EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM SELF-STUDY
2005-06 to 2010-11

I. PROGRAM REVIEW ELEMENTS AND STANDARDS

Program Overview: The Anthropology Program provides undergraduate education in anthropology for students wishing to complete the Anthropology Major, Anthropology Minor, Archaeological Technician Certificate or Applied Associate of Science Degree, or BIS emphasis. It also serves students seeking general education, diversity credits, or who wish to take anthropology courses for interest, and provides appropriate anthropological services, resources, and activities to the region that the university serves. Unique features of the program include a holistic, four-field approach to anthropology with its fields of archaeology, linguistics, ethnology and biological anthropology.

A. Mission Statement:
The overall mission of the Anthropology Major Program is to provide students with holistic, comparative knowledge about human biological and cultural differences and similarities world-wide and through time derived from anthropological research and theories. The program strives to produce students with anthropological experience in research, analysis, and interpretation and a strong sense of anthropology's relevance to the world today. Students are taught to question and examine the significance of beliefs, attitudes and prejudices toward human differences and similarities and to be informed of the anthropological position of relativism and valuing cultural and biological variation. The program prepares students for a broad range of both public and private sector employment in anthropology-related fields or to enter professional or graduate schools appropriate to their interests.

B. Curriculum:
  1. Types of Degrees Offered: There are <u>four kinds of degrees</u> and <u>one certificate</u> offered:
  ‣   Anthropology Major (BS/BA) — 36 hour degree, 2-track option in either General Anthropology or Archaeology
  ‣   Anthropology Minor (BS/BA) — 18 hour degree
  ‣   Anthropology and/or Archaeology BIS Emphases — 18 hour degree
  ‣   Archaeological Technician Associate of Applied Science (AAS)
  ‣   Archaeological Technician Institutional Certificate

  2. Numbers and Types of Courses Offered:
    a. 26 different courses offered in the program curriculum, 9 variable-titled.
    b. Five courses are General Education courses.
    c. Nine courses fulfill WSU diversity requirement.
    d. Two courses fulfill Scientific Inquiry requirement for B.S. degree.
    e. Three on-line courses exist in the curriculum.
    f. Three courses are High Intensity Learning, outside the classroom courses.

  3. Student Constituents Served by the Program:
     a. <u>Description of Students:</u> For the years examined in this self-study (2005-06 to 2010-11), the Anthropology Program has a very solid student constituency for a rather small program. The major is relatively young, having been approved by the Utah Board of Regents in April 2000, and the faculty feel it has done very well in its first decade in establishing its position on campus and attracting a significant group of students. Student constituents served by the program now include <u>six different groups,</u> each with slightly different needs and goals:
        (1) Students seeking an Anthropology Major;
        (2) Students pursuing an Anthropology Minor;
        (3) Students taking anthropology courses to fulfill general university requirements such as general education courses, diversity courses, or scientific inquiry;
        (4) Students seeking an Anthropology Emphasis for a Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) degree;
        (5) Students seeking an Archaeological Technician Institutional Certificate or Associate of

Applied Science,

(6) Students on campus and in the community taking anthropology courses for personal interest or for re-certification (e.g., in education, medical professions).

b. <u>Student Data</u>: *(See Appendix A of this report for a statistical summary of the six-year student data.)* Here are a number of observations of trends to be seen from the data:

(1) SCH Production: The program generated a fairly constant rate of rise in student credit hours (SCHs) over the past six years, averaging 3,939 SCHs annually (with a low of 3,357 in 2006-07 SCHs, then rising significantly to highs of 4,643 SCHs in 2009-10 and 5,071 SCHs in 2010-2011). Enrollments remained high for most courses and indicated good and steadily increasing student demand. In contrast, the average for the previous five years, 2001-05 was 3,572, with a high of 3,776 SCHs in 2003-04.

(2) Student Populations: The overall composition of the student population noticeably shifted with the new Major becoming available. The number of newly declared Majors in the program rose rapidly within the first two years of the program and then leveled out at approximately 100, suggesting that student demand remained fairly constant since 2003. At the same time, the number of Minors and Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) students modestly declined and stabilized in the 50-75 range.

(3) Graduates: The number of graduates in the Major in the past six years has varied between 8 and 15, while the number of Minors/BIS Concentrators graduating have fluctuated between 4 and 20.

(4) Gender Demographics: The gender of declared Majors and Minors in the program is essentially an evenly balanced 1:18 ratio of females to males in 2010-11, though within the past six years it has fluctuated from a 1.3 males to 1 female ratio to one of 2.71 females to 1 male. The gender of graduates, however, has tended to lean overall slightly in the direction of more females graduating annually than males, approximately 1.5F: 1M across the eleven-year history of the program. This is also reflected in the tendency for more males than females to become inactive in the program at any given semester, a problem perhaps exacerbated by WSU's high numbers of non-traditional students and the current economic climate. By 2011, of the total 141 Majors who had graduated, 60% were female and 40% were male. (Graduation gender data are unavailable for Minors/BIS.)

3. Allocation of Resources for Curriculum Delivery:

During 2010-11, 68.3% of the 62 sections of courses taught were allocated to the general education curriculum, 15% were required courses for one of our two Majors or the Minor, and 16.7% were electives. Full time faculty taught 58% of these as in-load classes and adjunct faculty the remaining 42%. Full time faculty taught 41.5% of general education courses, 100% of Major/Minor Required Courses, and 83% of Electives. Remaining courses were taught by Adjuncts. A total of 84% of enrollment and SCHs came from general education courses, 4.2% from Major/Minor required courses, and 11.8% from Electives. The primary factors affecting our resource allocation decisions are:

a. We have a small faculty, only 3.625 Full Time Equivalent (FTE), due to split administrative duties. Also, in 2010-11 and 2011-12, an adjunct faculty member is currently on contract for the full time teaching load of one full FTE faculty member who is on leave.

b. University funds are limited to hire adjuncts and there are few anthropologists to teach as adjuncts in the geographic area of WSU.

c. The program has approximately150-200 Majors/Minors to be served with required courses.

d. Rotation of courses in the curriculum allows all required courses in the program to be taught regularly and frequently so students can graduate in a timely manner.

4. Site Locations for Teaching Courses:

There are five primary locations or types of locations where the program's courses are taught:

a. WSU-Ogden campus, the area of highest student demand.

b. WSU off-campus sites, primarily the WSU-Davis campus.

c. Field Trips to off-campus localities: These have usually gone to locations within the Intermountain West,

but in 2006 the program began a series of annual Study Abroad programs, detailed in Section 6 on High Impact Learning.
    d. Archaeological Field School at various Great Basin sites, detailed in Section 6 on High Impact Learning.
    e. On-line

C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

AY2010-11 was the 11th year the Anthropology Program participated in the university's outcomes assessment program. It has developed its mission statement, identified 8 central learning goals, constructed a curriculum outcomes grid, articulated a formal assessment plan, used graduate exit interviews to measure student learning, assessed specific general education and diversity courses, and gathered data on student grades, graduation and retention.

<u>**Program Learning Goals:**</u>

1. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).

2. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.

3. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.

4. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.

5. KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS GOAL: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.

6. SKILLS GOAL: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.

7. SKILLS GOAL: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.

8. VALUES GOAL: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, anthropocentrism), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.

1. Linkage to program curriculum: Table 10 in the full document shows rankings (high, medium, or low), assessing the extent to which each anthropology course required for the major meets each of the 8 learning goals, each addressing two or more at a high level, with courses having varying emphases. Required courses for the Major and Minor and the upper division courses address objectives #4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 more thoroughly, building skills and knowledge of theory, research, critical thinking and communication about anthropology issues, while general education courses stress fundamental anthropological concepts and goals #1, 2, 3 and 8. The curriculum provides an excellent mixture of these goals, and students are well prepared to achieve them by the time they graduate.

2. Assessment Cycle: The **Evidence of Learning** tables evaluate all five of the Anthropology General Education courses as successfully meeting all 8 Learning Goals. In 2012-13 we will assess Anthropology Major and Minor required courses; in 2013-14, High Intensity Learning courses; and Elective courses in 2014-15. We will continue this yearly rotation in future to continuously evaluate and improve our courses.

D. Academic Advising:

The advising process currently in use in Anthropology and described in the attached is a result of previous assessments and experiences with advising students. Methods to assess its effectiveness are part of the larger, more formalized assessment efforts conducted in the program, detailed in the Appendices. Exit interviews administered to graduating seniors have been the primary tool for gathering student feedback data on advisement.. The 2001-2011 results detailed in this document suggest that advisement on graduate school and employment has been successful. All 2005-06 to 2010-11 graduating

majors indicated they planned to attend graduate school and pursue a career in anthropology. Students have also expressed a high level of satisfaction with their advisement, claiming it to be helpful, personal, and informative, which is supported by the rate and speed of graduation of Anthropology Majors compare to WSU overall:

	WSU Graduation Rates	
	Anthropology	**WSU Overall**
Within 4 years	33%	11-13%
Within 5 years	44%	19-30%
Within 6 years	58%	38-45%

E. Faculty

1. Size, Qualifications and Demographic Composition
    a. There are **four** full-time, tenured, full professors in anthropology:
        Dr. Brooke Arkush, Ph.D. (also Director of Archaeological Technician Program,
        with three-quarters teaching load)
        Dr. Rosemary Conover, Ph.D.
        Dr. Linda B. Eaton, Ph.D., Coordinator of Anthropology, with seven-eighths teaching load
        Dr. Ronald Holt, Ph.D. (on leave 2010-11 and 2011-2012)
    b. There were **seven** adjunct faculty in anthropology for 2010-2011, 5 with Ph.Ds and 2 with
        Master's degrees. Ms. Young is currently an 18-month contract employee due to Dr. Holt's leave
        Dr. LeGrande Davies, Ph.D.
        Dr. Caren Frost, Ph.D. (also with U of U)
        Dr. Wade Kotter, Ph.D. (also WSU Social Science Bibliographer)
        Dr. Kare McManama-Kearin, Ph.D.
        Dr. Mark Stevenson, Ph.D. (also Enrollment Director - WSU MBA Program)
        Mr. Stephen Niedzwiecki, M.A. Anthropology, M.S. Biology
        Ms. Susan Young, M.A., currently serving as contract replacement for Ronald Holt.
    c. Background: All regular faculty and adjuncts are of Euroamerican descent. All full-time faculty and four adjuncts have Ph.D.'s and more than 20 years of teaching experience each. Of the remaining adjuncts, one has the Ph.D. and two Master's degrees; all have at least 3 years teaching experience. The use of adjuncts with Master's degrees is counter to our usual policy and is the result of stress placed on our adjunct pool by Dr. Holt's leave of absence.
    d. All full time faculty and one adjunct are full professors with tenure on the campus. Faculty areas of expertise meet the program's mission to provide a four-field curriculum. The gender composition of the full time faculty is 2 males and 2 females. Adjuncts were 4 males and 3 females in 2010-11.

2. Teaching Responsibilities: Of the four full-time faculty, only two teach a full load of courses. Due to administrative responsibilities, the Anthropology Coordinator has a 7/8-time teaching load, though she volunteers an additional course each summer, and the Director of the Archaeological Technician Program has a 3/4 time teaching load. This results in a full time teaching equivalency of 3.625 FTE. In the first seven years of the Major program (AY2000-2001 to AY2006-2007), full time faculty taught the majority of courses and generated the majority of SCHs, ranging from 72% to over 90% of classes and SCHs. However, in the past four years (2007-08 to 2010-2011), tenured faculty accounted for 42.5% to 66.5% of credit hours and SCHs, in part because in 2010-11, one full-time faculty member was on leave. His courses were taught in Autumn semester by an adjunct, who was placed on a temporary full-time contract in the Spring semester. However, it is also due to increasing demand for anthropology offerings in Continuing Education's online, night, summer and Davis Campus. Thus, adjuncts in 2010-11 taught 53.8% of the total credit hours and generated 54.4% of the SCHs. This makes the program progressively more dependent on less predictable institutional resources and on a similarly unpredictable adjunct pool to augment stable department positions. An additional concern is that adjunct compensation at WSU is lower than at other comparable institutions in the state, making us less competitive for the already limited number of ABD or PhD potential adjuncts available in the area.

Student and Faculty Statistical Summary

(NOTE: data provided by WSU Institutional Research & amended by department records)

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Student Credit Hours:	3,590	3,629	3,417	3553	4643	5071
Student FTE*:	119.67	111.9	113.88	118.43	154.77	169.03
Declared Majors**:	99	134	111	140	98	101
Declared Minors/BIS***:	74	67	60	77	65	52
Graduating Majors	9	10	15	10	8	12
Minors/BIS***:	20	4	11	10	13	12
TOTAL	**29**	**14**	**26**	**20**	**21**	**24**
Student Gender Profile (**F**emale/**M**ale Ratio)						
Majors:	1 F: 1.3M	1.48F: 1M	1.67 F: 1M	1.65F: 1M	2.71 F: 1M	1.18F: 1M
Minors:	1 F: 1.2M	1 F: 1M	1.2F: 1M	1.1F: 1M	1.1F: 1M	1.1F: 1M
Graduates	1 F: 1.25M	1F: 1M	1 F: 1.14M	2.33F: 1M	3F: 1M	4F: 1M
Faculty FTE Total	3/ 3.25	3/ 3.25	3/3.5	3/3.75	3/3.625	3/3.625
Adjunct FTE	5	5	7	6	4	5
Contract FTE	6****	5****	4	4	4	3
Student Majors to Faculty Ratio	99: 3.25 (30.46: 1)	134: 3.25 (41.23: 1)	111: 3.5 (31.71: 1)	140: 3.75 (37.33: 1)	98: 3.625 (27.03: 1)	101: 3.625 (27.86: 1)

Notes: *1. FTE students based on undergraduate SCH/45 or 45 SCH=1 FTE.

   **2. Declared Majors & Minors include both active & inactive students in the program.

   ***3. Includes all Minors. BIS and Archaeological Technician Students.

   ****4. The number of Contract FTE was provided by WSU Institutional Research. The program has never had more than 4 FTE Contract FTE teaching.

3. Faculty Scholarship: Please see a brief discussion of faculty scholarship in the full document.

F. Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment and Library:
The program is part of a larger department (with Sociology) in which staff, budget, resources, policies, procedures, faculty recruitment, evaluation and retention, decision-making, leadership, and activities are shared.

1. Support Staff: This consists of one full-time, classified staff member of the department (department secretary Carol E. Jensen), and a part-time work-study student who typically works 20 hours per week.

2. Administration: The departmental administrative structure includes: (a) the Department Chair, currently a Sociologist (Rob Reynolds); (b) two Program Coordinators (Linda Eaton for Anthropology and Rob Reynolds for Sociology); and (c) The Archaeological Technician Program Director (Brooke Arkush). The Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences works closely with the Department Chairs group to set the budget, care for facilities, make hiring, salary, ranking, tenure and merit decisions, and other tasks. Administrative support seems adequate for the program's needs.

3. Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment: The program has an Archaeology Laboratory adequately equipped for the population it serves and the activities it supports. The program also has three assigned classrooms, one holding 72 students, the other two 35 students each. Office equipment is shared with Sociology faculty and staff

in the joint department. For classroom instruction there is shared media equipment and an inadequate, but noteworthy variety of teaching materials, such as videos, software, fossil casts, models, maps, skeletal preparations, artifacts and replicas.

4. Adequacy of Library Resources: Library resources are judged adequate for the program. An excellent staff includes the Social Sciences & Music Librarian, who is also an anthropologist with ties to our program.

G. Relationships with External Communities:

The program maintains ongoing relationships with several agencies and community organizations connected to our program mission (detailed in Appendices E and F). They have been very beneficial to supporting the program for our archaeological field school, field trips, internships, contacts with employers, guest speakers in classes, research opportunities, library facilities in the lab, equipment outreach to the larger community, and occasional grants for support of the archaeological field school.

H. Results of Previous Program Review and Future Directions:

The Anthropology faculty concurred with the team's identification of the program's <u>three primary strengths</u>: (1) the quality of the faculty, (2) the strong relationships with the community, and (3) the excellent student-faculty relations which exist; as well as the program's two primary challenges: (1) small number of faculty, and (2) consequent limited course offerings.

1. **Team Recommendation (both 2000 and 2005 reviews): Increase faculty lines, on either Main or Davis campus or by adding a new joint position with another department.**
   a. <u>Program Response</u>: We agreed, due to strong student demand and programmatic complexity.
   b. <u>Action Plan and Timeline</u>: We outlined several possible forms for 2005-08: (1) A position, possibly non-tenure track, at the Davis campus, (2) An additional faculty member on Main campus in either Biological Anthropology or Linguistics, (3) Shared joint position in Biological Anthropology with Criminal Justice, due to shared forensic interest, or (4) possible joint position in Linguistic Anthropology with Arts and Humanities programs.
   c. <u>Assessment of Action Plan and Evidence of Results</u>: The new position(s) were not allotted to us. However, since this review, a Weber State University <u>Linguistics Minor</u> was developed and approved in 2009, which has enabled an expansion of direction and offerings to students who wish additional linguistic courses and credentials. Rosemary Conover serves on the Advisory Board of this Minor and helped to design the Minor. More sections of ANTH HU/DV1040, Language and Culture, have been added with Dr. Conover's return to full-time teaching.
2. **Team Recommendation: Increase adjunct faculty sections to allow full time faculty to concentrate on areas such as Biological Anthropology. Add lab to lower division class. Add upper division biological course.**
   a. <u>Program Response</u>: We agreed on the need for more sections of biological anthropology and linguistic anthropology, due to growing demand. We disagreed with the lab component recommendation due to in-class lab components already existing, lack of sufficient faculty to teach lab, articulation issues with other schools in the USHE system, and the potential of losing the course's General Education status at WSU. Upper division biological anthropology can be handled under existing special topics courses.
   b. <u>Action Plan and Evidence of Results</u>: We developed a more active recruitment strategy for adjuncts and in Biological Anthropology employed two who could offer the course in the evening or off campus. Dr. Conover's return to full-time teaching also allowed additional sections.
3. **Team Recommendation: Evaluate opportunities to enhance the AAS degree and develop an anthropology career ladder.**
   a. <u>Program Response</u>: The Archaeological Technician Associate of Applied Science and Institutional Certificate were developed to serve a now-defunct "Archaeological Technician" position in the Civil Service System. <u>Employment standards have since changed</u>, a BA/BS (or higher) in archaeology preferred, and <u>students also favor the BA/BS.</u> We will monitor and make changes if appropriate.

ANTHROPOLOGY SELF-STUDY
Table of Contents

ANTHROPOLOGY SELF-STUDY
2005-06 to 2010-11

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Submitted December, 2011

Program Review Evaluation Team Members:

Self-Study Team Chair, Member external to the University, but from within the discipline:
> Dr. Pam Miller, Associate Professor of Anthropology
> Dept. of Anthropology, Utah State University-East
> Price, UT

Member external to the University, but from within the discipline:
> Dr. David Knowlton, Professor of Anthropology
> Dept. of Behavioral Sciences
> Utah Valley University
> Orem, UT

Member external to the College, but from within the University:
> Dr. Michael Wutz
> Professor of English, Editor, Weber Studies
> Weber State University, Ogden, UT

Member internal to the College and from within the University
> Dr. Dan Bedford
> Professor of Geography,
> Weber State University, Ogden, UT

Program Contact Information: Dr. Linda B. Eaton, Coordinator of Anthropology
> Phone: 801-626-6244
> Email: leaton1@weber.edu

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

(Note: The Anthropology Program has no professional accreditation review to connect with this review.)

September 2011: An orientation to the process of program review was provided by College Dean to the Department Chair, who informed the Program Faculty of this review.

October-December 2011: Program data were collected, analyzed, interpreted, and discussed by the program faculty in preparation for writing the self-study report. Members of the Evaluation Team were selected and approved by the Program Faculty and College Dean. The self-study report was prepared as a draft by the Coordinator for discussion and revision by the program faculty before it was completed. The self-study report was submitted to the College Dean. The self-study team visit schedule was prepared and discussed.

January, 2012: Copies of the self-study report were sent to the members of the Evaluation Team for their use.

February, 2012: The Evaluation Team will make its on-site visit to interview faculty, students, staff, alumni, and administrators, tour the program facilities, and review their findings.

March 15, 2012: The Program Review Evaluation Team will submit its report.

April 15, 2012: The Program Faculty will provide its response to the Program Review Evaluation Team's report and provide any updated plans for change.

May 1, 2012: The Dean will prepare his response to both the Program Review Evaluation Team's report and the Program Faculty's response. The Dean will forward all documents to the Office of Academic Affairs.

Early Fall Semester, 2012: The Coordinator will present the findings of the Program Review to the University Program Review Standing Committee for its discussion and acceptance. The Program Faculty and Dean will respond to the report prepared by the Provost as an institutional response, if necessary.

I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW

The Anthropology Program is located in the Department of Sociology & Anthropology within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. It provides undergraduate education in anthropology for students wishing to complete degrees that include the Anthropology Major, Anthropology Minor, Archaeological Technician Certificate or Applied Associate of Science Degree, or BIS emphases. It also serves students seeking general education, diversity credits, or who wish to take anthropology courses for interest, and provides appropriate anthropological services, resources, and activities to the region that the university serves. Unique features of the program include a holistic, four-field approach to anthropology with its fields of archaeology, linguistics, ethnology and biological anthropology. The anthropological philosophical perspective views humans and their behavior within the context of long-term interactions and adaptations among biological, cultural, and environmental factors. The major has a two-track program option: General Anthropology or Archaeology. The program also offers both an Archaeological Field School and a two-week Study-Abroad experience program during most summers.

The program has been a presence on the campus for nearly fifty years, with an active Minor and Anthropology Club throughout that period, although the Anthropology Major was not granted by the Board of Regents until April, 2000. Prior to that time, students constructed anthropological foci within the Bachelor of Integrated Studies Program, combining Archaeology, Anthropology, and a third field of their choice to replace the more usual major/minor combination. In the years since the B.A./B.S. in Anthropology became available, the number of declared majors annually has grown, by Autumn, 2011, to a total of 107, of whom 31 are in the Archaeology track and 76 in General Anthropology.   The program has graduated 141 Majors by Spring 2011. Anthropology faculty numbers are now at 3.625 FTE.

II. PROGRAM REVIEW ELEMENTS AND STANDARDS

A. Mission Statement:

The current program overview and mission statement were developed in November 2000 to accommodate the new program Major approved by the Utah Board of Regents in April 2000. (For discussion of Program Support to the Missions of the Department, College, and University, please see Appendix G.)

The overall mission of the Anthropology Major Program is to provide students with holistic, comparative knowledge about human biological and cultural differences and similarities world-wide and through time derived from anthropological research and theories. The program strives to produce students with anthropological experience in research, analysis, and interpretation and a strong sense of anthropology's relevance to the world today. Students are taught to question and examine the significance of beliefs, attitudes and prejudices toward human differences and similarities and to be informed of the anthropological position of relativism and valuing cultural and biological variation. The program prepares students for a broad range of both public and private sector employment in anthropology-related fields or to enter professional or graduate schools appropriate to their interests.

B. Curriculum:

1. Types of Degrees Offered: There are <u>four kinds of degrees</u> and <u>one certificate</u> offered:

- ‣ Anthropology Major (BS/BA) — 36 hour degree, 2-track option
- ‣ Anthropology Minor (BS/BA) — 18 hour degree
- ‣ Anthropology and/or Archaeology BIS Emphases — 18 hour degree
- ‣ Archaeological Technician Associate of Applied Science (AAS) – 43-47 hours
- ‣ Archaeological Technician Institutional Certificate – 23-25 hours

a. The <u>Anthropology Major:</u> leads to either a B.A. or B.S. degree and consists of two track options for students to select: the General or Archaeology. Both tracks require four courses (12 hours): a general 4-field introduction to anthropology, an anthropological theory course, a research methods course, and a statistics course. The General Track requires two courses (6 hours) to be selected from among the standard anthropological four fields, and 18 hours of electives selected from the remaining curriculum. The Archaeology Track designates the additional 7 courses to be taken and one 3-hour elective course to total the remaining 24 hours.

b. The <u>Anthropology Minor</u> and <u>BIS Emphasis:</u> are identical 18-hour programs consisting of two required courses (6 hours), a general 4-field introduction to anthropology and an anthropological theory course, two courses (6 hours) to be selected from the standard anthropological four fields, and six hours of electives to be selected from the remaining anthropology curriculum.

c. The <u>Archeological Technician Associate of Applied Science (AAS) Degree:</u> consists of 12 required core courses (37-40 hours) and two support courses (6-7 hours).

d. The <u>Archaeological Institutional Certificate:</u> requires six courses (20-21 hours) and one support course (3-4 hours).

e. The <u>Archaeological BIS Emphasis:</u> consists of a comparable program as for the Institutional Certificate with six required courses and one support course.

2. Numbers and Types of Courses Offered:

There are 26 different courses offered in the program curriculum, nine of which allow different topics to be offered each time they are taught (i.e., ANTH 2990 - Special Topics, ANTH 2810/4810 -Experimental Courses, ANTH 2920/4920 -Short Courses, Workshops, Institutes, and Special Programs, ANTH 2950/4950 - Elementary/Advanced Field Trip, ANTH DV3600 - Culture Area Studies, ANTH 4830 - Readings and/or Projects, ANTH 4890, Internship in Anthropology, and ANTH 4990 - Seminar in Anthropology). These more open-ended and flexible courses provide needed curricular vitality and flexibility for faculty expertise and interest, and student and campus/community demand. Here are some other features of our courses.

a. <u>General Education and Other Service Courses Offered:</u>

(1) The program offers <u>five</u> WSU general education courses (three in Social Sciences (SS), one in Life Sciences (LS), and one in Humanities (HU):

    ANTH SS/DV1000 - Introduction to Anthropology (3)
    ANTH SS/DV2010 - Peoples and Cultures of the World (3)
    ANTH SS2030 - Principles of Archaeology (3)
    ANTH LS/DV1020 - Biological Anthropology (3)
    ANTH HU/DV1040 - Language and Culture (3)

(2) The program offers <u>nine</u> courses which can fulfill the WSU diversity requirement (DV):

    ANTH SS/DV1000 - Introduction to Anthropology (3) - also offered on-line; concurrent enroll. ANTH SS/DV2010 - Peoples and Cultures of the World (3) - also offered on-line
    ANTH LS/DV1020 - Biological Anthropology (3)
    ANTH HU/DV1040 - Language and Culture (3)
    ANTH DV 3200 - Archaeology of Early Civilizations (3)
    ANTH DV3500 – Advanced Cultural Anthropology (3)
    ANTH DV3600 - Culture Area Studies (3)
    ANTH DV3700 - Sex Roles: Past, Present and Future (3)
    ANTH DV3900 - Magic, Shamanism and Religion (3)

(3)   The program offers <u>two</u> scientific inquiry courses (SI) which fulfill BS degree requirements:

> ANTH SI3400 - Archaeological Laboratory Techniques (3) ANTH
> SI 4300 - Anthropological Research Methods (3)

b. <u>Courses Offered Outside of the Traditional In-person Classroom Delivery Mode:</u>

(1) The program offers <u>three</u> Online Courses:
> ANTH SS/DV1000 - Introduction to Anthropology
> ANTH SS/DV2010 - Peoples & Cultures of the World
> ANTH 2990/4990 - Special Topics: Medical Anthropology

(2) Also outside the classroom are <u>four</u> courses:
> ANTH 2920/4920 and ANTHRO 2950/4950, used for Field Trips and Study Abroads
> ANTH 3300, Archaeological Field Techniques, used for the Archaeological Field
> School in various locations.
> ANTH 4830, Readings and/or Projects
> ANTH 4890, Internship in Anthropology

c. <u>Courses offered for the Major and Minor:</u> These consist of the required core courses. Both the General Anthropology Major and the Archaeology Track require 4 courses: ANTH 1000, 4200, SI4300, and SOC3600; in addition, the Archaeology Track requires: ANTH 3100, ANTH DV 3200, ANTH 3300, ANTH SI 3400 and ANTH 4100. Required courses for the Minor are ANTH 1000 and 4200). Both Major and Minor programs also require two of the Four-Field courses (ANTH 2010, 2030, 1020 and 1040). Required courses unique to the Archaeology Track requirements are also Electives for students in other parts of the program.

3. Student Constituents Served by the Program:

a. <u>Description of Students:</u> For the years examined in this self-study (2005-06 to 2010-11), the Anthropology Program has a very solid student constituency for a rather small program. The major is relatively young, having been approved by the Utah Board of Regents in April 2000, and the faculty feel it has done very well in its first decade in establishing its position on campus and attracting a significant group of students. Student constituents served by the program now include <u>six different groups,</u> each with slightly different needs and goals:
> (1) Students seeking an Anthropology Major;
> (2) Students pursuing an Anthropology Minor;
> (3) Students taking anthropology courses to fulfill general university requirements such as general education courses, diversity courses, or scientific inquiry;
> (4) Students seeking an Anthropology Emphasis for a Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) degree;
> (5) Students seeking an Archaeological Technician Institutional Certificate or Associate of Applied Science,
> (6) Students on campus and in the community taking anthropology courses for personal interest or for re-certification (e.g., in education, medical professions).

b. <u>Student Data:</u> *(See Appendix A of this report for a statistical summary of the six-year student data.)* Here are a number of observations of trends to be seen from the data:

> (5) SCH Production: The program generated a fairly constant rate of rise in student credit hours (SCHs) over the past six years, averaging 3,939 SCHs annually (with a low of 3,357 in 2006-07 SCHs, then rising significantly to highs of 4,643 SCHs in 2009-10 and 5,071 SCHs in 2010-2011). Enrollments remained high for most courses and indicated good and steadily increasing student demand. In contrast, the average for the previous five years, 2001-05 was 3,572, with a high of 3,776 SCHs in 2003-04.
> (6) Student Populations: The overall composition of the student population noticeably shifted with the

new Major becoming available. The number of newly declared Majors in the program rose rapidly within the first two years of the program and then leveled out at approximately 100, suggesting that student demand remained fairly constant since 2003. At the same time, the number of Minors and Bachelor of Integrated Studies (BIS) students modestly declined and stabilized in the 50-75 range.

