1. Assessment information collected

   Per our 2012 SLOA plan:

   - All students enrolled in the capstone course (ANTH F411: Senior Seminar) are given a standardized, summative exercise (10 questions) designed to assess facility in four areas:
     1. A basic understanding of the history of the discipline, including subdisciplinary perspectives and approaches to the study of culture, society, and human development.
     2. An understanding of methods in anthropological research.
     3. An understanding of cultural and linguistic diversity and the implications of cultural difference for understanding the human condition.
     4. Exhibit effective skills in written and oral communication.

   - All students enrolled in ANTH 411 will be given an exit survey with emphasis on student’s overall assessment of the content and quality of education received in anthropology.

   ***As indicated in our 2016 SLOA summary, the alumni survey was not being administered and we removed it from our SLOA plan at the same time that we incorporated the Communication Plan; however, due to a series of delays in getting comments back on our Communication Plan, these revisions did not go into effect until January 2018.***

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above

   - Summative exercise:
     The standardized, summative exercise was administered to all BA students enrolled in ANTH 411 in 2017 and 2018. The students were given ten questions and asked to respond to six in short essay format and the rest as short answers with bullet points or brief sentences. The resulting answers were scored by the instructor of Senior Seminar (Brian Hemphill), the BA Outcomes Assessment Coordinator (Patrick Plattet) and another BA faculty member (David Koester) on the following scale: W= substantial
wrong information; U= unsatisfactory; UP= unsatisfactory but partial; SP= satisfactory but partial (missing some pertinent information); S= satisfactory; VS= very satisfactory.

In summarizing we ranked as satisfactory all answers scored “VS”, “S” and “SP”. Similarly we ranked as unsatisfactory those scored as “U”, “UP” and “W”.

1. A basic understanding of the history of the discipline, including subdisciplinary perspectives and approaches to the study of culture, society, and human development

   • Three questions on the exercise addressed this learning objective. The questions in this category that the students chose to answer were also the most broad and related to the most important idea the student had learned as an anthropology major. 88.9% of the answers were scored as satisfactory (with 11.1% of the answers scored as unsatisfactory).

   These results show a slight decrease in relation to the 2016 SLOA report (100% of satisfactory answers). However, the rate of satisfactory answers is still very high, especially in relation to the 2014 SLOA report (45% of unsatisfactory answers). The current results confirm that the new version of ANTH384 (History of Anthropology), introduced in 2013-14, has helped our students increase their knowledge of the history of the discipline, including subdisciplinary perspectives and approaches.

2. An understanding of methods in anthropological research.

   One question on the exercise addressed this learning objective. Overall, 66.7% of the answers scored as satisfactory, and 23.3% as unsatisfactory. These results show a slight decrease compared to the 2014 SLOA report (satisfactory: 73%; unsatisfactory: 27%) and 2016 SLOA report (satisfactory: 79.3%; unsatisfactory: 20.7%). We recognize that understanding various methodologies and the multiple methods of anthropological research is an important dimension that needs to be emphasized systematically. We will revise the questionnaire to introduce new questions that will make our assessment exercise more open to subdisciplinary approaches.

3. An understanding of cultural and linguistic diversity and the implications of cultural difference for understanding the human condition.
Six questions on the exercise addressed this learning objective. Overall, the results show 59.5% of satisfactory answers and 31.5% of unsatisfactory answers. These results cannot be compared to previous SLOA scores because the criteria for evaluation area#3 has changed. Some of the weakness in this area can be attributed to the fact folk concepts (such as ‘gender’ and ‘ritual’), and analytical concepts (‘genre,’ ‘linguistic ideology,’ and ‘cultural configuration’) are defined differently in cultural and linguistic anthropology. We will believe that the rate of satisfactory answers in this area can be improved by more explicitly recognizing and discussing the range of definitions of these concepts in undergraduate cultural and linguistic anthropology courses.

4. Exhibit effective skills in written and oral communication

- As discussed in our two previous assessment reports, given the format of the summative exercise, it does not seem the best way to judge communication skills; we have developed a new series of criteria for evaluating communication skills, based on our Communication Plan. However, because the Communication Plan + revised SLOA did not go into effect until Spring 2018, curricular changes have not fully been put into place and we do not have sufficient data to address this aspect of student performance.

- **The Exit Survey**

The exit survey comprises eight questions that ask students to reflect upon their experiences in the program.

Completion of the survey was optional. Responses are summarized below:

- Re: their overall experiences in the program: students who responded were very positive, mentioning the quality of instruction, support from faculty, and opportunities for research.

- Re: department strengths/weaknesses: students enjoyed the variety of course offerings, diversity of readings, critical thinking, and opportunities for field research in Alaska. One student expressed a desire for more online courses and evening courses. Two students suggested that our capstone class (ANTH411/Senior Seminar) be more discussion based and that it should reflect a higher degree of consultation among anthropology faculty from the various subdisciplines.
• Re: curriculum: as discussed above, students appreciated the diversity of offerings. Suggested additions to the curricular offerings include: more linguistic anthropology courses (possibly a linguistic “religion” class), offering again the “anthropology of death” course, as well as offering more special topic courses related to “pop culture”. Students generally felt challenged (in a positive way) by their courses. Three comments suggested that all students in the program should be required to take all of the 200-level introductory courses to anthropology (as opposed to currently being required to choose three out of four). One student suggested that ANTH384 (History of Anthropology) be offered at the 400-level, so that it could also count as one of the six electives (including four at the 400-level) required for BA students.

• Re: preparation for the job market: three students felt that their experiences had helped prepare them for jobs in the field and/or in the “real world”. One highlighted the central role played by his/her mentor, and another recommended the addition of a preparatory seminar for graduate school.

We are encouraged by the fact that students expressed satisfaction with the quality of education and felt that the degree had helped prepare them for their professional future.

We are confident that our constant efforts to adjust the format and the content of our courses, as well as the current development of more online courses by our faculty, will help address the most pressing learning needs of our students.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

In AY 15-16, the BA has been expanded to incorporate all four subfields, and, as a result, many archaeology and biological anthropology students are now in the BA program. Given the shift, the department should reevaluate the role of the BS degree.

The department will offer a new, 200-level online course in Spring 2019 that will provide a unique opportunity for our undergraduate students to learn about cultural and linguistic anthropological methods.
4. Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting

Patrick Plattet, BA coordinator
Brian Hemphill, Senior Seminar instructor (2017 and 2018)
David Koester, BA faculty member

5. Has your SLOA plan been updated to include assessment of the program’s Communication Plan, as required by Faculty Senate motion? (required for baccalaureate programs only)

Yes. We updated our SLOA once we obtained approval for our Communication Plan; the revised SLOA was approved by Departmental Faculty in Fall 2017 and submitted to the Provost’s Office in Spring 2018. Because the new SLOA involved changes to classes being offered during Spring 2018, not all of them could be implemented this year. This is why the current report still relies upon the 2012 SLOA plan.