articulated. (Where applicable) Some opposing evidence is considered and refuted.	Evidence used to support the central point is rich, detailed and well chosen. Evidence sections employ appropriate illustrations and/or quotations. The connection between argument and evidence is clearly and compellingly articulated in all cases. (Where applicable) Important opposing evidence (i.e. evidence that might seem to contradict your argument) is considered and convincingly refuted.	
Conclusion	Is missing or cursory. Repeats the topic paragraph more-or-less verbatim.	Restates the same points as the topic paragraph without reframing them. Introduces new material rather than new perspectives.	Synthesizes and brings closure but does not examine new perspectives or questions.	Elegantly synthesizes and reframes key points from the paper. Suggests new perspectives or questions relevant to the central argument, and brings closure.	
Organization	Organization of the paper as a whole is not logical or discernable.	Organization of the paper as a whole can only be discerned with effort. Not all parts of the paper fit the organizational structure. Not all the parts of the paper are effectively integrated. In a number of paragraphs, there is not a distinct or coherent point. Topic sentences are missing or unclear in a number of paragraphs. In a number of paragraphs, the parts do not connect logically.	Organization of paper as a whole is logical and apparent, but transitions between paragraphs are not consistently smooth. Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point and, for the most part, the parts of each paragraph connect logically and effectively. In all but a few cases, the paragraph's point is expressed in a clear topic sentence.	Organization of paper as a whole is logical and quickly apparent. Connections among paragraphs are clearly articulated. Transitions between paragraphs are smooth. Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point, expressed in a clear topic sentence; the parts of each paragraph connect logically and persuasively, and internal transitions are smooth.	
Clarity	Throughout the paper, wording is imprecise or ambiguous. Sentence structure is consistently confusing.	Wording is imprecise or ambiguous fairly often. Sentence structure is often confusing. Quotations are not framed effectively in the text.	Paper is for the most part precisely worded and unambiguous. Sentence structure is mostly clear. Quotations are framed effectively in the text.	Throughout the paper, wording is precise and unambiguous. Sentence structure is consistently clear and lucid. Quotations are all framed effectively in the text (i.e. integrated properly in terms of both grammar and meaning) and explicated where necessary.	
Mechanics	Paper is unacceptably sloppy. Quotes are frequently not attributed or improperly cited.	There are a number of spelling and grammatical errors. In a few places, quotes are not attributed and cited.	There are a few minor spelling or grammatical errors. Quotes are all properly attributed and cited.	Paper is clean and appropriately formatted. There are no incomplete or run-on sentences. Quotes are all properly attributed and cited. There are virtually no spelling or grammatical errors.	

--	--	--	--	--	--

This type of rubric can be used for all levels of assessment (the anticipated evaluation score may vary according to the course level). Some rubrics/assessments may be more tailored for courses (e.g. designed to assess outcomes in upper division courses or for lower division) and therefore the scores might be similar across course levels. Or, if you are assessing more basic learning outcomes, you might expect outcomes to be established earlier in the academic career.

3. How Data Were Collected

a) How were data collected? (Please include method of collection and sample size).

For ANTY 313, all of the completed quizzes (16 of 19 in the class) were submitted as artifacts. Of the 16, a little over a third (6 of 16, 37.5%) were evaluated with the above rubric. Each quiz was given a number and a random number generator used to select the 6 in this sample.

For ANTY 225, a sample of 7 papers was submitted by the instructor as artifacts. These represent an 16% sample (7 of 44) for the class.

b) Explain the assessment process, and who participated in the analysis of the data.

Each of the artifacts for each PLO was read and scored for each category using the rubrics presented above. Every artifact was given a final overall score. These are presented in table form below.

The analysis of the data was carried out by the assessment committee chair. Since the department currently only has three faculty, it was decided that the initial assessment would be carried out by the single individual and then present the material to the rest of the faculty. These was done so that faculty would not be evaluating their own courses.