(7) Graduates: The number of graduates in the Major in the past six years has varied between 8 and 15, while the number of Minors/BIS Concentrators graduating have fluctuated between 4 and 20.

(8) Gender Demographics: The gender of declared Majors and Minors in the program is essentially an evenly balanced 1:18 ratio of females to males in 2010-11, though within the past six years it has fluctuated from a 1.3 males to 1 female ratio to one of 2.71 females to 1 male. The gender of graduates, however, has tended to lean overall slightly in the direction of more females graduating annually than males, approximately 1.5F: 1M across the eleven-year history of the program. This is also reflected in the tendency for more males than females to become inactive in the program at any given semester, a problem perhaps exacerbated by WSU's high numbers of non-traditional students and the current economic climate. By 2011, of the total 141 Majors who had graduated, 60% were female and 40% were male. (Graduation gender data are unavailable for Minors/BIS.)

c. <u>Procedures for Admitting Students to the Program:</u> There are no special admission or application requirements for Majors or Minors, All students admitted to WSU in good standing qualify for admission to the program. Students are encouraged to come to the department office to declare their program of study, are provided with an initial advisement session, and go through the standard campus process to officially make their declaration. Following this, a file is created for each declared student to be maintained in the department for subsequent advisement and record-keeping.

4. Allocation of Resources for Curriculum Delivery:

Table 1 below displays the number of sections of courses taught by full time and adjunct faculty in 2010-11 and accompanying enrollments and SCHs generated for each course type. These data illustrate how the program allocates its curriculum resources in the most recent year.

During 2010-11, 41 sections (68.3%) of the total 62 sections of courses taught were allocated to the general education curriculum, 10 courses (15%) were required courses for our Majors or the Minor, and 11 (16.7%) were electives. We feel this is an appropriate ratio of allocation of course type to meet program mission requirements, student demand, and faculty and classroom resources. Additionally, general education courses serve our Majors and Minors, and some required courses attract non-majors, so the balance of course types remains reasonable.

Full time faculty taught 36 (58.%) of these 62 course sections as in-load classes and adjunct faculty the remaining 26 sections (42%). Full time faculty taught 41.5% of general education courses (17 sections of 41), 100% of Major/Minor Required Courses (9 sections of 9), and 83% of Electives (10 of 12 sections). Adjuncts, consequently, taught 42.3% of general education course sections, 17% of electives, and none of the required courses for Majors/Minors. A total of 84% of enrollment and SCHs came from general education courses, 4.2% from Major/Minor required courses, and 11.8% from Electives.

The primary factors or constraints affecting our resource allocation decisions are the following:

a. A small, with only 3.625 Full Time Equivalent (FTE), faculty is normally available due to split administrative duties for some (see Section F on Faculty of this report for further details). Additionally, in 2010-11 and 2011-12, one full FTE faculty member is on leave, and an adjunct faculty member was contracted to assume his full time teaching load in Spring 2011..

b. There are limited university funds to hire adjuncts and equally limited availability of anthropologists to teach as adjuncts in the geographic area of WSU, exacerbated by the university's pay-scale for adjuncts being below that of other colleges and universities in the area.

c. The program has approximately 150-200 Majors/Minors to be served with required courses.

Overall, however, we feel that our resource allocation decisions provide a satisfactory curriculum delivery consistent with the mission of the program, the needs of the Majors and Minors, the general education students and others served by the program, and the limiting constraints of the program.

Table 1. Allocation of Resources for Curriculum Delivery AY2010-11

Types of Courses Taught:	# Sections Taught:	Total Enrollment:	Total SCHs:	# Full Time Faculty Sections:	# Adjunct Faculty Sections:
1. General Education:	41	1349	4047	17	24
2. Major/Minor Required Courses:	9 [+5 in Soc 3600]	67	201	9 [+5 Soc Fac]	0
3. Electives:	12	191	573	10	2
TOTAL:	**62**	**1,607**	**4,821**	**36**	**26**

Gen Ed courses included ANTHRO 1000, 1020, 1040, 2010 and 2030.
Major/Minor Required Courses did not include ANTH 1000 (which is counted in Gen.Ed), nor was SOC SI3600 (Social Statistics) included. It is taught by the Sociology faculty.
ANTHRO 4830-Readings and/or Projects was counted as 1 section per semester/term.
On-line courses were included as sections in the data.
Diversity courses were counted in General Education only, though they also serve our program as electives. SI courses were counted as Required courses.
Cross-listed courses tiered as single classes were counted as one section (e.g., 2990/4990, 2950/4950).

Site Locations for Teaching Courses:
There are five primary locations or types of locations where the program's courses are taught:

> e. WSU-Ogden campus.
> f. WSU off-campus sites, primarily the WSU-Davis campus.
> g. Field Trips to various off-campus localities: These have primarily gone to locations within the Intermountain West, but in 2006 the program began a series of annual Study Abroad programs, detailed in Section II-6 on High Impact Learning below.
> h. Archaeological Field School, held at various sites in the Great Basin, also detailed in Section II-6 on High Impact Learning below.
> i. On-line.

Student demand for the program is primarily for daytime classes on the WSU-Ogden campus, though demand at the Davis campus is growing. Consequently, all courses in the curriculum are offered on the main WSU-Ogden campus and in the day program. Evening, on-campus offerings are usually limited to two or three on-campus lower-division, general education courses a semester with one or two occasional upper-division courses taught when student demand warrants. Courses at WSU off-campus sites, evening and online classes, are primarily limited to three lower division, general education courses per semester and occasional upper division offerings, all funded through Continuing Education.

5. Curriculum Planning and Review Process:
All members of the anthropology faculty are involved in curriculum planning, meeting several times a year to discuss related issues and concerns, especially as schedules are planned and as we obtain information through annual program assessment efforts. If changes are needed, the Program Coordinator initiates a curriculum proposal for review by faculty, department and other impacted parties, sends it to the appropriate College and University curriculum committees for review and Faculty Senate for final approval.

6. High Impact Learning Aspects of Curriculum:
Anthropology is primarily a fieldwork discipline, and the program offers students opportunities to (a) participate in archaeological research fieldwork in the Great Basin, (b) participate in local fieldwork projects in cultural anthropology as a part of the Anthropological Research Methods course, to participate in internships, and/or (c) travel outside the United States to look at archaeological and cultural sites and engage directly with other cultures. All of these offer course credit, and a department Research Conference each spring offers opportunities for students to present results of these and other types of research:

a. In 2006 the Anthropology program began a series of annual Study Abroads, concentrating on archaeological and cultural sites in various parts of the world, the students engaging with local cultures via small individual observation projects. To date, trips have included: 2006 and 2008, History and Culture of Ireland; 2007, Pyramids of Mexico; 2009, The Celtic Edge of Britain (Scotland and Wales); 2010, Greece and Turkey; and 2011, Peru. Participants totaled 170 in these first six Study Abroad offerings, which have been influential in generating both majors and minors for the program.

b. The Anthropology program has offered opportunities for archaeological fieldwork since the mid-1960s and a field school for more than 25 years. During the summers of 2006-2011, the WSU Archaeological Field School was involved in two major excavation projects on US Forest Service-administered public lands in southern Idaho. The 2006-2008 project, funded mostly by a US Forest Service Challenge Cost Share Grant, provided hands-on experience in archaeological field methods, artifact and faunal classification, and High Desert ecology for 20 WSU Anthropology students and numerous volunteers. It was conducted during a total of three months at Trapper Cliff Rockshelter in the Sawtooth National Forest in south-central Idaho, investigating a major residential base camp, occupied by Late Archaic, Northern Fremont, and Shoshone groups ca. A.D. 100-1800, used most intensively after ca. A.D. 650, when it was a seasonal hub within the local settlement system. From 2009-2011, the Field School spent portions of the summers excavating at the Rock Creek Site,10Oa275, a late prehistoric big-game processing camp along the West Fork of Rock Creek on the Curlew National Grassland in southeastern Idaho. This multi-year project also was funded mostly by a Challenge Cost Share Grant, this time from the Caribou-Targhee National Forest. Sixteen WSU Anthropology students and various volunteers participated in this excavation.

c. The Anthropological Research Methods and the Internship in Anthropology courses offer students the opportunities either to participate directly in local cultural anthropological research or to do an internship in one of the four fields.

d. The joint Department of Sociology and Anthropology Annual Student Research Conference held each spring (in existence since May, 1995) provides students with opportunities to conduct research, prepare and make formal presentations, and share findings with the department, campus, and community.

7. Rotation of Courses Offered in Curriculum for Past Three Years:

Table 2 below summarizes the rotation of all courses offered in the curriculum in 2008-2011. It shows that courses in the program are taught regularly and frequently to ensure that students are able to graduate in a timely manner. Most frequently taught are the General Education courses, with ANTH 1000,1020, 1040 and 2010 taught each semester, including summer. Major/Minor Required Courses are offered yearly with ANTH 4200 (Anthropological Theory) taught Fall semesters and ANTH 4300 (Anthropological Research Methods) each Spring. (SOC 3600-Social Statistics is taught by Sociology faculty every semester). Some Electives are taught annually, though others are taught less frequently due to faculty constraints. Our more open-ended topical or geographical area elective courses (ANTH 2990/4990 - Special Topics or Seminar in Anthropology and ANTH 3600 - Culture Areas Studies) are taught 1-3 times per semester with titles appropriate to the subject offered and are in high demand. The Readings and/or Projects course (ANTH 4830) and the Internship in Anthropology (ANTH 4890) are offered every semester to allow students opportunities to do individualized study. Lastly, our experimental courses (ANTH 2810/4810) and Short Courses, Workshops, Institutes, and Special Programs (ANTH2920/4920) are taught as needed, the latter sometimes used for study abroad courses. The rotation pattern of the curriculum enables Majors and Minors to complete graduation requirements within two

years and offers a continuous variety of courses for general education and also for non-majors and non-minors.

Table 2. Anthropology Course Rotation 2008-2011

General Education Courses:	Su08	Au08	Sp09	Su09	Au09	Sp10	Su10	Au10	Sp11
SS/DV 1000 Introduction to Anthropology	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SS/DV 2010 Peoples & Cultures of World	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SS 2030 Principles of Archaeology		X	X		X			X	X
LS/DV 1020 Biological Anthropology	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
HU/DV 1040 Language and Culture		X	X		X	X		X	X
Major/Minor Required Courses:									
4200 Anthropological Theory		X			X			X	
SI 4300 Anthropological Research Methods			X		X	X			X
Soc 3600 Social Statistics	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Electives:									
2920 Workshops, Spec. Programs							X		
2950 Elem. Anthropological Field Trip	X			X			X		
2990 Special Topics in Anthropology		X	X		X	X		X	X
DV 3200 Archaeology of Early Civs		X			X			X	
3100 Prehistory of North America			X						X
3300 Archaeological Field Techniques	X			X			X		
SI 3400 Archaeological Lab Techniques		X				X		X	
DV3500 Advanced Cultural Anthropology						X			
DV 3600 Culture Area Studies		X	X			X		X	X
DV 3900 Magic, Shamanism & Religion		X	X	X	X	X		X	
4100 Arch Method, Theory and Cultural Resource Mgmnt						X			
4830 Readings and/or Projects	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4890 Internship in Anthropology		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
4920 Workshops, Spec Programs							X		
4950 Advanced Anthrop. Field Trip	X			X			X		
4990 Seminar in Anthropology		X	X		X	X		X	X

**ANTH 2810/4810 - Experimental Courses and ANTH DV3700, Sex Roles: Past, Present and Future were not offered during these three years and are only offered as Electives upon need.

C. Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment:

AY2010-11 was the eleventh year the Anthropology Program participated in the university's outcomes assessment program. In 2000-01 Anthropology developed its current mission statement, identified 8 central learning goals for the major, constructed a curriculum outcomes grid, and began an exit interview to measure student learning. In ensuing years, the grid was amended slightly to reflect course foci, a formal "assessment plan" was articulated, graduate exit interviews continued, and the program participated in general education and diversity assessment of specific courses, most recently in 2011, and gathered data on student grades, and graduation and retention. See Appendix H for details.

a. Program Learning Goals:

7. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).

8. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.

9. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.

10. KNOWLEDGE GOAL: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.

11. KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS GOAL: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.

12. SKILLS GOAL: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.

7. SKILLS GOAL: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.

8. VALUES GOAL: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, anthropocentrism), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.

b. Linkage to the program's curriculum: These goals are well linked to the curriculum. Table 3 below, the Curriculum Map, displays the rankings (high, medium, or low) the degree to which each anthropology course required for one of the two Majors or the Minor meets each of the 8 learning goals, each course addressing two or more of these goals at a high level, with some courses emphasizing some goals more than others. Required courses for the Major and Minor and the upper division courses address objectives #4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 more thoroughly, building skills and knowledge of theory, research, critical thinking and communication about anthropology issues, while general education courses stress fundamental anthropological concepts and in goals #1, 2, 3 and 8. The curriculum provides an excellent mixture of these goals objectives, and students are well prepared to achieve these learning goals by the time they graduate.

c. **5-Year Plan for Assessment Cycle:** In the Evidence of Learning Tables 4 through 8, which follow the Curriculum Map, all five of the Anthropology General Education courses were evaluated in terms of their success in meeting the eight Learning Goals listed above. In **2012-13** we will analyze the courses required in the Anthropology Major and Minor; in **2013-14**, the High Impact Learning courses; and in **2014-15**, the Electives. In **2015-16**, we will re-assess the Anthropology General Education courses again. **The plan is to continue this yearly rotation in future, in order to continuously evaluate and improve our courses.**

Table 3: Curriculum Map

Key: Degree to which course meets the learning goal: H = High focus in course content, M = Medium focus in course content, L = Low focus in course content, Blank = Not emphasized in course content.

