**2018-2019 Annual Program Assessment Report Guide**

Please submit report to your department chair or program coordinator, the Associate Dean of your College, and to [james.solomon@csun.edu](mailto:james.solomon@csun.edu), Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review, by **September 30, 2019**. You may, but are not required to, submit a separate report for each program, including graduate degree programs, which conducted assessment activities, or you may combine programs in a single report. **Please include this form with your report in the same file and identify your department/program in the file name.**

**College: College of Social and Behavioral Sciences**

**Department: Anthropology**

**Program: Undergraduate**

**Assessment liaison: Chin-hsin Liu**

1. **Please check off whichever is applicable:**

**A. \_\_\_x\_\_\_\_ Measured student work within program major/options.**

**B. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Analyzed results of measurement within program major/options.**

**C. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Applied results of analysis to program review/curriculum/review/revision major/options.**

**D. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Focused exclusively on the direct assessment measurement of General Education Arts and Humanities student learning outcomes**

1. **Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s).** On a separate sheet,provide a brief overview of this year’s assessment activities, including:

* an explanation for why your department chose the assessment activities (measurement, analysis, application, or GE assessment) that it enacted
* if your department implemented assessment **option A**, identify which program SLOs were assessed (please identify the SLOs in full), in which classes and/or contexts, what assessment instruments were used and the methodology employed, the resulting scores, and the relation between this year’s measure of student work and that of past years: (include as an appendix any and all relevant materials that you wish to include)
* if your department implemented assessment **option B**, identify what conclusions were drawn from the analysis of measured results, what changes to the program were planned in response, and the relation between this year’s analyses and past and future assessment activities
* if your department implemented **option C**, identify the program modifications that were adopted, and the relation between program modifications and past and future assessment activities
* if your program implemented **option D**, exclusively or simultaneously with **options** **A, B, and/or C**, identify the basic skill(s) assessed and the precise learning outcomes assessed, the assessment instruments and methodology employed, and the resulting scores
* in what way(s) your assessment activities may reflect the university’s commitment to diversity in all its dimensions but especially with respect to underrepresented groups
* any other assessment-related information you wish to include, including SLO revision (especially to ensure continuing alignment between program course offerings and both program and university student learning outcomes), and/or the creation and modification of new assessment instruments

1. **Preview of planned assessment activities for 2019-20.** Include a brief description as reflective of a continuous program of ongoing assessment.

# **2. Overview of Annual Assessment Project**

## **A. Assessment Rationale**

This year’s assessment plan was designed 1) to execute one of the assessment activities planned during AY17-18 for AY 18-19 and 2) to evaluate the effectiveness of the Department’s AY18-19 teaching theme “Engaging Evidence”. In the AY17-18 assessment report, one of the planned items was “… to more closely evaluate the overall performance of students in our courses, in keeping with the University goals set by the 2025 initiative, in order to decrease the DFU rates and close the achievement gaps where they exist.” As the Department and its faculty members continue to implement policies and pedagogical strategies to reach the goals of the Graduate Initiative 2025, for AY 18-19 it was fitting to assess these efforts as reflected by students’ performance. In addition, with full support of the faculty the Department selected “Engaging Evidence” as the teaching theme for AY18-19. With anthropology being an all-encompassing discipline, our curriculum is designed to offer a variety of courses in major subdisciplines (sociocultural anthropology, archaeology, and biological anthropology). Students majoring and minoring in anthropology have an extent of freedom to choose courses that would most fulfil their specific interests in anthropology. The goals of establishing a teaching theme is to deepen students’ knowledge of an important concept in anthropology by amplifying the discussion around it, to demonstrate to students how the subdisciplines of anthropology “speak” to one another to form a holistic social science, and to promote cohesiveness across the curriculum. Since the teaching theme is a new approach for the Department, in consultation with the Department Chair, the assessment liaison and committee members collectively decided to incorporate assessing the effectiveness of this approach into the AY18-19 assessment activities.

## **B. Assessment Design**

To best integrate the above assessment goals, the committee chose to assess a portion of the Undergraduate Program Learning Outcome **(PLO) 5** “**Demonstrate the ability to conceptualize, collect, describe, analyze, interpret, and communicate anthropological evidence according to generally accepted professional practice and ethics**”. We decided to focus on the “**analyze and interpret**” aspects of PLO5 to best align assessment with the teaching theme “Engaging Evidence”.

To control for level of difficulty and to measure performance represented by students majoring/minoring in anthropology, three (3) 400 level courses offered in Fall 2018 were chosen for assessment, one in each subdiscipline. They were **ANTH 490C (Seminar in Cultural Anthropology: Anthropology of Tourism), ANTH 426 (Old World Archaeology), and ANTH 440 (Bioarchaeology)**.