Data Table for ANTY 313 PLO #2: Students will identify the biological principles and historical contingencies that explain and govern the deep history of humanity as revealed by the findings of human paleontology and archaeology.

	Sample #2	Sample #3	Sample #4	Sample #8	Sample #9	Sample #13	Overall
Relevance of Answer to the Question	L3/L4	L3/L4	L2/L3	L2	L4	L2	(2.91) L3
Thoroughness of the Answer	L3/L4	L3	L3	L2	L3/L4	L2	(2.91) L3
Organization & Logic of Answer	L3	L3/L4	L2/L3	L2	L3/L4	L2	(2.75) L3
Mechanics of Writing	L3	L3/L4	L2/L3	L3	L3/L4	L3	(3.08) L3
Overall	L3/L4	L3/L4	L2/L3	L2	L3/L4	L2	(2.83) L3

A summary of the scores show three answers at Level 3/Level 4, one at Level 2/Level 3, and two at Level 2. This puts four (67%) of the answers (rounding up) at Highly Competent or above and two of these at Fairly Competent.

Data Table for ANTY 225 PLO #1: Students will develop an appreciation for the diversity of human cultures and languages and the principles and methods that anthropologists employ for studying them.

	Paper #1	Paper #2	Paper #3	Paper #4	Paper #5	Paper #6	Paper #7	Overall
Topic	Unabomber	Covid Impact	Covid vs. Spanish Flu	Pipe Tobacco	Julien Solomita & Fam	Body Modification	Theatre, Cult. Shock	
Depth of Analysis	L3/L4	L2/L3	L2/L3	L3	L3	L2/L3	L3/L4	(2.92) L3
Grasp of Readings	L3	L2/L3	L3	L2/L3	L2/L3	L3	L3	(2.78) L3
Thesis Paragraph	L3	L3	L2	L3	L2	L2/L3	L2/L3	(2.57) L2/L3
Evidence	L3	L3	L2/L3	L3	L3	L2	L3/L4	(2.85) L3
Conclusion	L3	L2/L3	L2/L3	L3	L2/L3	L2	L3	(2.64) L2/L3
Organization	L3/L4	L3	L3	L2/L3	L2/L3	L2/L3	L3	(2.85) L3
Clarity	L3/L4	L3	L2/L3	L3	L2/L3	L2	L3	(2.78) L3
Mechanics	L3	L3	L3	L3	L2	L2	L3	(2.71) L2/L3
Overall	L3/L4	L3	L2/L3	L3	L2/L3	L2	L3/L4	(2.78) L3

A summary of the overall scores for this answer have two at Level 3/Level 4, two at Level 3, two at Level 2/Level 3, and one at Level 2. Rounding up, six (**85%**) are at Highly Competent or above and only one is at Fairly Competent.

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.

4. What Was Learned

Based on the analysis of the data, and compared to the threshold values provided, what was learned from the assessment?

In one case (ANTY 225) the threshold of 80% was met, whereas in the other case only 67% of the artifacts met the threshold. Since this is the first time we have used this rubric and threshold, there might be some value in thinking about what the scores reflect and whether we should use the current 80% as our threshold. One of the difficulties with the use of levels vs. standard grades is that we tend to equate the levels with grades (i.e., sophisticated =A, highly competent =B, etc.). Since this is our first run through with this system, we may want to revised our thresholds to reflect this different way of thinking.

a) Areas of strength

In the essay answer, the strength of the argument is typically reflected in the student addressing or understanding the question and then being able to bring sufficient detail to address the question. Organization is also important, but not nearly as much as knowing something about the question. Writing mechanics seem to be least important and probably serve to separate high competent from sophisticated responses. So, it seems that students are getting the necessary information/details to construct very good answers.