Core Courses in Program—Includes the General Education Courses and courses required for Minor or both of the two Majors	Department/Program Learning Outcomes							
	Learning Outcome 1	Learning Outcome 2	Learning Outcome 3	Learning Outcome 4	Learning Outcome 5	Learning Outcome 6	Learning Outcome 7	Learning Outcome 8
ANTH SSIDV1000 (3) INTRODUCTION TO ANTHROPOLOGY	H	H	H	L	L	M	L	H
ANTH SS/DV2010 (3) PEOPLES & CULTURES OF THE WORLD	H	H	H	L	M	M	M	H
ANTH SS2030 (3) PRINCIPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGY	H	H	H	L	M	M		
ANTH LS1020 (3) BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	H	H	H	M	M	M	M	H
ANTH HU/DV2300 (3) LANGUAGE & CULTURE	H	H	H	L	H	M	M	H
ANTH 4200 (3) ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY	L	M	H	H	M	H	H	M
ANTH 514300 (3) ANTHROPOLOGICAL RESEARCH METHODS	L	M	M	H	H	H	H	L

Table 4: Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses ANTH SS/DV 1000, Introduction to Anthropology

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 1: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to understand and correctly identify the broad categories and functions of political, economic and kinship systems that exist worldwide.	Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from Exam 1	Measure 1: These 10 questions were answered correctly 84% of the time.	Measure 1: Most of the students could correctly identify the categories and understood that these categories existed around the world.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Pop quizzes of a paragraph written about what they learned the day before.	Measure 2: 82% of students received satisfactory scores.	Measure 2: Most students have satisfactory retention and understanding of the materials.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 2: A student will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.	Learning Outcome 2: Students will understand the concept of holism, as applied in anthropology, and have a basic understanding of what each of the 4 subfields does.	Measure 1 . A set of 10 multiple choice questions from Exams 1 and 2	Measure 1: 79% of students were able to correctly answer questions on these topics.	Measure 1: Students understood the concept of holism and could recognize techniques and conclusions associated with the 4 subfields.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Pop quizzes of a paragraph written about what they learned the day before.	Measure 2: 82% of students received satisfactory scores.	Measure 2: Most students have satisfactory retention and understanding of the materials.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 3: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand basic concepts and terms used by anthropology not used or used differently outside the discipline.	Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from Exam 1	Measure 1: 84% of students successfully identified definitions of these unique key concepts.	Measure 1:. Students successfully demonstrated interpretation and understanding skills	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
		Measure 2: Pop quizzes of a paragraph written about what students learned in the previous class period.	Measure 2: 82% of students received satisfactory scores.	Measure 2: Most students have satisfactory retention and understanding of the materials.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
Goal 4: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand the basic theories and processes of biological evolution as they are applied and evaluated in studies of human fossil forms.	Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from the Final Exam.	Measure 1: 83% of students successfully answered questions on elementary aspects of evolutionary theory and how it has been applied to human fossil evidence.	Measure 1: Students showed basic understanding of evolutionary theory and how it has been used by biological anthropologists to interpret human fossil evidence.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 5: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to comprehend the form and	Measure 1: Students were given a pair of multi-generation kinship charts, and	Measure 1: 76% of students were able to successfully complete the exercise at an A	Measure 1: Most students were able to successfully understand and employ a	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
research methods and techniques of analysis.	rationale of kinship systems different from their own.	asked to identify members of a matrilineage and of a patrilineage.	or B level.	kinship determination process significantly different from their own.	
Goal 6: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropologic problems and issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to comprehend the logic of ideas about religion and the supernatural that are different from their own.	Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from Exam 2.	Measure 1: 86% of students successfully answered questions on beliefs about the supernatural that challenge the commonly held beliefs of US culture.	Measure 1: Students showed the ability to consider modes of thought at variance with those of their own culture.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 7: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to write about a cross-cultural experience of their own, using basic anthropological concepts.	Measure 1: An assignment in which each student seeks out and participates in a cross-cultural experience and writes a short essay about it.	Measure 1: 92% of students wrote about their cross-cultural experience at an A or B level, discussing concepts like culture shock, ethnocentrism and other appropriate anthropological issues.	Measure 1: Students were able to employ and successfully communicate basic anthropological concepts in writing.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 8: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism, sexism,), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand the concepts through which anthropology examines prejudice and discrimination and learn the germane results at an introductory level.	Measure 1: A set of 10 multiple choice questions from the Exams 1, 2, and the Final Exam	Measure 1: 81% of students correctly answered these questions, indicating knowledge of how anthropology's methods and data deal with concepts of prejudice and discrimination.	Measure 1: (Ex. Students successfully demonstrated an understanding of the roots of prejudice and discrimination, as well as the data necessary to judgment on these issues.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
		Measure 2: Brief essays on student's self-chosen cross-cultural experiences	Measure 2: 75% of students received a score of 80% or above on these writings.	Measure 2: Students were able to engage in a minor cross-cultural experience and analyze it with minimal apparent prejudice and ethnocentrism or with the ability to recognize those reactions in themselves.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Summary: As the introductory course in the program, ANTH 1000 contains in the most basic form all eight of the program's identified learning goals, though in appropriately varying amounts. As noted in the Curriculum Map, Learning Goals 1,2, 3 and 8 are areas of High focus in Introduction to Anthropology, Learning Goal 6 is Medium, while 4, 5 and 7 are Goals primarily addressed as students progress beyond this first course and are thus marked for ANTH 1000 as Low in focus. In all cases, however, the measures show that at least three-quarters of the students are reaching all 8 goals at levels of 80% or above, so no curricular and pedagogical changes are seen as needed at this time. Data in this table are derived from two sections of the course taught in Spring 2011 by Dr. Linda Eaton.

Table 5. Evidence of Learning -- General Education Course: ANTH LS/DV1020 - Biological Anthropology

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 1: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand a biocultural approach to describing and explaining human similarities, variation, and evolution.	Measure 1: Six quizzes containing essay and objective questions on central biocultural material taught across the semester.	Measure 1: 85% of the students passed the quizzes with grades of C or better.	Measure 1: The majority of students (85%) could meet this learning goal.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Course logs used as learning tools on readings and discussions – collected & graded 5 times during the semester. Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions on readings for participation and leadership.	Measure 2: 95% of students received satisfactory scores on their logs demonstrating knowledge of material. Measure 3: Discussions were led successfully by 98% of the students as leaders and/or participants.	Measures 2& 3: The majority of students have satisfactory or better understanding of the biocultural approach and can communicate about it effectively with examples. Overall the pedagogical methods and measurements employed are appropriate.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 2: A student will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to identify and understand the relationships among biology, culture, and ecology and how to integrate the knowledge contributed from the 4 fields of anthropology into this holistic perspective.	Measure 1: 6 quizzes (see above) containing essay and objective questions involving 4-field integration and a holistic perspective.	Measure 1: 85% of the students passed the quizzes with grades of C or better.	Measure 1: Most students understood the nature of a holistic perspective of interrelationships and could identify the 4 fields of anthropology.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Course logs on readings with written responses involving integration. Measure: Weekly small group discussions on readings for participation and leadership	Measure 2: 95% of students received satisfactory scores on their graded logs. 98% of the students served as leaders and/or participants and demonstrated skill in discussing issues in readings.	Measure 2: Most students demonstrated the ability to identify and write about the issues and factors contri-buting to human variation, evolution, and the integration of knowledge from the 4 fields in anthropology.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 3: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to define and recognize key concepts and terminology used in anthropology and the life sciences.	Measure 1: 6 quizzes containing essay and objective questions on key concepts and terminology.	Measure 1: 85% of students passed the course with grades of C or better showing ability to command these concepts and terms.	Measures 1, 2, and 3: The majority of students successfully achieved proficiency of the key concepts and terms.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
		Measure 2: Course logs entailing the appropriate use of key concepts and terms. Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions required knowledge and use of these key concepts and vocabulary.	Measure 2: 95% of students received satisfactory scores based on ability to use key concepts and terms. Measure 3: 98 % of students participated and/or led discussions demonstrating their ability to use the key	The teaching methods of the course appear to be effective in achieving this goal.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
			terms and explore central concepts effectively.		

Goal 4: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.	Learning Outcome :
	  Students will understand the fundamental issues, theories, challenges, and processes explaining biological variation and evolution derived from such studies as human genetics, primatology, and paleoanthropology.
		Measure 1: 6 quizzes across the semester pertaining to evolutionary theories and scientific explanations of human variation.
		
		Measure 2: Course logs graded 5 times (see above) contain theory topics.
		
		Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions (see above) on theoretical issues.
			Measures 1, 2, and 3:
			   85% of students successfully passed the class with grades of C or better, answering questions and discussing evolutionary theory and explanations of human variation.
				Measures 1, 2, & 3:
				Students showed basic understanding of evolutionary theory and how it has been used by biological anthropologists to interpret human evolution and population genetics.
				
				The course design and pedagogical methods appear to be appropriate.
					Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.

Goal 5: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to comprehend the roles of the scientific method used in fieldwork, lab research, and analysis in areas of human genetics, primatology, paleoanthropology, and forensics in describing and explaining human variation and evolution.	Measure 1: 6 quizzes across the semester (see above) entail questions of research. Measure 2: Course logs (see above) require examining research topics. Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions (see above) include research topics.	Measures 1, 2, and 3: 85% of students tested well in this area (earning final grades of C or better); and 95% successfully demonstrated knowledge of the processes of scientific data collection and interpretation in anthropology in their logs and class discussions.	Measures 1, 2, and 3: Most students were able to describe and explain fundamental research methods and analysis in anthropology. Course design and teaching methods appear to be appropriate to achieve the goal.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 6: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to engage in critical thinking about the paradigm of biological evolution and arguments against biological race and racism.	Measure 1: 6 quizzes across the semester (see above) involve essays entailing reasoning skills. Measure 2: Course logs (see above) require thoughtful responses. Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions (see above) entail critical thinking.	Measure 1: 85% of students passed their quizzes on sections requiring critical thinking and discussion with grades of C or better. Measures 2 & 3: 95-98% of students demonstrated an ability to write or discuss topics or issues critically.	Measures 1, 2, & 3: Students showed the ability to discern critical issues and arguments in biological anthropology and discuss or describe these logically. The course methods and design appear to be effective in achieving this goal.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 7: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to write about and discuss issues pertaining to biological anthropology.	Measure 1: Essay portions of 6 quizzes enable students to communicate their knowledge of course issues. Measure 2: Course logs require writing about readings and assigned topics of	Measure 1: Essay portions of the quizzes were answered better than the objective sections and determined the students' final grades (85% earning grades of C or better). Measure 2: 95% of students	Measures 1, 2, and 3: The majority of students demonstrated the ability to communicate about anthropological concepts and issues. The writing-intensive and	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
		anthropological relevance. Measure 3: Weekly small group discussions require students to lead discussions 3 times during the semester and participate as discussants 14 times.	earned grades of C or better on their written logs. Measure 3: 98% of students demonstrated the ability to lead discussions and participate meaningfully in discussions.	student-based discussion methods of the course seem to be especially effective in teaching students how to write and discuss to learn. And the exams, logs, and organized discussions are good measures to maintain.	
Goal 8: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism, sexism,), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.	Learning Outcome: Students will understand the issues and anthropological arguments against such prejudices as racism, anthropocentrism, sexism, and antievolutionism.	Measure 1: The 6 quizzes given during the semester contain questions pertaining to the anthropological position on these forms of prejudice.	Measure 1: The majority of students demonstrated the ability to address these issues and present the anthropological interpretations regarding them (resulting in 85% receiving final grades of C or better).	Measures 1, 2, and 3: The majority of students appear to comprehend and be able to communicate about the nature and existence of these prejudices and the main anthropological positions against them.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
		Measure 2: Log entries contain assignments on readings and topics requiring students to respond to the anthropological perspectives on these issues. Measure 3: Many of the articles assigned for group discussions entail examining these prejudicial issues.	Measure 2: 95% of students submitted logs appropriately discussing these issues to warrant grades of C or better on their logs. Measure 3: Student discussions showed an ability to present and discuss anthropological positions on these prejudices and forms of discrimination.	The course's pedagogical methods and course design appear to be effective in achieving the desired learning goals.	Measure 2: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Summary and Comments: This course addresses all 8 of the Program Learning Goals listed on the Curriculum Map, with Goals #1,2,3, and 8 rated by the faculty to have a high degree of presence in the course and Goals #5, 6, and 7 having more of a medium-level focus. Results obtained from the measures specified above have demonstrated that all of these goals are being very well achieved with over 85% of the students attaining these goals at least 70% of the time or better (earning final grades of C or better). This course also fulfills Life Science General Education requirements and complies with the standards of the Life Science Mission and Learning Outcomes. It was successfully reviewed institutionally in 2009 and was given a high rating for continuance by the university general education committee. Lastly, this course additionally provides Diversity Credit for graduation as defined by the university and continues to meet the standards defined for this designation. Consequently, no significant changes in this course are needed at this time. Data in the table are derived from results obtained from assessment of the course sections taught in Spring 2011 by Rosemary Conover.

Table 6. Evidence of Learning -- General Education Course: ANTH HU/DV1040 - Language and Culture