Direct assessment of signature assignments was employed. Culminating work by all students in each class was designated as signature assignments:

ANTH 490C & ANTH 440: final research papers

ANTH 426: final exam essays

The assessment committee chair (= liaison) developed and finalized the following assessment rubric, with the committee members’ input. The assessment activities were divided among the committee chair and its two members. The committee chair and each committee member had sufficient knowledge of the subject matter to evaluate students’ performance against the rubric.

**Assessment Rubric**

|  | **1. Unsatisfactory** | **2. Developing** | **3. Proficient** | **4. Exemplary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Analysis** | Analyses of data are not conducted or are conducted entirely incorrectly for the type(s) of evidence analyzed. | Analyses of data are conducted. | Analyses of data are conducted without errors for the type(s) of evidence analyzed. | Analyses of data are conducted sophistically for the type(s) of evidence analyzed. |
| **Interpretation** | No connection between argument and evidence is made or is attempted with significant logical flaws. | The connection between argument and evidence is not clearly articulated and/or with some logical flaws. | The connection between argument and evidence is articulated logically and clearly. | The connection between argument and evidence is articulated logically, clearly and compellingly. |

Digital version of the signature assignments from each course was collected at the beginning of Spring 2019. Instructor of each course removed all identifiable student information prior to submitting the assignments to the committee chair. The committee chair then verified and organized the files into folders and distributed securely to committee members. All assessment activities were completed by the end of March 2019 and results were collected by the committee chair.

## **C. Results & Interpretations**

Below are the tabulated results (number of students; %) of assessment for each course.

**ANTH 490C (Seminar in Cultural Anthropology: Anthropology of Tourism)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# of students= 27** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 1 | 9 | 6 | 1 |
| Interpretation | 1 | 7 | 6 | 3 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **%** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 3.7 | 33.3 | 22.2 | 3.7 |
| Interpretation | 3.7 | 25.9 | 22.2 | 11.1 |

**ANTH 426 (Old World Archaeology)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# of students= 28** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 2 | 9 | 9 | 8 |
| Interpretation | 3 | 12 | 9 | 4 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **%** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 7.1 | 32.1 | 32.1 | 28.6 |
| Interpretation | 10.7 | 42.9 | 32.1 | 14.3 |

**ANTH 440 (Bioarchaeology)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **# of students= 7** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| Interpretation | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **%** | 1. Unsatisfactory | 2. Developing | 3. Proficient | 4. Exemplary |
| Analysis | 0 | 57.1 | 42.9 | 0 |
| Interpretation | 28.6 | 57.1 | 0 | 14.3 |

Below are comparisons on the levels of performance among courses (in %)

These results show that, in terms of “**analysis**” (or “analyze” in PLO5), majority of students (65% of all 62 students assessed) across all three courses performed on the “developing” and “proficient” levels, with a smaller portion (15%) performing at the exemplary level. This means that students **were capable of appropriately performing analysis for the types of data (i.e., evidence) collected**, indicating that the courses **fulfilled the tenant of PLO5 in our Undergraduate Program: Demonstrate the ability to** conceptualize, collect, describe, **analyze**, interpret, and communicate **anthropological evidence according to generally accepted professional practice and ethics**.

In terms of “**interpretation**” (or “interpret” in PLO5), majority of students in ANTH490C and 426 performed on the “developing” and “proficient” levels, with some students achieving the exemplary level. For ANTH440, the majority of students performed on the “developing” level and the rest were distributed at two ends of the performance spectrum. Overall, most students in all three courses **were capable of making connections between data (evidence) and argument**, albeit with varying degrees of proficiency, indicating that the courses generally **fulfilled the tenant of PLO5 in our Undergraduate Program: Demonstrate the ability to** conceptualize, collect, describe, analyze, **interpret**, and communicate **anthropological evidence according to generally accepted professional practice and ethics**.

Reflecting on the results, while we are generally satisfied with students’ performance and the courses’ fulfillment of PLO5, it is clear that pedagogical efforts are required to enhance students’ ability in both data analytics and making coherent arguments with the evidence in hand. We believe working towards these goals would not only facilitate student success in course performance and graduation rate, it would also ensure that our students are proficient in these highly sought-after skills by future employers and during graduate studies. As for whether the Department’s efforts in teaching to the theme “Engaging Evidence” impacted students’ performance related to “the evidence”, it is difficult to draw a definitive conclusion. This is because this “teaching theme” approach was inaugurated in AY18-19 and there is no prior data available to compare the assessment results with. Thus, rather than forcing a conclusion (and risking articulating an unclear connection between argument and evidence with some logical flaws- see the assessment rubric, interpretation, “Developing”), the current results are best viewed as a set of baseline data against which future data can be evaluated, if applicable.

