**Annual Assessment Report for 2020-2021 AY**

Reports completed on assessment activities carried out during the 2020-21 AY will be due September 30th 2021 and must be e-mailed to the Director of Assessment, Dr. Douglas Fraleigh (douglasf@csufresno.edu).

Provide detailed responses for each of the following questions within this word document. Please do NOT insert an index or add formatting. Furthermore, only report on two or three student learning outcomes even if your external accreditor requires you to evaluate four or more outcomes each year. Also be sure to explain or omit specialized or discipline-specific terms.

Department/Program: \_\_\_\_\_Anthropology\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Degree \_B.A.\_\_\_\_

Assessment Coordinator: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Walter A. Dodd, PhD\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Please list the learning outcomes you assessed this year.

 Goal A: Provide students with background in the concepts and bodies of knowledge used and produced by anthropologists.

 Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to discuss the basic core concepts of anthropology and cite factual evidence to support their arguments.

 Learning Outcome 3: Students will be able to think and write critically about anthropological topics. Students can identify key terms, concepts, and forms of argumentation used in anthropological discourse and evaluate their validity.

1. What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment? **Please describe the assignment and the criteria or rubric used to evaluate the assignment in detail and, if possible, include copies of the assignment and criteria/rubric at the end of this report.**

 The assignment used to assess the outcomes is the Midterm Exam taken by students in ANTH 100 (Concepts and Applications) during Fall Semester 2020. It consists of a two- question essay exam, in which students must demonstrate proficiency in understanding the nature and causes of human warfare. This same assignment was previously used to assess outcomes in the same course for AY 2018-2019, and based on feedback from the Annual Assessment Report Evaluation of that year, the exam and rubric were updated and revised to be more specific and in alignment with Assessment Goal A and its Outcomes 1 and 3 (see Appendix I). Question 1 (Outcome A3) student failures included inability to identify differences between biological-evolutionary, cultural-idealist, and cultural-materialist forms of argument; insufficient citation of evidence to back up the different viewpoints; and occasional misunderstanding of what constitutes a persuasive argument. Question 2 (Outcome A1) student failures included inability to differentiate materialist and cultural approaches, lack of citation of specific examples in support of each approach, or insufficient connection between concept and example.

1. What did you learn from your analysis of the data? Please include sample size (how many students were evaluated) and indicate how many students (number or percentage instead of a median or mean) were designated as proficient.

 The ANTH 100 class in Fall 2020 was evaluated, and it had 37 students enrolled. Two tenured faculty members from our Department volunteered to grade the essay exams submitted by 30 of those students (an 81% sample). The updated and revised assignment and rubric served as a guide for the grading process. The two professors each graded 60 essay questions (2 questions for each of the 30 students). The grades assigned were in agreement 114 out of 120 times (an impressive result). Grades conferred on Question 1 were not significantly different: 5/4 in Rank 1, 11/14 in Rank 2, and 14/12 in Rank 3 (chi-square = 0.625, df = 2, p = 0.7316). Grades on Question 2 were also comparable: 5/5 in Rank 1, 13/16 in Rank 2, 12/9 in Rank 3 (chi-square = 0.7389, df = 2, p = 0.6911). The overall results, for both questions combined, unsurprisingly follow the same pattern: chi-square = 1.212, df = 2, p = 0.5349. All obtained chi-square values are lower than the critical value of 5.99 (at 2 degrees of freedom), thereby indicating that the samples are not significantly different and that the Null Hypothesis cannot be rejected. That shows that the results from the two raters are comparable in outcome. We conclude that the rubric is sufficiently clear in indicating the criteria by which grades are to be assigned, and that any professor in our Department who is competently trained to teach the same subject matter should attain similar results. Although the comparability of the grading results was very positive, the level of student proficiency was less so (26 of 60, or 43%, were proficient on Question 1; 21 of 60, or 35%, were proficient on Question 2; and 47 of 120, or 39%, were proficient on both questions overall).

1. What changes, if any, do you recommend based on the assessment data?

 We are recommending no changes because the academic year under review was likely anomalous due to pandemic conditions. But, in spite of that, the data show a somewhat normal distribution with a skew toward proficiency. Had the classroom situation been conducted under the usual pre-pandemic conditions, student proficiency would likely have been closer to the numbers observed in AY 2018-2019.

1. If you recommended any changes in your response to Question 4 in last year’s assessment report, what progress have you made in implementing these changes? If you did not recommend making any changes in last year’s report please write N/A as your answer to this question.

 In the previous report, we recommended more "drills, in-class exercises, or online exercises in which students read relatively easy case study examples and explicitly categorize them according to the major theories." Most of these recommendations were very difficult to implement in the virtual Fall 2020 semester. For example, in-class exercises were difficult to field in the virtual synchronous environment, and these were actually less than previous years. Most other aspects of the course structure remained constant with prior years, as the instructor focused on just making the transition to a virtual synchronous course.

1. What assessment activities will you be conducting during the next academic year?

 Goal B: Provide students with training on the application of anthropological theory and method to problems in archaeology, physical anthropology and cultural anthropology dependent on their emphasis in the major.
 Learning Outcome 4: Students will become familiar with basic methods used on
 archaeological/ethnographic research, and demonstrate the ability to apply those methods to solve given problems.
 Learning Outcome 5. Students will achieve competence in technologies used by
 anthropologists in collecting, managing, and analyzing data.

 The course to be assessed is ANTH 111 (Ethnographic Fieldwork).

1. Identify and discuss any major issues identified during your last Program Review and in what ways these issues have or have not been addressed.