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 1: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand the relationships between language and culture worldwide and in specific language communities. They will also learn about the biological bases of human communication.	Measure 1: Weekly graded Course Logs with entries consisting of 3 parts - reading assignments, daily in-class reflections, and weekly outside observations.	Measure 1: 92% of students achieve grades of C or better on log assignments connecting language to culture.	Measure 1: The degree of performance indicates a high level of comprehension of the existence and causes of linguistic universals and diversity within cultural contexts.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Seven course assignments which require students to complete linguistic exercises, engage in data collection/observation, and demonstrate comprehension of course topics.	Measure 2: 85% of students achieve grades of C or better on course assignments which show excellent achievement of this learning goal.	Measure 2: These excellent outcomes of performance on assignments demonstrate a high degree of achievement of this learning goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 2: A student will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.	Learning Outcome: Students will understand the interrelationships between language and culture, and the contributions of knowledge which the 4 fields of anthropology make toward investigating these.	Measure 1: Weekly Course logs (see above) addressing the connections and contributions of the 4 fields in anthropology toward understanding the many factors affecting human communication	Measure 1: 92% of students achieve grades of C or better on their logs pertaining to these issues.	Measures 1 & 2: Students demonstrate a high level of competence in understanding the 4-fields of anthropology and their combined contributions toward holistically comprehending the connections between culture and language.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		Measure 2: Seven course assignments (see above) which entail applying information from the 4 fields to such topics as the origin of writing, the biological basis of language, the archeological evidence of ties between cultural groups and language families and the cultural norms of speaking.	Measure 2: 85% of students achieve grades of C or better on their assignments on these issues.	Overall the course design and teaching methods seem to be successful in achieving this program learning goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 3: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to identify and appropriately use and discuss the key concepts and terminology from anthropology, linguistics, and the humanities.	Measure 1: Weekly course logs which require students to recognize, interpret, and use central concepts and key terms of anthropology, linguistics and the humanities.	Measure 1: 92% of students successfully complete their logs assignments in which these concepts and terms occur with grades of C or better.	Measures 1 & 2: Most students demonstrate a high degree of proficiency in discussing and accurately using these central concepts and key terms in their logs and assignments.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
		Measure 2: Course assignments (see above)	Measure 2: 92% of students can use and discuss these	Measure 2: The majority of students perform well in this	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
		require students to demonstrate competence in the comprehension and use of these central concepts and key terms.	terms and concepts appropriately.	area and meet the expectations of this learning goal. Overall: Students achieve a high level of competence in acquiring and using basic terminology and concepts.	
Goal 4: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.	Learning Outcome: Students will gain fundamental knowledge of current theories about animal communication, human non-linguistic communication, the biological basis of language and communication, the structure and function of spoken language, language acquisition, the rules and use of speech in speech communities, processes of language change, and the relationships among language, thought, and culture.	Measure 1: Weekly log assignments entailing writing about linguistic theories (e.g., on animal communication, language change, linguistic variation, the existence of language universals, or on the causal linkages among language, culture, and perception). Measure 2: Course assignments require students to be able to engage in reading and writing about these theoretical proposals and positions in linguistics and anthropology.	Measure : 92% of students earn grades of C or better on these kinds of assignments in their logs. Measure 2: 85% of students earn grades of C or better on these assignments pertaining to discussing theories.	Measures 1 & 2: The majority of students demonstrate the ability to process information of linguistic and anthropological theories and their formation, thereby achieving this learning goal very well. Overall, the course's design and methodology seem to be appropriate for achieving this learning goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 5: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to understand and use basic forms of methodology used in Linguistic Anthropology to collect and analyze data.	Measure 1: Weekly course Logs (see above) including entries which require discussing data collection and research methods of linguists and anthropologists (e.g., in sociolinguistics, historical linguistics, and ethnolinguistics). Measure 2: Seven course assignments, some of which require students to gather linguistic data and make their own observations according to research guidelines.	Measure 1: 92% of students can complete their logs earning grades of C or better on these topics. Measure 2: 85% of students succeed with these assignments by achieving grades of C or better.	Measure 1: The majority of students demonstrate the ability to discuss research methods and techniques employed in linguistic anthropology. Measure 2: The majority of students can engage effectively in assignments requiring fundamental research skills. Overall the use of small and relatively simple research assignments are useful	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
				methods for students to achieve this learning goal.	
Goal 6: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues	Learning Outcome: Students will be able to engage in critical thinking and reasoning about language (e.g., rules and norms of speaking, language change, standardization, and societal attitudes regarding linguistic diversity).	Measure 1: Weekly course logs (see above) which entail discussing the purported relationships between language and culture and evaluating social issues of change and variation in speech communities. Measure 2: Seven course assignments (see above) which require students to interpret and discuss social and linguistic patterns.	Measure 1: 92% of students perform well on their logs, achieving grades of C or better. 85% of students earn grades of C or better on their assignments involving analysis and critical thinking.	Measures 1 & 2: Most students showed they could think critically on assignments and provide effective insights on discussing linguistic and cultural issues. Overall, the pedagogical techniques used in the course seem to provide good outcomes on achieving this goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 7: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.	Learning Outcome : Students will be able to write and discuss issues and concepts central to anthropological linguistics. Students will also learn to write the American Phonetic Alphabet.	Measure 1: Weekly course logs (see above) which require writing-intensive efforts. Measure 2: Seven course assignments which also require writing skills, including that of using the phonetic alphabet. Measure 3: Spontaneous classroom discussions with student participation.	Measure 1: 98% of students submitted written logs on a weekly basis and 95% achieved grades of C or better on their logs. Measure 2: 90% of student submitted their written assignments and 85% earned grades of C or better on these. Measure 3: 90% of students can vocalize their opinions and responses to assignments and topics explored in class.	Measures 1 & 2: This is a writing-intensive course, and the majority of students show marked improvement of their writing skills as the course progresses plus find that writing-to-learn is the larger payoff of their writing efforts. Their ability to express themselves through writing and organize their thoughts grows significantly throughout the semester. Students find their voice more easily as the semester progresses and can communicate better as the course progresses. Reliance on these pedagogical tools will be maintained in the course, since they definitely contribute to achieving this program learning goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 8: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of	Learning Outcome: Students will understand the causes and existence of	Measure 1: Weekly course logs (see above) which often require exploring prejudicial	Measure 1: 92% of the students earn grades of C or better on their logs including	Measures 1 & 2: The majority of students demonstrate the abilities to	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism, sexism,), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.	linguistic ethnocentrism and cultural forms of prejudice reflected in and often maintained through communication norms, and those pertaining to issues of language change and diversity.	issues of linguistic ethnocentrism, societal attitudes of language change and variation, misplaced stereotypes, language-learning programs, and prescriptive grammar.	sections pertaining to discussing prejudice and discrimination.	recognize and discuss the existence and causes of linguistic and cultural prejudice in their logs and assignments.	
		Measure 2: Seven course assignments (see above) which often entail students having to interpret and analyze speech and communication events reflecting societal norms and values.	Measure 2: 85% of the students earn grades of C or better on their assignments pertaining to prejudice and discrimination.	Overall: The course design and pedagogical methods appear to be effective in teaching students about prejudice and discrimination, thereby achieving the desired outcomes for this learning goal.	No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Summary and comments: This course fulfills all of the Program Learning Goals (specified on the Curriculum Map) in the following ways -- Goals #1, 2, 3, 5, and 8 are addressed to a high degree, Goals #6 and 7 to a medium degree, and Goal #4 to a low degree of focus as rated by the program faculty. The results obtained from the measures used in the course indicate that these goals are being well achieved with over 85% of the students attaining these goals earning final grades of C or better. This course also fulfills WSU Humanities General Education requirements and complies with the standards of the Humanities Mission and Learning Outcomes. It was successfully reviewed institutionally by the university general education committee in 2010 and was supported with a high rating for continuance. Lastly, this course additionally provides Diversity Credit for graduation as defined by the university and continues to meet the standards defined for this designation. Consequently, no significant changes in this course are needed at this time. Data in the table above are based on results obtained from assessment of the course sections taught in Spring 2011 by Rosemary Conover.

Table 7. Evidence of Learning: General Education Course: ANTH SS/DV2010, Peoples and Cultures of the World

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses—ANTH 2010—Peoples and Cultures of the World					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 1: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).	Learning Outcome 1: Students will learn the ways in which economic systems vary around the world and those relationships to the types of environments they occupy.	Measure 1: 3 Log Entries reflecting on the seven subsistence and economic readings for the economic portion of the course, relating them to class lectures and discussion.	Measure 1: Students received an average of 82% of the possible points for these log entries.	Measure 1: These scores indicate that most students understand these readings and the economic concepts contained within them at a B level or above.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 2: A student will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.	Learning Outcome 2: Students will understand the concepts of culture change and globalization , as they are applied in cultural anthropology.	Measure 1: 2 log entries on the lecture materials and 5 articles on these subjects.	Measure 1: Students received an average of 87% of available points for their log entries on these topics.	Measure 1: Log entry scores indicate that most students understood the concepts of culture change and globalization at a B level or above	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 3: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.	Learning Outcome 1:. Students will understand basic concepts and terms used by anthropology not used or used differently outside the discipline.	Measure 1: 20 log entries from throughout the course.	Measure 1: 84% of students successfully used specialist anthropological terminology in writing log entries throughout the various sub-areas of the course.	Measure 1:. Students successfully demonstrated that they understood anthropological terminology well enough to use it in writing log entries about anthropological topics.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
				.	
				Measure 1: Students showed basic understanding of the cross-cultural variation of languages and other forms of communication.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 4: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand the basic theories and processes of language and communication as they are applied and evaluated in cultural	Measure 1: 3 log entries in which students write about articles they have read about language and communication	Measure 1: Students received 90% of available points on log entries addressing about language and communication in		

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses—ANTH 2010—Peoples and Cultures of the World					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.	studies.	in cross-cultural settings.	cross-cultural settings.		
Goal 5: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to understand how and why cultural anthropologists do fieldwork.	Measure 1: Student log entries will demonstrate a basic understanding of cultural anthropology and its techniques.	Measure 1: Students received an average of 89% on log entries related to these topics.	Measure 1: Students demonstrated a high degree of understanding of cultural anthropology and its basic fieldwork methods	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 6: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to comprehend the logic of ideas about religion and the supernatural that are different from their own.	Measure 1: 3 log entries in which students must respond to articles on supernatural beliefs different from their own.	Measure 1: Students received an average of 72.6% on log entries on beliefs about the supernatural that challenge the commonly held beliefs of US culture.	Measure 1: Students showed the ability to consider modes of thought at variance with those of their own culture.	Measure 1: That these results drop slightly below the 80% or higher standarad maintained for all other Goals suggests that issues of worldview and religion should have more attention in lecture and discussion.
Goal 7: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will be able to write about a cross-cultural experience of their own, using basic anthropological concepts.	Measure 1: An assignment in which each student seeks out and participates in a cross-cultural experience and writes a short essay about it.	Measure 1: Students received 92% of possible points in writing about their cross-cultural experiences, discussing concepts like culture shock, ethnocentrism and other appropriate anthropological issues.	Measure 1: Students were able to employ and successfully communicate basic anthropological concepts in writing.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 8: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism, sexism,), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand the concepts through which anthropology examines prejudice and discrimination and learn the germane results at an introductory level.	Measure 1: A set of 3 log entries on the subject of group, gender and ethnic identities.	Measure 1: Students received an average of 82% of points available for these log entries.	Measure 1: (Ex. Students successfully demonstrated an understanding of the roots of prejudice and discrimination, and how anthropology's methods and data deal with concepts of prejudice and discrimination.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time

Summary: ANTH 2010, Peoples and Cultures of the World, is the first course in cultural anthropology and as such focuses exclusively on that aspect of the discipline. Our course grid notes that its primary learning goals are 1, 2, 3 and 8 for High level, 4 is at Low level and 5, 6 and 7 at Medium. Our measures, however, suggest that the course is conveying 7 of the 8 learning goals at a B level or above with only goal 6 dropping to C level. Though this is not unreasonable for a goal of Medium, still it suggests that issues of worldview and religion should have more attention in lecture and discussion. Data for this evaluation were drawn from a Spring 2007 course taught by Linda Eaton.

Table 8. General Education Courses: ANTH SS2030, Principles of Archaeology

		Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses			
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures*	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 1: Students will attain a general understanding of human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological descriptions (data) and explanations (theories).	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand how archaeologists combine field data and theoretical modeling to reconstruct aspects of ancient societies at the band, tribe, chiefdom, and state levels of socio-political and economic organization.	Measure 1: A set of 4 multi sentence definitions and 4 brief response problems on the third exam.	Measure 1: These 8 problems were answered correctly 78% of the time.	Measure 1: Most of the students understood the interplay between data and theory, and how the use of both are critical for documenting how ancient societies were structured.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 2: A student will attain a fundamental understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and through time.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will have a solid grasp of the four field approach in anthropology, and how biological, ethnographic, and linguistic studies can enhance our understanding of the past.	Measure 1: A total of 6 multi sentence definitions and 4 fill-in-blank problems on the second and third exams.	Measure 1: 84% of students provided correct responses to these problems.	Measure 1: Students understood the concept that the 3 non archaeological fields of anthropology can provide critical insights to past human behavior.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
		.	.		
Goal 3: Students will achieve proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will understand basic concepts and terms used primarily by archaeologists, but also those that are employed by biological and cultural anthropologists.	Measure 1: A total of 18 multi sentence definitions from Exams 1, 2, and 3.	Measure 1: 80% of students successfully defined these basic concepts and terms.	Measure 1: Students became familiar with a number of anthropological terms and concepts, many of which were unknown to them prior to enrolling in this course.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time
			.		
Goal 4: Students will gain a basic knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will become familiar with various theoretical approaches used in archaeology such as ecological systems theory, behavioral ecology, and middle range theory.	++Measure 1: A total of 8 multi sentence definitions from Exams 1, 2, and 3.	Measure 1: 75% of students provided completely correct or mostly correct definitions of various schools of thought or theoretical approaches to studying archaeology.	Measure 1: Most students showed a basic comprehension of archaeological theory and how it is used to interpret archaeological data.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.

Evidence of Learning: General Education Courses					
Program Learning Goal	Measurable Learning Outcome	Method of Measurement Direct and Indirect Measures*	Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes	Interpretation of Findings	Action Plan/Use of Results
Goal 5: Students will be able to demonstrate basic knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will know that studying ancient settlement systems requires comprehensive surface survey, test excavation, and geospatial analysis using Geographic Information System technology.		Measure 1: 82% of students were able to provide completely correct or near correct responses.	Measure 1: Most students understand that reconstructing prehistoric settlement systems requires a great deal of field work and relatively large sample sizes, as well as interdisciplinary analysis of data.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 6: Students will employ basic abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will learn to identify flaws in the methods and interpretations of archaeological research.	Measure 1: . Students will produce Critical Analysis Papers in which they write a review/critique of one professional archaeological journal article.	Measure 1: 80% of students wrote reviews that received either A or B grades.	Measure 1: Most students have become sufficiently knowledgeable in archaeology so as to be able to identify methodological and/or logical weaknesses of professional research projects.	Measure 1: No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 7: Students will demonstrate a basic ability to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues.	Learning Outcome 1: Students will learn to write about methods and interpretations of archaeological research.	Measure 1: . Students will write Critical Analysis Papers in which they write a review/critique of one professional archaeological journal article.	Measure 1: 80% of students wrote reviews that received either A or B grades.	Measure 1: Most students can write effectively about methodological and/or logical weaknesses of professional research projects.	Measure 1: : No curricular or pedagogical changes needed at this time.
Goal 8: Students will demonstrate a fundamental awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, anthropocentrism, sexism,), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.	Learning Outcome 1: Not applicable to this course, which deals specifically with cultures of the past in which these attitudes are not identifiable from the data.. .	Measure 1: N/A.	Measure 1: N/A.	Measure 1: N/A.	Measure 1: N/A.

Summary: ANTH 2030 is the introductory archaeology course within our curriculum and provides students with a broad overview of this field. At the present time, it addresses six of the eight program Learning Goals: Goals 1,2, and 3 are areas of High focus in Principles of Archaeology, Learning Goals 5 and 6 are Medium in focus, and Goal 4 is a Low level of focus. As indicated on the Curriculum Map, Learning Goals/Outcomes 8 typically is not emphasized in this course. Measurement outcomes show that the student study population (62 people from two different classes) attained the seven relevant Learning Goals at a combined average level of 80% (79.8%), so no curricular and pedagogical changes are seen as needed at this time. These statistics are based on the 2011 version of the course taught by Dr. Brooke Arkush.

d. <u>Description of Other Assessment Processes & Measures Used:</u> Other measures currently in use to accomplish program assessment include: (1) written exit interviews, based on the program's mission statement and learning objectives and administered to graduating seniors at each graduation cycle of Fall and Spring semesters, (2) student grades and GPAs, (3) graduation rates, (4) retention rates of Majors, and (5) successful participation in general education and diversity assessment of our courses by the university.