Possible factors that may have affected the measurements included 1) disparate sample sizes among courses (ranging from 7 to 28); 2) differing nature and methodologies of data collection and analysis (e.g., qualitative ethnographic data, descriptive archaeological findings and contextualization, combination of qualitative and quantitative bioarchaeological evidence) among signature assignments; and 3) individual committee member’s subjective impression of students’ performance while evaluating the work. The first factor was unavoidable as a result of course scheduling. Due to the unique disciplinary characteristics of anthropology, the latter two factors are inherent elements of what make anthropology interesting and sustainable.

Results of this year’s assessment were not comparable to those of past years’ in that this year’s activities were designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the inaugural voluntary teaching theme (although instructors of all three courses assessed made an effort to teach accordingly), something that were not conducted in past years. Results of this year’s assessment will facilitate the Department’s decision-making on whether to continue designating a teaching theme in the coming years. However, it is important to recognize that other factors will also contribute to this decision, besides assessment results.

Similar to the University, the Department of Anthropology serves a diverse student body, including students from underrepresented groups. We chose to assess three courses covering a wide range of topics and methodologies to ensure each student’s unique background, identity, and interest could be captured by the assignments. For example, in ANTH 490C, the signature assignment was based on ethnographic projects for which each student chose a particular tourism-related topic, designed a suitable data collection protocol, and conducted interviews and/or participant observation. It was a delightful process assessing the signature assignments from this course as the assignments covered a diverse array of topics on cultural and spiritual practices, methods of language acquisition, college experiences, recreational activities, and more. In ANTH 440, students chose from a list of historical cemeteries with various significance (religious, history of the America West, entertainment industry, landscape design, urbanization, etc.) in the Los Angeles area to conduct bioarchaeological research and to produce the signature assignments. Students were able to articulate their family and/or cultural experiences within the research protocol and in the end, added to the vibrancy of research. We believe the Department could benefit the most from the assessment data derived from courses with inclusive pedagogical approaches and continue to facilitate student success.

## **D. Other Assessment Activity**

In addition to the above direct assessment of student performance, the AY18-19 assessment committee also completed the 5-year assessment plan drafted by the previous liaison. See Appendix A. This plan was approved unanimously by the faculty.

# **3. Preview of planned assessment activities for 2019-20**

Per directives from the Office of Academic Assessment, assessment activities for AY19-20 will focus on assessing GE courses in Social Sciences since our department 1) regularly offers a large selection of GE courses in this section, 2) is not going through accreditation, and 3) has no other known assessment priorities at this time. The assessment liaison will consult with the Department Chair and assessment committee members to select GE courses in Social Sciences section to conduct assessment activities. These courses will be selected based on whether they would yield most relevant evidence to inform the Department’s policies in facilitating student success and achieving goals of GI 2025.

**Appendix A**

**Program Assessment Plan, 2017-2022**

**Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Anthropology / Undergraduate, Graduate\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Option: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

