The anthropology department faculty met to discuss program assessment and consider changes in the curriculum on September 20, 2013. The next meeting is scheduled for September 2014. At the 2013 meeting we discussed the results of our outcomes assessment process and decided that the current process neither met the needs of the department nor did it fit the model for Student Learning Outcomes Assessment that was recommended for the university. We proposed, on the basis of our discussions, to implement a new procedure following the protocol we then submitted in 2013. Thus half of this assessment 2012-2014 is under the prior protocol (2010) and half is under the not yet fully implemented new protocol. No data were generated under the new protocol because there were no PhD students finishing their comprehensive exams or defending their dissertations during the period since implementation of the new protocol. Rubrics for these objectives have been developed and will be refined as data from PhD students begin to be collected. This report thus refers primarily to data from the period 2010-2013, with updates for 2013-14 from faculty discussions.

1. Assessment information collected
This table shows the measures, outcomes and data collected for learning objectives given in the 2010 protocol. The assessment was made on the basis of a faculty survey that encompassed the year 2010-2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-13 (2010 protocol) Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment measures and learning outcomes</th>
<th>Information collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Understanding of subfield, history, theory, methodology and areas of specialization</td>
<td>Faculty surveyed, comprehensive exam data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special research skills – languages, tools</td>
<td>Faculty surveyed; data on proposal completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ability to write proposals, reports, papers</td>
<td>Faculty surveyed; data on grants and publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Training for teaching</td>
<td>Faculty surveyed; employment and other data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Protocol (2013-2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Assessment measures and learning outcomes</th>
<th>Information collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>Learning as realized in comprehensive exam synthesizing papers</td>
<td>Rubric prepared but no PhD student completed the three comprehensive exam papers during this period; proposal to require rubric for each of the three papers written as part of the comprehensive exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-14</td>
<td>Understanding of subfield, history, theory, methodology and areas of specialization as evident in completed Ph.D. dissertation</td>
<td>Evaluation form prepared for distribution to committees but no Ph.D. dissertations were completed during the time period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected for the Ph.D. program mostly have to do with the program outcomes.

Objective 1—History and theory. As mentioned in the review submitted October 2013 we surveyed faculty about students who entered the program over the 2-year review period. All but one of them were reported by faculty to have satisfactory or exceptional learning results in classes. The new assessment tool for obtaining data on completion of the comprehensive papers will bear fruit in the coming academic year (three or four students are expected to finish the comprehensive papers). No students, however have completed since the implementation of the new rubric.

Objective 2—Special research skills. The results stated in the 2013 report are valid for 2012-13. Half of the 2012 Ph.D.-supervising-faculty (2 of 4) responded to questions about the effectiveness of the language and methods tool as follows. For archaeology and biological anthropology students the research tool is essential and this requirement is usually completed early. For social cultural students the language tool is usually used to gain some familiarity with a field language. The majority of social-cultural students are foreign and come equipped with a scholarly language that is appropriate for their research or their future scholarly career.

Objective 3—Proposal and report writing. All recent Ph.D. students have taken Anth 652, Research Design and Professional Development Seminar. This course involves the development of a research proposal and discussions of research strategies and ethics. The outcome of the course is a research proposal that is evaluated both by the instructor and the student’s advisory committee. Data collection on student grants has been incomplete.

Objective 4—Teaching experience and preparation. The department has a mandatory annual, if brief TA training meeting. Faculty reported working with students on an individual basis

2. Conclusions drawn from the information summarized above (Sept. 2013 meeting)
Objective 1. The faculty continue to believe that the current system of three “synthesizing papers” and a research prospectus defense has served the students very well and is our best tool in assessing learning in the program. The papers exhibit the student’s ability to synthesize complex theory and data and write about the synthesis in a clear manner. Students simultaneously demonstrate their learning and learn from the process. The papers are evaluated by the advisory committee and must be satisfactory before the student can go on to complete the degree. The new assessment plan includes a rubric for evaluating the learning outcomes of this component of the program.

Objective 2. We discussed the possible requirement of a methods course for all Ph.D. students. This would help to insure that students (1) have a better chance to receive research funding, (2) conduct more thorough and efficient research and (3) have a clear path from research to write-up. We decided again to leave this requirement to the students’ committees. The question of reinstituting proseminars in the four subfields was raised in connection with the MA program and this would have a significant (positive) impact on course offerings for the Ph.D. students. No decision was made on requiring these classes at the Ph.D. level, leaving the default to be that the requiring of the proseminars would be up to the advisory committees.

Objective 3. No changes were recommended in the language and research tool policy.

Objective 4. All faculty were in general agreement that the required course Anth 652, Research Design and Professional Development Seminar was serving the students well. The required training has led to more student confidence in the planning and carrying out of research, which has led, in turn, to the more efficient completion of theses. Questions were raised about whether students could use more specific training in research methods in each subdiscipline and whether methodology courses currently being offered should be required in students’ subfields. This, again, was left to the discretion of the advisory committee.

Objective 5. Because Teaching Assistant training is conducted in a one-on-one, tutorial manner there was no general discussion of a department-wide approach.

Objectives 1(14) and 2(14). No data yet; no conclusions yet to draw.

3. Curricular changes resulting from conclusions drawn above

1. The in the autumn 2013 meetings, the faculty decided to replace Anth 629, Structures of Anthropological Argument with a four-fields course (covering the four subfields of anthropology (biological, cultural, linguistic and archaeology). This will not have an impact on the Ph.D. program, because many Ph.D. students took Anth 629 in their first year. It is expected that many will take the new course; it will be up to individual committees whether to require the student to take this class. The curricular changes that were recommended as a result of the last outcomes assessment report have not yet been implemented. The new
graduate-level history of anthropology course treating all of the subfields, ANTH 485/685 has not been designed yet and thus remains as a plan. Faculty leaves and time-consuming and unsuccessful attempts to hire new faculty have have slowed implementation of the new program. ANTH 629, Structures of Anthropological Argument, will, for the time being, remain and will be a course that many Ph.D. students will take. As noted in the previous assessment, faculty do not see a need to change the course requirements for the Ph.D. program.

2. The introduction of methods course requirement for the MA students will affect the Ph.D. program. Students will be able to take one of two methods course options for their subfield every year. Social-cultural and linguistic anthropology students will take either Ethnographic Research Methods or Discourse in Society. Biological anthropology and archaeology students will take either Archaeological Method and Theory or a biological anthropology course to be determined. The question of whether this course is required for the student be left to the advisory committee.

3. Curricular development is partially dependent on hiring of replacement faculty. We expect enrollment numbers to decline slightly because our current understaffing has narrowed the range of student interests that may be accommodated in our program and limited the range of courses that can be offered. If we can return to minimum staffing numbers and admit correspondingly more students, we would plan to reinstate the graduate proseminars in each of the four subfields. Three out of the four proseminars would be required for MA students. This would provide an important course offering for Ph.D. students.

4. **Identify the faculty members involved in reaching the conclusions drawn above and agreeing upon the curricular changes resulting**

Graduate Studies Program coordinator Robin Shoaps and Department Chair David Koester met to summarize the 2013-14 results and make the recommendations for the general faculty meeting to be held in September 2014.

Kara Hoover, Robin Shoaps, Patrick Plattet, Brian Hemphill, David Koester, Joshua Reuther, Jamie Clark (was only present for part of the meeting) --met in October 2013 to discuss the results of the 2012-2013 assessment.