Results obtained from these various measures have been compiled annually, analyzed, discussed by the faculty and used for making decisions on curriculum, advisement, scheduling, and other issues of programmatic relevance. In general, the assessment results have provided important information on how the program is fulfilling its mission, student outcomes and program planning to continuously improve and develop the program. In particular, it has given us feedback on how to improve our methods of advising (especially in career planning), better track students, more appropriately schedule classes, and provide better means of informing students of program changes and plans. No needs for substantive changes to the program were identified in the past six years, but small issues of scheduling, course design, and career advisement have been discussed and addressed. The program assessment plan, now based on 141 graduates, can be seen in Appendix H.

D. Academic Advising

1. Advising Strategy and Process - Systematic advisement consists of the following:

All new students (whether majors, minors, BIS, AAS or those seeking an Institutional Certificate) should first come in person for advisement by the Program Coordinator, who will ascertain which program (minor, major, etc.) the student is seeking, provide students with a description of that particular program and initial advisement. A file is constructed for each student, including student biography, a current graduation evaluation, a dated printout of courses completed in the discipline to date, and a course work/graduation plan sheet. A tentative plan of courses and requirements and projected schedule of course work are drawn up, dated and signed by both student and coordinator/ advisor. The original goes into the student's file maintained in the department office, and a copy given to the student for his/her records Students are assigned by the Coordinator to a faculty advisor (by alphabetic means or by choice). Archaeology students are assigned to the Archaeology Director (B. Arkush). The faculty advisor is noted on the student file and faculty members notified of new advisees. Students should have follow-up advisement sessions at least annually before sign-off for graduation. An annual tracking system monitors this process. Advisors should review their advisee files approximately every six months. Sign-offs for graduation are the responsibility of the Program Coordinator. Advisement in career decisions and graduate school is addressed by: (1) faculty advisors in personal advisement sessions; (2) faculty in required classes such as Anthropological Theory and Anthropological Research.Methods; (3) faculty in special presentations made annually on careers and graduate school in anthropology hosted by the student Anthropology Club; and (4) by the campus Careers Services Office and their annual campus career fairs.

2. Effectiveness and Assessment of Advising: The advising process described is the result of previous assessments and experiences with advising students since semester conversion in 1998. Methods to assess its effectiveness are part of the larger, more formalized assessment efforts conducted in the program. Exit Interviews administered to graduating seniors have been the primary tool for gathering student feedback data on advisement.

3. Results: Exit Interviews conducted from 2001-2011 suggest that advisement on graduate school and employment has been successful. All of the 2005-06 to 2010-11 graduating majors indicated they planned to attend graduate school and intended to pursue a career in anthropology. Students have also expressed a high level of satisfaction with their advisement, indicating they were generally pleased with the quality of faculty advisement, claiming it to be helpful, personal, and informative. Some suggested that more advisement attention be given to student career goals, graduate school, and future plans.

Another measure of its advisement effectiveness is that the 141 Anthropology Majors who graduated from the program by Spring 2011 took 6.02 years on average to graduate from WSU since entering the university, faster than

the institutional average (6.58 years). One-third of anthropology majors graduate within four years, compared to 11-13% of the overall WSU population.

E. Faculty:

1. Size, Qualifications and Demographic Composition: *(See Appendices B and C of this report regarding the faculty in the program.).*

      a. There are **four** full-time, tenured, full professors in anthropology:
               Dr. Brooke Arkush, Ph.D. (also Director of Archaeological Technician Program
               with three-quarters teaching load)
               Dr. Rosemary Conover, Ph.D.
               Dr. Linda B. Eaton, Ph.D., Coordinator of Anthropology, with seven-eighths teaching load
               Dr. Ronald Holt, Ph.D. (on leave 2010-11 and 2011-2012)

      c.   There were **seven** adjunct faculty in anthropology for 2010-2011, 5 with Ph.Ds and 2 with Master's degrees.
               Dr. LeGrande Davies, Ph.D.
               Dr. Caren Frost, Ph.D. (also with U of U)
               Dr. Wade Kotter, Ph.D. (also WSU Social Science Bibliographer)
               Dr. Kare McManama-Kearin, Ph.D.
               Dr. Mark Stevenson, Ph.D. (also Enrollment Director - WSU MBA Program)
               Mr. Stephen Niedzwiecki, M.A. Anthropology, M.S. Biology
               Ms. Susan Young, M.A.

      c. Background: All regular faculty and adjuncts are of Euroamerican ethnic background. All full-time faculty and four adjuncts have Ph.D.'s and over twenty years of teaching experience. Of the remaining adjuncts, one has a Ph.D. and two have Master's degrees; all have at least three years teaching experience. The use of adjuncts with Master's degrees is counter to our usual policy and is the result of stress placed on our adjunct pool by Dr. Holt's two-year absence.

      d. Rank and Tenure: All full time faculty and one adjunct are full professors with tenure on the campus. Faculty areas of expertise meet the program's mission to provide a four-field curriculum. The gender composition of the full time faculty is 2 males and 2 females. The adjuncts were 4 males and 3 females in 2010-11 (each year this changes slightly in composition).

   2. Teaching Responsibilities: Of the four full-time faculty, only two teach a full load of courses. Due to administrative responsibilities, the Anthropology Coordinator has a 7/8-time teaching load, though she volunteers an additional course each summer, and the Director of the Archaeological Technician Program has a 3/4 time teaching load. This is a full time teaching equivalency of 3.625 FTE. In the first seven years of the Major program (AY2000-2001 to AY2006-2007), full time faculty taught the majority of courses and generated the majority of SCHs, ranging from 72% to over 90% of classes and SCHs. However, in the past four years (2007-08 to 2010-2011), tenured faculty accounted for 42.5% to 66.5% of credit hours and SCHs, in part because in 2010-11, one full-time faculty member was on leave. His courses were taught in the Autumn semester by an adjunct, who was placed on a temporary full-time contract in the Spring semester. However, it is also due to increasing demand for anthropology offerings in Continuing Education's online, night, summer and Davis Campus. Thus, adjuncts are becoming increasingly critical to the program, with adjuncts in 2010-11 having taught 53.8% of the total credit hours and having generated 54.4% of the SCHs. This makes the program progressively more dependent on less predictable institutional resources and on a

similarly unpredictable adjunct pool to augment stable department positions. An additional concern is that adjunct compensation at WSU is lower than at other comparable institutions in the state, making us less competitive for the already limited number of ABD or PhD potential adjuncts available in the area.

3. Teaching Standards: Teaching standards are determined by three sources: (1) the campus Peer Review policies and procedures, (2) the Merit Review policies and procedures of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; and (3) the College and University Rank and Tenure policies and procedures. For additional details on these, see Section 4 below. These standards are communicated to the faculty by the Program Coordinator, Department Chair, Dean, and other key academic administrators of the university such as the Associate Provost and Provost. New faculty are also given orientations in the Fall Semester of their first two years as well as through campus workshops provided for all faculty and are given first- and second-year reviews by the Chair.

4. Evidence of Effective Instruction:

a. **Regular Faculty**: There are several kinds of systematic evaluations of full-time faculty used in the department:
  (1) Merit Reviews conducted every two years of all faculty by the Department Chair using data provided by faculty members pertaining to teaching, scholarship and service and evaluated according to established College of Social and Behavioral Sciences merit criteria with the results reported to the College Dean;
  (2) Second Year Reviews of new tenure track faculty made by the Department Chair according to university policy, and with the results submitted to the faculty professional files;
  (3) Peer Reviews of all faculty (including post-tenure faculty) conducted by an elected department Peer Review Committee, using instruments and procedures developed in the department which measure teaching effectiveness and occurring every two or three years with the results submitted to the faculty professional files in the department and College;
  (4) Ranking and Tenure Reviews, conducted by the appropriate committees as indicated by institutionally established policy and procedures of the University and College measuring effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and service, with the results maintained in faculty professional files; and
  (5) Student Evaluations of faculty and classes conducted formally in accordance with College and institutional policies and procedures using a standardized instrument developed by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and occurring at least one semester per year for all classes taught for all faculty (tenured and non-tenured). Informal student evaluations are also often obtained by individual faculty in their classes.

b. **Adjuncts and part-time faculty**, according to department policy, must be reviewed by:
  (1) Student Evaluations for every course taught, using formal instruments developed either by Continuing Education or by the College of Social & Behavioral Sciences, depending on the funding entity;
  (2) Peer Reviews (identical to that used on full time faculty described above);
  (3) Program Coordinator classroom reviews conducted every two years; and
  (4) Annual Employment Reviews of every adjunct as specified by department adjunct policy to be made by the full-time contract faculty for approval of annual reappointment.

c. The Department Chair and Program Coordinator are formally evaluated every 3 years by the Dean and faculty.

d. All data are compiled from these evaluations with the results being given to the faculty and kept on file by the appropriate administrators. Often data obtained from one form of evaluation are used within other evaluations (e.g., Peer Review and Student Evaluation data are used for purposes of merit, tenure, and ranking reviews). Evaluations have kept faculty and administrators informed of institutional expectations and the caliber of their performance in compliance with these expectations. Feedback from this array of evaluations has enabled them to improve their teaching, research and service over the years. This has also led to outcomes of retention and tenure, promotion, merit pay, and pay adjustments.

5. Mentoring of Faculty and New Faculty Orientation: New Faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology are oriented and all faculty are mentored primarily by the Department Chair and Program Coordinator, with other faculty assuming more informal mentoring roles within the department. There is a good atmosphere of camaraderie in the department allowing for ongoing, open faculty discussions and guidance in teaching, service and research.

6. Ongoing Review and Professional Development: Ongoing review of faculty follows the procedures Research Scholarship & Professional Growth, Hemingway, and Fulbright Grants), teaching seminars, and workshops are shared among the faculty, which have often resulted in teaching improvements and a number of grants and professional opportunities being secured, including several collaborative projects and proposals over the years for both full-time and part-time/adjunct faculty. Projects have been funded at the university, regional, and national levels, sometimes even across disciplinary lines. Faculty are encouraged and supported to take sabbatical leaves and seek professional growth whenever possible. A Faculty Development Endowment Fund was developed in the department in 2004-05, with its interest income to be distributed to faculty annually for their professional growth and scholarship needs. The first distribution from this fund was made in Autumn 2005 and has continued through the present.

7. **Faculty Scholarship:**

F. Support Staff, Administration, Facilities, Equipment and Library: The program is part of a larger department (with Sociology) in which staff, budget, resources, policies, procedures, faculty recruitment, evaluation and retention, decision-making, leadership, and activities are shared.

1. Support Staff: *(See also Appendix C of this report regarding the program staff).* There is one full-time, classified staff member of the department (department secretary): Carol E. Jensen, as well as a part-time work-study student who typically works 20 hours per week. There are no professional staff positions in the program or department. She has worked in the department for over 17 years, but when she first came, the faculty and previous secretary mentored her through this new system, and the Dean's secretary and other senior secretaries in the college also provided informal training assistance. Work-study students are trained by the department secretary, who was also selected as the recipient of the WSU Presidential Outstanding Classified Staff Award in April, 2002, thereby receiving further assistance and recognition. She is formally and systematically evaluated annually, primarily by the Department Chair, using PREP, an institutional evaluation program, but also including input from the other faculty in the department. The department secretary is shared with the Sociology Program (consisting of 7 full time Sociology faculty, 4 adjuncts, and approximately 200 students, in addition to the 4 full time Anthropology faculty, 7 adjuncts, and 150 students). Clearly the secretary is extraordinarily stretched in her workload, and her job description has grown ever-longer as the university continues to delegate and pass responsibilities down to the departmental level to manage.

2. Adequacy of Administrative and Departmental Support: There is a departmental administrative structure which includes: (a) the Department Chair, who is currently a Sociologist (Rob Reynolds); (b) two Program Coordinators (Linda Eaton for Anthropology and Rob Reynolds for Sociology); and (c) the Archaeological Technician Program Director (Brooke Arkush). There is a Dean for the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, who works closely with the group of Department Chairs to set the budget, care for the facilities, make hiring and salary decisions, as well as ranking, tenure and merit decisions, raises funds, and deals with the institutional administration and larger community. The administrative support seems adequate for the program's needs and the administration has been supportive of the program in budget, philosophy, and actions.

3. Adequacy of Facilities and Equipment: The program has a specialized lab facility, the Archaeology Laboratory located in the basement of the Social Sciences building, which is adequately equipped for the population that it serves and the activities that it supports. The program also has three classrooms assigned to it (in addition to the lab). One holds 72 students, the other two 35 students each. All three are dedicated multimedia classrooms equipped with a computer, audiovisual projecting system, and visualizer. Additional classrooms can

be obtained, if needed, but the availability is very limited, especially at prime times of the day.

Equipment and Institutional Support Resources are somewhat adequate, but ongoing budgetary cuts continue to erode away the ability to obtain or replace many of these needed resources. For Archaeology, there is specialized equipment acquired and used for field activities and laboratory analyses. For Anthropology in general, the office equipment is shared with Sociology faculty and staff in the joint department such as copy machine, fax machine, typewriters, collating equipment, etc., to which all faculty have access. Each faculty member has a personal computer. For classroom instruction there is shared media equipment and an inadequate, but noteworthy variety of teaching materials that have been acquired, such as videos, software, fossil casts, models, maps, skeletal preparations, artifacts and replicas.

Students have access to computer labs funded by the university, one of which is located in the Social Sciences Building, and faculty have access to these labs and to a portable computer cart containing laptop computers for student use during class time. Additionally, faculty have access to a computer classroom containing approximately 30 computers for student use during class time. These resources have been very useful to the faculty teaching the research methods and statistics classes.

4. Adequacy of Library Resources: The library is used extensively by faculty and students for research and course assignments. Library resources are judged to be adequate to support the program. Its collection includes approximately 11,500 bound volumes and 200 videos in all areas of anthropology, including approximately 500 electronic books. In addition, the library provides print and/or electronic access to approximately 420 journals in anthropology and closely related fields. Also available to students are over 200 article databases, many of which index journals in anthropology and related fields and, in many cases, provide direct access to the full-text of the article. And if the full-text is not directly available, students have access to a very efficient interlibrary-loan service which provides most requested articles within 2-4 days. Students may also request books and other materials through interlibrary-loan; most such items arrive within 4-7 days. The overall collection, both print and electronic, is very strong, and is supported by strong collections in other disciplines related to anthropology, such as sociology, history, and geography. Training/assistance for use of the library is readily available for students and faculty. An excellent staff includes the Social Sciences & Music Librarian, Wade Kotter, who is also an anthropologist with strong ties to our program.

G. Relationships with External Communities:

(See Appendices E and F for a list of external communities important to the program.)