The Department of Anthropology significantly revised its Program Learning Outcomes in Spring 2017 because since the last 5 year Assessment Plan. Additionally, one senior faculty member left the department, changing the composition of the department. The revision of our PLOs in Spring 2017 was done to allow the new faculty to provide their input in this important process. As a result, the first year of the Assessment Plan presented below is transitory and aims at re-gearing our assessment tools to align them with the new PLOs to prepare for the following years when these new tools will be used to assess our programs.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Activity**  Specify type of assessment activity and SLO (may refer by number to list below) | **Time Period** | **Direct Measures**  Describe student work to be used to provide evidence for outcome | **Indirect Measures**  Describe instrument: survey, interview | **Where will evidence be gathered?**  Course name, internship, etc | **What results would indicate success or failure?**  What is the expected level of achievement? | **Status** |
| 2025 Initiative compliance efforts | AY 2017-2018 | As part of the 2025 Initiative, we have been assessing the impact of new practices on the DFU rates of students in large GE courses. | Participation in Freshmen Connection (ANTH 152) | ANTH 152 in the Fall, ANTH 151 and 152 in the Spring | Lower levels of DFU | on going |
| Current Student and Alumni Surveys and Collection of Contact Information | AY 2017-2018 | N/A | - Current Undergraduate and Graduate Students will be surveyed with a set of questions that will help us evaluate not only the past successes of our program but also the impacts of our ongoing efforts to improve both graduation and retention rates in a more immediate time frame.  - To evaluate the differences between our current student experience and past efforts, as well as learn about the post-graduation experiences and career paths of our alumni, Alumni who graduated in 2015 and thereafter will also be surveyed. Email addresses of past students will be collected from faculty, and the chair of the department will request Development Services to distribute our survey to their contacts to increase the number of alumni we can reach. A link to the survey will also be posted on department social media pages to increase response rate. | Current Anthropology majors and Alumni | N/A | completed |
| Alignment Matrices Revision | AY 2017-2018 | Since the revised PLOs were adopted in Spring 2017, the whole faculty will be asked to fill in alignment matrices for courses they teach. The revised alignment matrices will be used for subsequent assessment activities. | N/A | N/A | N/A | completed |
| Use of Alignment Matrices to Identify Potential Gaps in our Programs | SPRING 2018 | The Alignment Matrices will be used to identify the levels of mastery expected from undergraduate majors and minors for each PLO over the course of their curriculum. This activity will be used to inform our decisions on potential curriculum modifications. | N/A | N/A | N/A | completed |
| Assessment of graduate students' progress | AY 2017-2022 | - Collecting direct evidence of graduate students' learning through the compilation of data on all of the students who will have entered our graduate program since last review cycle: i) time-to-degree; ii) Track- General Anthropology or Public Archeology; iii) if enrolled in General Anthropology track, if they write a thesis or take the comprehensive exam.  - Data collected will be used to assess efforts invested in enhancing the graduate program.  - Data will be also circulated for discussion among the department faculty (at the annual faculty retreat or scheduled faculty meetings) to make data-driven decisions on action plans to close the loop. | N/A | Graduate Student Graduation Rates and Time-to-Degree | Reduced time-to-degree, increased retention and graduation rates, and the subsequent maintenance of this progress | ongoing |
| Assessment of undergraduate students' progress | AY 2017-2022 | - Using the data accessible on CSUN Counts, retention rate, graduation rate, and time-to-degree for both first-time freshmen and transfer students will be used to assess the department’s efforts invested in enhancing undergraduate program.  - Data will be also circulated for discussion among the department faculty (at the annual faculty retreat or scheduled faculty meetings) to make data-driven decisions on action plans to close the loop. | N/A | Undergraduate Students  Retention and Graduation Rates, Time-to-Degree | Reduced time-to-degree, increased retention and graduation rates | ongoing |
| Exit Interviews of Graduating Students and Collection of Contact Information | AY 2018-2022 | N/A | Towards the end of each semester, graduating students will be contacted through email and asked to share their future contact information. They will also be asked to make an appointment with a member of the assessment committee to organize an exit interview during which they will be asked questions including their experience (positive and negative) in the program, preparedness while in the program, and future career plans. | Graduating Anthropology majors | N/A | completed annually |
| Preparation of Outcome Assessment work for AY 2018-19 | SPRING 2018 | - To enhance coherence of department courses and student learning experience, the department moved to designate a broad theme every AY which faculty members are encouraged to highlight in their respective courses. The department designated the AY 18-19 theme to be “Engaging Evidence”.  - Direct assessment will involve assessing PLO(s) on signature assignments in courses to be offered in AY 18-19. Three undergraduate courses from different anthropology subdisciplines will be assessed. Identify the most relevant PLO(s) to the theme for direct assessment. | N/A | N/A | N/A | completed |
| Outcome Assessment | AY 2018-2019 | - Aligning with the department’s teaching theme of AY 18-19 “Engaging Evidence”, PLO 5 (see below) will be used to assess signature assignments from three courses, one in each subdiscipline of anthropology, in the undergraduate program.  - Design rubrics and assess signature assignments | N/A | ANTH 490C  ANTH 426  ANTH 440 | High level of analytical and interpretative ability of anthropological evidence in each subdiscipline | ongoing |
| Preparation of Outcome Assessment work for AY 2019-2020, AY 2020-2021, AY 2021-2022 | SPRING 2019, SPRING 2020, SPRING 2021 | - Using the results of Assessment from a given AY and after reviewing the courses offered in the next AY, two UG PLOs and two Graduate PLOs will be selected to be assessed in the next AY (two in the Fall and two in the Spring).  - Direct Assessment of PLOs will be used. It will involve creating signature assignments that will be used in courses at different levels to assess students' progress. | N/A | N/A | N/A | completed annually |
| Outcome Assessment | AY 2019-2022 | Direct Assessment (using signature assignments) of the two PLOs for the undergraduate program and two PLOs for the graduate program decided upon in the previous spring semester. | N/A | N/A |  | completed annually |
| Preparation of Program Assessment Plan for 2022-27 | SPRING 2022 | - Preparation of a new Program Assessment Plan for 2022-2027 in consultation with the whole faculty. | | | N/A |  |