For the paper example, the strengths are depth of analysis, use of evidence, and organization. Again, it seems that the concepts/ideas and the evidence to support them are strengths of the writing process. In addition, good organization is also reflected in these papers.

b) Areas that need improvement

In the paper examples, the biggest weaknesses are seen in the mechanics of writing, the thesis paragraph, and the conclusion. Anecdotally, this seems to be a time issue as students who write things at the last minute tend to have less well-written text (less time for editing) and often run out of steam when they get to the conclusion section. The issue of the thesis statement is important, as it is the lynchpin for a successful paper. So often students have good paper ideas and data, but have a difficult time understanding what it and how to present a compelling thesis statement.

5. How We Responded

a) Describe how “What Was Learned” was communicated to the department, or program faculty. Was there a forum for faculty to provide feedback and recommendations?

The results were sent to each of the faculty and then the three of us got together to discuss the results. There was a general sense that this was useful, but no plan of action was deemed to be necessary at the present.

b) Based on the faculty responses, will there any curricular or assessment changes (such as plans for measurable improvements, or realignment of learning outcomes)?

YES _____ NO ___x___

If yes, when will these changes be implemented?

Please include which outcome is targeted, and how changes will be measured for improvement. If other criteria is used to recommend program changes (such as exit surveys, or employer satisfaction surveys) please explain how the responses are driving department, or program decisions.

c) When will the changes be next assessed?

6. Closing the Loop

a) Based on assessment from previous years, can you demonstrate program level changes that have led to outcome improvements?

This is the first year that we have collected data under the new assessment plan so there is no comparative data to use to direct changes or improvements. It is likely that several years of data and multiple outcome assessments will be needed in order to figure out the best path for altering the learning outcomes.

One area of change that we feel is useful for further assessment is the development of a curriculum map for anthropology. We have started the map (see below) as a way to help us see where different courses fit into the program learning outcomes.

Submit report to programassessment@montana.edu

ANTY Curriculum Map

Course #	Title	Program Outcomes				
		Diversity of cultures & languages and methods used to study them	Biological & historical contingencies used to explain the past	Laws & processes of heredity and evolution	Knowledge of anthropological or archaeological theory	Critical thinking & cross cultural competencies
ANTY 101D	Anth & Human Experience	I	I	I	-	I
ANTY 212CS	Bones, Apes, & Ancestors	-	I	I	-	-
ANTY 215IS	Human Prehistory	-	I	I	-	-
ANTY 223IS	Anth, Pop Culture & Everyday Life	I	-	-	-	I
ANTY 225IS	Culture, Lang & Society	I	-	-	-	I
ANTY 242D	Contemporary Japan	I	-	-	-	I
ANTY 252IS	Mysteries of the Past	-	I	I	-	-
ANTY 313	Biological Anthropology	-	D	D	-	-
ANTY 315	Forensic Anthropology	-	D	D	-	-
ANTY 327	Medical Anthropology	D	D	-	-	D
ANTY 332	Native North America	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 336	Myth, Ritual, & Religion	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 337	Sex, Gender, Sexuality Japan	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 343	Popular Culture Japan	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 348	Contemporary Africa	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 350	Old World Prehistory	-	D	D	-	D
ANTY 351	Archaeology of N. America	-	D	-	-	D
ANTY 356	Archaeology of SW Asia	-	D	-	-	D
ANTY 375	Anth of Humans & Environ	-	D	-	-	D
ANTY 427	Anthropology of Gender	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 428RS	Anthropological Theory	-	-	-	D/M	D
ANTY 441	Social Movements in Japan	D	-	-	-	D
ANTY 450R	Archaeological Theory	-	D/M	-	D/M	D
ANTY 454	Lithic Technology	-	D	-	-	D
ANTY 467	Arch Field School	-	D	-	-	-
ANTY 473	Language & Culture	D	-	-	-	D
		I—Students are introduced to the outcome				
		D—Students have the opportunity to further develop the outcome				
		M—Students can demonstrate mastery at the exit level				