Description of Role in External Communities: Although the program does not have a formal Advisory Committee, we maintain ongoing relationships with several agencies and community organizations connected to our program mission:

1. The program has had since the mid-1970's a partnership with the **Regional Archaeology Division of the U.S. Forest Service** due to two faculty who left the program then to work as Regional Archaeologists with the Forest Service. Over the years, various relationships emerged such as joint research projects in the area, shared teaching responsibilities, student internships, public education efforts, and shared resources in the form of lab and office space, and equipment at WSU. The U.S. Forest Service still maintains a formal relationship to the program in the form of an official cooperative agreement reviewed every few years between the two entities which specifies financial and service obligations shared by both. This has been very beneficial to supporting the program for our archaeological field school, field trips, internships, contacts with employers, guest speakers in classes, research opportunities, library facilities in the lab, equipment, and outreach to the larger community. Several of the Forest Service personnel have been adjuncts in our program. We have obtained grant money, especially from the National Heritage Resource Policy Development Project, and many students have received training and seasonal employment from this partnership. Overall, much of the success and strength of our Archaeological Technician Program and Archaeology Track Major can be attributed to our relationship with

the U.S. Forest Service.

2. The program has also maintained a relationship with the **Utah Bureau of Land Management.** We have been a repository for a number of artifacts acquired from previous excavations in state lands conducted in the 1960's between faculty at WSU and others in the state. These materials have been useful in the lab and in our classes as teaching aids and a comparative collection. We have also had collaborations with BLM members who served on a now defunct advisory board for the archaeological technician program and have had good ties for student projects.

3. The program hosts and participates in the meetings of the **Promontory-Tubaduka Chapter of the Utah Statewide Archaeological Society** held monthly in the archaeology lab. Faculty often make presentations to this group, collaborate in workshops and field trips, and students often attend. One of the program's alumni, Mark Stewart, has been the president of this group for a number of years.

4. Over the years the biological anthropologist in the program, Rosemary Conover, has kindly rendered her consulting services to the **Ogden Police and Weber County Sheriff Departments** on forensic cases providing preliminary forensic diagnostics. She has worked on approximately 20 cases in the past 6 years.

5. **Sagebrush Consultants,** a local private archaeology agency, has employed many of our archaeology students and graduates over the years and serves also to provide internships for advanced students. This has been a very positive experience for our students and a good relationship for the program to maintain.

These external connections have contributed in countless ways to the improvement of the curriculum, faculty, students, equipment and other resources of the program.

H. Results of Previous Program Review and Future Directions:

1. Anthropology program faculty response to evaluation team report, April 2006

The Anthropology faculty concurred with the team's identification of the program's three primary strengths: (1) the quality of the faculty, (2) the strong relationships with the community, and (3) the excellent student-faculty relations which exist; and the program's two primary challenges: (1) the small number of faculty and (2) the consequent limited course offerings, especially in biological and linguistic anthropology.   Here are the faculty responses to the evaluation team's three recommendations for change:

Team Recommendation 1: Faculty lines need to be increased (also recommended in the 2000 review).This might be accomplished by adding a position at the Davis campus or adding a new joint position shared with criminal justice.

a.   Program Response: We agreed on the need for more faculty to be able to respond to our strong student demand and programmatic complexity. This may be achieved in several ways: (1) In 2005 the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences had a plan for adding positions for each program of the college to the Davis Campus (initially as non-tenure track with the possibility to convert to tenure track upon later need), and anthropology had been scheduled for this addition within the next few years after the last evaluation.
(2) An additional full-time Anthropology faculty member on the main campus was also discussed, to be full time in either Biological Anthropology or Linguistics (two subfields now covered by Dr. Conover). (3) The possibility of sharing a joint position in Biological Anthropology with Criminal Justice was considered, due to the shared forensic interest, and/or (4) a possible joint position in Linguistic Anthropology with programs in the Arts and Humanities.

b.   Action Plan and Timeline: The tentative plan of action developed in the College to add an anthropology faculty member on the Davis Campus remains contingent upon availability of funds and favorable needs assessment. Discussions on the addition of another full time anthropology faculty member on the main campus and/or shared positions with Criminal Justice or Arts and Humanities programs will occur when a new position is approved. These were originally intended to happen in 2005-08.

c.   Assessment of Action Plan and Evidence of Results: In a climate of, at that time, falling enrollments and trimmed budgets campus-wide, the new position(s) failed to materialize.

Team Recommendation 2: Adjunct faculty sections need to be increased to allow the full time faculty to concentrate on areas such as biological anthropology and linguistics. The team recommends that a laboratory be added to the lower division class and an upper division biological course be added to the curriculum.

a. Program Response:

(1) We agreed that we need to offer more sections of ANTH LS/DV1020 - Biological Anthropology and ANTH HU/DV1040 - Language and Culture, considering growing student demand for these courses.

(2) Since this review, a Weber State University Linguistics Minor was developed and approved in 2009, which has enabled an expansion of direction and offerings to students who wish additional linguistic courses and credentials. Rosemary Conover serves on the Advisory Board of this Minor and helped to design the Minor. More sections of ANTH HU/DV1040, Language and Culture, have been added with Dr. Conover's return to full-time teaching.

(3) The faculty philosophically agreed, but realistically disagreed with the team's recommendation to add a laboratory component to the lower division, general education Biological Anthropology course (ANTH LS/DV1020) for several reasons:

  (a) Resource Issues: We don't currently have the resources to appropriately equip our lab as a Biological Anthropology lab and to provide adequate faculty to teach this lab section.

  (b) Articulation Issues: No other institution in the USHE system teaches this course (ANTH 1020 - Biological Anthropology) with a lab. Adding a lab would alter its structure and content compared with other courses in the state, creating equivalency complications for articulation.

  (c) General Education Consistency Issues: Adding a lab would have implications on the comparability of this course with other general education courses offered at WSU in the Life Sciences Breadth Area requiring 9 credit hours. Of the 15 courses currently offered, only 5 have labs and are primarily addressed to specific audiences: two courses are taught for 4 hours of credit with a lab added on -- Health Sciences LS 1510 (Biomedical Core Lecture/Lab) intended for biomedical students, and Microbiology LS/SI2054 (Principles of Microbiology) intended for science majors, which also has prerequisites; and the other three courses are intended for elementary education majors, provide scientific inquiry credit, and are 3 credit hours with incorporated labs -- Botany LS/SI1370, Microbiology LS/SI1370, and Zoology LS/SI1370 - all named Principles of Life Science. The remaining 10 general education life science courses are intended for a general student audience, are 3 credit hours, do not have prerequisites, and do not contain labs. This is the category to which Anthropology LS/DV1020 belongs. The course is consistent with this group and enables students to take three 3-hour Life Science General Education courses to meet the

institutional minimum of 9 credit hours. Changing the anthropology course by adding or incorporating a lab would alter its role on campus among these courses and might jeopardize its existence.

(d) Sufficiency Issue: ANTH LS/DV 1020 already contains some lab-like components (for example, learning bones, fossils, and forensics through using real and model or replica materials, and comparative anatomy through visiting the campus science museum), which we feel are sufficient learning experiences for general education students to have without formally adding a lab component per se.

In conclusion, if a lab were added to our curriculum, we believe it should be a separate course (either as a required or elective lab for majors, or to accompany an upper division course), rather than be part of ANTH LS/DV1020, though this action would have the resource implications noted above.

(3) For now, offering an upper division Biological Anthropology course is easily achieved by scheduling it through our ANTH 4990 - Seminar in Anthropology or as a variable credit course, and we have done so in the past.   With our limited faculty and resources this enables us to have the flexibility we need, and we have no plans to add a permanent upper division course in Biological Anthropology to our curriculum at this time, but will readdress this decision if student/employment demand increases.

b.   Action Plan and Evidence of Results:
We developed a more active recruitment strategy for adjuncts. Though we still were able to find no adjuncts to teach Linguistic Anthropology, in Biological Anthropology we employed two who could offer the course in the evening or off campus. Of these, only one is still available but is an MS rather than ABD or PhD, in contrary to our general policy. We were also able to offer additional sections of Biological Anthropology Language and Culture when Dr. Conover ceased to be Chair of the department. One of the greatest challenges to the program remains locating qualified anthropology adjuncts in Utah (very few exist in general, even fewer in Biological or Linguistic Anthropology), and attracting them to work at WSU, with its low adjunct pay scale and the necessity of commuting to Ogden/Davis.

Team Recommendation 3: Faculty need to evaluate the opportunities to enhance the AAS degree and develop a career ladder in anthropology. Given the current faculty loads, these programs have not received much faculty attention as the faculty have been developing the new baccalaureate degree.

a.   Program Response:
While we continue to evaluate and monitor the viability of the Certificate and AAS degree in archaeology, we disagreed with the team's recommendations to enhance it and/or develop a career ladder among the component programs we have within the larger anthropology program at this time.   Here is our rationale:

When the Archaeological Technician Associate of Applied Science (AAS) degree and Institutional Certificate were developed in the 1980's, there was convincing evidence of need to provide these as training programs for employees in the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and comparable federal and private agencies, as well as to offer university students opportunities to obtain these credentials. A nationally designated position of "Archaeological Technician" existed in the Civil Service System which required an Associate degree, Certificate, or their equivalent in Archaeology as qualifications for the position at that

time.   Today, however, <u>the employment standards have changed</u> for an Archaeological Technician, with a bachelor's degree (or higher) in archaeology being preferred.   Agencies typically don't employ graduates with only Certificates or Associate degrees, and, with the emergence of our major program, <u>students personally favor obtaining a bachelor's degree</u> once they are declared within the program and don't seek the AAS degree.   Consequently, we have focused on the archeology track of the Major because this is where current employment and student demands exist. However, we also know that employment climates and student interests and needs change, so we do not intend to delete the Certificate or AAS degree options from our menu of programmatic choices available to students or agencies. Their presence costs nothing to the program or university (apart from that used to run the larger program), but to reclaim these programs which were approved by the Board of Regents would be difficult. We will continue to monitor the situation and make changes when appropriate.

b.   <u>Assessment of Action Plan and Evidence of Results</u>: Not applicable.

2. PROGRAM GOALS BEYOND EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS:

The faculty has delineated 22 long-term goals for the Program contained in the Program's Strategic Plan described in Appendix I. Two of these long-term goals and an additional positive change are selected to mention here for further emphasis:

1.   Create a greater presence of a consultancy or applied anthropology orientation across the program, in general, which will better prepare students for employment opportunities in the current labor market. This will entail infusing all of our courses with this perspective and increasing the applied research and internship components of our program.

2.   Build our summer, evening, and off-campus (especially Davis Campus) offerings to provide full program service to these student populations. This will require addressing many of the resource issues discussed above and revising our teaching schedules and faculty assignments.

III. APPENDICES

Appendix A

Table A1: Student and Faculty Statistical Summary
(NOTE: data provided by WSU Institutional Research & amended by department records)

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Student Credit Hours:	3,590	3,629	3,417	3553	4643	5071
Student FTE*:	119.67	111.9	113.88	118.43	154.77	169.03
Declared Majors**:	99	134	111	140	98	107
Declared Minors/BIS***:	74	67	60	77	65	52
Graduating Majors	9	10	15	10	8	12
Minors/BIS***:	20	4	11	10	13	12
TOTAL	**29**	**14**	**26**	**20**	**21**	**24**
Student Gender Profile (**F**emale/**M**aleRatio) Majors:	1 F: 1.3M	1.48F: 1M	1.67 F: 1M	1.65F: 1M	2.71 F: 1M	1.18F: 1M
Minors:	1 F: 1.2M	1 F: 1M	1.2F: 1M	1.1F: 1M	1.1F: 1M	1.1F: 1M
Graduates	1 F: 1.25M	1F: 1M	1 F: 1.14M	2.33F: 1M	3F: 1M	4F: 1M
Faculty FTE Total	3/ 3.25	3/ 3.25	3/3.5	3/3.75	3/3.625	3/3.625
Adjunct FTE	5	5	7	6	4	5
Contract FTE	6	5	4	4	4	3
Student Majors to Faculty Ratio	99: 3.25 (30.46: 1)	134: 3.25 (41.23: 1)	111: 3.5 (31.71: 1)	140: 3.75 (37.33: 1)	98: 3.625 (27.03: 1)	101: 3.625 (27.86: 1)

Notes: *1. FTE students based on undergraduate SCH/45 or 45 SCH=1 FTE.
 **2. Declared Majors & Minors include both active & inactive students in the program.
 ***3. Includes all Minors. BIS and Archaeological Technician Students.

Table A2: Faculty Statistical Summary
(NOTE: data provided by WSU Institutional Research amended by department records)

	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Adjunct Headcount	5	5	7	6	4	7
Contract Headcount	6	5	4	4	4	4
Tenure Track/Tenure FTE*	3 / 3.25	3 / 3.25	3 / 3.25	3 / 3.75	3 / 3.625	3/3.625
% Credit Hours taught by Adjuncts:	27.3%	29.1%	52.6%	47.4%	33.3%	53.8%
% SCHs Generated by Adjuncts:	19.1%	30.9%	57.5%	56.2%	33.5%	54.4%

Note: *The program has 3 tenure track positions but 4 tenured faculty.
For calculating teaching FTE: R. Conover taught half-load as department Chair through Autumn 2006. L. Eaton half-load as Acting Chair in Spring-Autumn, 2007, then 7/8 load in 2010-11 as Anthropology Coordinator; B. Arkush taught 3/4 load throughout the 6 years in his position as Arch Tech Director
R. Conover was on leave Spring 2007- through Spring 2008. In Autumn 2008, L. Eaton was on one semester sabbatical leave in Autumn 2008; R. Holt was on leave in Autumn 2009, and also in the first year of a two-year leave in 2010-11 replaced by Susan Young on full-load contract beginning Spring 2011.

Appendix B

Contract/Adjunct Faculty Profile
2010-11

(NOTE: data provided by WSU Institutional Research amended by department records)

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Rank	Tenure Status	Highest Degree	Years of Teaching			Areas of Expertise
						WSU	Other	Total	
Arkush, Brooke	M	Euroamerican	Full Prof.	Tenured	Ph.D.	20	2	22	North American Prehistory, Colonialism.
Conover, Rosemary	F	Euro American	Full Prof.	Tenured	PhD.	41	0	41	Biological; Linguistics; Theory; Sex Roles, Research

Eaton, Linda	F	Euro-American	Full Prof	Tenured	Ph.D.	19	10	29	Cultural; Early Civ, Art/ Symbol; American Indians, US Southwest, Celts
Holt, Ronald	M	Euro-American	Full Prof.	Tenured	Ph.D.	29	2	31	Cultural; War, Religion & Politics, Asia Native
Davies, LeGrande	M	Euro-American	Adjunct	N/A	Ph.D.	5	27	40	Archaeology; Middle East
Frost, Caren	F	Euro-American	Adjunct	N/A	Ph.D.	Off & On Since 1996	14	19	Cultural; Medical
Kotter, Wade	M	Euro-American	Parttime (Full Prof.)	Tenured	Ph.D.	16	8	24	Archaeology; Middle East; Library
Stevenson, Mark	M	Euro-American	Adjunct (P.Staff)	N/A	Ph.D.	14	8	22	Cultural; Europe; Globalization
Young, Susan	F	Euroamerican	Adjunct (Contract-Spring 2011-Spring	N/A	M.A.	5	0	5	Ethnobotany
Niedzwiecki, Stephen	M	Euroamerican	Adjunct	N/A	M.S. Anthropology & Bio	3	2	5	Biological Anthro
McManama-Kearin, Kare	F	Euroamerican	Adjunct	N/A	Ph.D.	2	2	4	Archaeology, Ancient and Medieval Europe

Appendix C:

Contract Staff Profile
2010-11
(NOTE: data provided by WSU Institutional Research)

Name	Gender	Ethnicity	Job Title	Years of Employment			Areas of Expertise
				WSU	Other	Total	
Jensen, Carol	F	Euro-American	Classified Secretary II	17	5	22	Office Management

Appendix D:

It is important to note that the <u>data in the form below commingles the budget for both Anthropology and Sociology</u> and that it is not possible to separate out Anthropology's actual expenses in any meaningful way. The germane information is probably that Anthropology has 3.625 FTE faculty, while Sociology had 5 faculty positions (4.5 FTE because the current Chair is a sociologist). Two other positions are authorized but were unfilled for 2010-2011. Therefore, at this point Anthropology uses less than half of the budget.

Financial Analysis Summary

Department of Sociology & Anthropolocy					
Cost	**06-07**	**07-08**	**08-09**	**09-10**	**10-11**
Direct Instructional Expenditures	928,780	966,223	1,034,266	918,154	871,350
Cost Per Student FTE	2,785	2,971	3,108	2,664	2,165
Funding	**06-07**	**07-08**	**08-09**	**09-10**	**10-11**
Appropriated Fund	928,780	966,223	1,034,266	918,154	871,350
Other:					
Special Legislative Appropriation					
Grants of Contracts					
Special Fees/Differential Tuition					
Total	928,780	966,223	1,034,266	918,154	871,350

Appendix E:

External Community Involvement Names and Organizations

Name	Organization
William Reed	USDA Forest Service Intermountain Region
Ali Abusaidi	Caribou-Targhee National Forest
Bret Guisto	Sawtooth National Forest
Mark Stuart	Utah Statewide Archaeological Society
Joel Janetski	Brigham Young University (emeritus)
John Ives	University of Alberta
Caroline Smith	Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of Fort Hall
Mary Anne Davis	Idaho State Historic Preservation Office

Appendix F:

External Community Involvement Financial Contributions

Organization	Amount	Type
Sawtooth National Forest	$10,000	Grant
Caribou-Targhee National Forest	$11,500	Grant
USDA Forest Service Intermountain Region	$25,000	Grant/Agreement
Utah Statewide Archaeological Society	$300	Donation

Appendix G

Mission Statements of Department, College, & University

The *Department Mission Statement* was developed in 2000-2001 and continues to guide the activities and goals of the department:

The departmental mission is to administer and facilitate the goals and missions of the two academic programs within the department: Anthropology and Sociology. This includes organizing and coordinating tasks and activities of the faculty, staff and students; managing the budget and resources necessary to run quality programs; and maintaining campus and community relations.

Program Support to the Missions of the Department, College, and University:
The program supports the missions of all three institutional levels to which it belongs: the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, and the University. Overall, the program is consistent with and instrumental to fulfilling these missions in providing liberal arts, science, and vocational education pertaining to humans in our changing, diverse, and complex world.

a. The program supports the <u>Department Mission</u> as a strong co-partner (with Sociology) in meeting the academic needs of students and the community.

b. The program supports the <u>College Mission</u> by providing general education as well as Major and Minor degrees in the Social Sciences. It contributes centrally to providing a global, holistic understanding of humans and our sociocultural behavior. It teaches critical thinking and problem-solving and provides undergraduate research as well as traditional classroom approaches to learning. It provides an appreciation of human diversity and comparative perspectives, and students are taught to question and examine beliefs, attitudes, and prejudices, and to value cultural and biological variation. It has established effective community partnerships to assist students with employment and extracurricular experience. The faculty are highly committed to teaching, scholarship, and service to create a stimulating learning environment for students and to equip them with the knowledge necessary for successful living and working in our contemporary world.

c. While the program supports the <u>University Mission</u> in many ways, eight key passages from the University Mission Statement match best (quoted segments are extracted from the University Mission Statement in the WSU 2010-2011 Catalog):

> (1) *"...to meet the educational needs...through...the liberal arts and sciences and...vocations..."* Both academic and vocational programs are offered in anthropology through its Major, Minor, BIS Emphases, and Archaeological Technician Programs.

> (2) *"Instructional programs are designed to prepare students for immediate employment or further study, at the same time equipping them through liberal education for lifelong learning in a changing world. -* Anthropology provides a set of paradigms for interpreting the world, anticipating change, understanding cultural processes, questioning prejudices, and exploring ecological principles and dynamics as a context for lifelong learning in a changing world. Students are given a solid foundation of anthropological knowledge required to equip them with the educational preparation for employment or graduate school. The archaeology programs have excellent records of employment placement, and the more general anthropology programs compare well with all undergraduate liberal arts programs in job placement. Almost all anthropology students go onto graduate or professional school. Research projects and partnerships with the community extend the arena of learning beyond the classroom and give opportunity for growth and independent, life-long learning to faculty, students, and the public alike.

> (3) *The process of learning is emphasized, as well as accumulation of knowledge. -* Although the requisite anthropological content is taught throughout the curriculum to provide a firm foundation for undergraduates and to prepare students for graduate school or employment, the processes of learning are emphasized in the courses to develop student abilities in abstract thinking, critical reasoning and logic, problem-solving, conceptual integration and synthesis, comparison and questioning which will serve students well throughout their lives as active learners.

> (4) *"...to transcend disciplinary boundaries..."* As a holistic discipline, anthropology integrates knowledge of human biology and culture, throughout time and across the world. It is both a biological science and a cultural/ behavioral science sometimes classified with the humanities. It transcends disciplinary boundaries internally on its own, with its subfields of biological anthropology, linguistics, archaeology, and cultural anthropology, and also sustains a dynamic interdisciplinary exchange of courses, subject matter, and activities in collaboration with many other academic disciplines and programs throughout the university, and with professions such as education, medicine, business, and law/criminal justice.

> (5) *"Extensive personal contact and support among students, faculty, and staff create an enriched learning environment both in and out of the classroom."* The program uses traditional classroom and lab settings and provides many opportunities for faculty, students and staff to interact outside of them. These experiences include participation in the Anthropology Club, attending field school, field trips and study abroads, attending or participating in the department annual

student research conference, attending department social events, and receiving advisement and program information in person and through mailings and websites.

(6) *"...addressing the particular needs of its diverse students... -*
Program curriculum and activities focus on understanding and valuing human diversity and inclusivity and are flexible to accommodate diverse needs, experiences.

(7) *"...responds to the changing global environment through innovative and conventional instruction, public service activities, and continuous improvement of its programs."*
Because the subject matter of anthropology deals with world-wide issues, the program is very sensitive to global issues and changes. Program updates and innovations are constant and ongoing (e.g., revising courses, developing online or distance-learning courses). Faculty expertise in the program is instrumental in campus efforts to understand and respond to these changing needs. We have developed public educational outreach connections and activities with the community through field school, field trips, the study-abroad program, and partnerships with the U.S. Forest Service, the regional amateur archaeology club.

(8) *"...engages in scholarship, research...[and] learning-oriented partnerships with the community"* The program encourages, supports, and rewards faculty and student research. It maintains ties with local private and public agencies by providing consultation services and engaging in collaborative projects (e.g., with the US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Utah law enforcement agencies).

1. The *College of Social and Behavioral Sciences Mission Statement: The College of Social and Behavioral Sciences constitutes an important part of Weber State University's extensive liberal arts component, offering a wide range of courses and degree programs in the traditional social sciences —political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology as well as history and philosophy. It also houses programs in military science, criminal justice, social work, and gerontology, and serves as a base for interdisciplinary programs that draw upon other colleges for support — women's studies, Asian studies, and Latin American Studies. While disciplines within the College offer an extensive list of major and minor fields of study, University's extensive liberal arts component, offering a wide range of courses and degree programs in the traditional social sciences —political science, sociology, anthropology, and psychology as well as history and philosophy. It also houses programs in military science, criminal justice, social work, and gerontology, and serves as a base for interdisciplinary programs that draw upon other colleges for support — women's studies, Asian studies, and Latin American Studies. While disciplines within the College offer an extensive list of major and minor fields of study, they also serve as an important general education resource. The College is primarily committed to quality undergraduate education. Emphasis is placed on a variety of processes of learning including inquiry, research, analysis and interpretation, knowledge building and synthesis, communication, and problem-solving. The College fosters extensive personal contact and support among students, faculty, and staff to create a rich learning environment, and seeks to emphasize both the accumulation of knowledge and the process of learning. Because the social sciences are essential to understanding modern global existence, its programs are especially effective in equipping students for meaningful life-long learning and functioning in an ever-changing world.*

College faculty are encouraged to engage in research and scholarship as essential to effective teaching on the university level. The College works to ensure the vitality of its faculty through the active support of continuous improvement in effective teaching, scholarship, and service. The College builds and maintains effective partnerships with community and educational groups through regular academic programs and the Center for Social Science Education.

2. The *WSU University Mission Statement* (Taken from the WSU 2010-11 Catalog):

Weber State University provides learning opportunities appropriate to a comprehensive institution of higher education, welcoming participants from all regions, nations, and cultures. The mission of the university is to meet the educational needs of Utah through roles assigned by the State Board of Regents in the liberal arts and sciences and a variety of vocations and professions. Primarily committed to quality undergraduate education, the university offers degree programs which include advanced professional preparation.

Students are admitted on the basis of demonstrated competence in skills that assure a reasonable chance of success in both college and career. Curricular and co-curricular programs emphasize further development of such skills, together with the acquisition of knowledge and development of character. Eligibility for degrees requires meeting established standards of competence through outcomes assessment.

Instructional programs are designed to prepare students for immediate employment or further study, at the same time equipping them through liberal education for lifelong learning in a changing world. The process of learning is emphasized, as well as accumulation of knowledge. Organized around traditional disciplines, the university also cultivates opportunities for faculty and students to transcend disciplinary boundaries. Extensive personal contact and support among students, faculty, and staff create an enriched learning environment both in and out of the classroom.

Weber State University responds to the changing global environment through innovative and conventional instruction, public service activities, and continuous improvement of its programs. To insure vitality for effective teaching and service, the university engages in scholarship, research, artistic expression, and other professional pursuits. The university serves as a cultural center for its region and seeks to be a leader in addressing the particular needs of its diverse students, improving public education, and stimulating economic development through appropriate, learning-oriented partnerships with the community.

Appendix H

<u>Anthropology Program Assessment</u>

This appendix contains the following assessment documents:

1. Outcomes Grid for All Anthropology Courses

2. Anthropology Assessment Plan

3. The Program Outcomes Assessment Report 2010-11

4. Attachments to the 2010-11 Assessment Report:

   A. Program Exit Interview Memorandum to Students

   B. Exit Interview Instrument

   C. Numeric Results of Part A. of the Exit Interview

   D. Student Responses to Part B. of the Exit Interview

   E. Table H-1: Data on 67 Graduated Anthropology Majors from Spring 2006 to Spring 2011

   F. Table H -2: Grade Patterns for ANTH 4200 and ANTH 4300 For All 75 Anthropology Graduates from Spring 2000 To Spring 2005

5. Strategic Plan and Long-Term Goals of the Program

ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM COURSE OUTCOMES GRID

LEVEL OF OUTCOME OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES:
L = Low level of the program objective is achieved in the course
M = Moderate level of the program objective is achieved in the
course H = High level of the program objective is achieved in
the course
V = Varies with course content

8 OBJECTIVES BY NUMBER:
#1 = Understanding human biological & cultural differences & similarities across time and space in terms
     of anthropological data and theories.
#2 = Understanding the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology and how these interrelate
     to provide a holistic perspective to human differences and similarities through time and space.
#3 = Proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology.
#4 = Knowledge of theory formation and the history of various theories in anthropology.
#5 = Basic knowledge of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis.
#6 = Basic abilities in critical thinking & reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues.
#7 = Basic ability to write, speak & communicate about anthropological issues.
#8 = Fundamental awareness of existence of human prejudice and discrimination and anthropological
     alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Program Learning Goals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ANTH SSIDV1000 (3) INTRODUCTION TO ANTHRO	H	H	H	L	L	M	L	H
ANTH SS/DV2000 (3) PEOPLES & CULTURES	H	H	H	L	M	M	M	H
ANTH SS2030 (3) PRINCIPLES OF ARCHAEOLOGY	H	H	H	L	M	M		
ANTH LS1020 (3) BIOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY	H	H	H	M	M	M	M	H
ANTH HU/DV1040 (3) LANGUAGE & CULTURE	H	H	H	L	H	M	M	H
ANTH 2810 (1-3) EXPERIMENTAL COURSES	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTH 2920 (1-3) SHORT COURSES/WORKSHOPS	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTH 2950 (1-3) ELEMENTARY ANTHRO FIELD TRIP	H	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTH 2990 (1-3) SPECIAL TOPICS IN ANTHROPOLOGY	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTH 3100 (3) PREHISTORY OF NORTH AMERICA	H	M	H	L	L	M	M	L
ANTH DV3200 (3) ARCH OF EARLY CIVILIZATIONS	H	M	M	M	L	H	H	L

::COURSES/EXPERIENCES..	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5.	#6.	#7:	#8.
ANTHRO 3300 (3) ARCHAEOL FIELD TECHNIQUES	L	L	M		H	M	M	L
ANTHRO SI3400 (3) ARCHAEOL LAB TECHNIQUES	L	L	H	L	II	II	H	L
ANTHRO DV3500 (3) ELEMENTS OF CULTURE	H	L	H	H	M	H	H	H
ANTHRO DV3600 (1-3) CULTURE AREA STUDIES	H	L-M	M	L-M	L	H	H	H
ANTHRO DV3700 (3) SEX ROLES: PAST,PRES,FUTURE	H	H	M	M	H	H	H	H
ANTHRO DV3900 (3) MAGIC, SHAMANISM & RELIG		L	M	M	L	H	H	H
ANTHRO 4100 (3) ARCHAEOL METHOD, THEORY & CULT RESOURCE MANAGE		M	M	11		11	H	L
ANTHRO 4200 (3) ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY	L	M	H	H	M	H	H	L
ANTHRO 514300 (3) ANTHRO RESEARCH METHODS	L	M	M	H	H	H	H	L
ANTHRO 4810 (1-3) EXPERIMENTAL COURSES	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTHRO 4830 (1-3) READINGS OR PROJECTS	V	V	V	V	V	II		V
ANTHRO 4920 (1-3) SHORT COURSES/ WORKSHOPS	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTHRO 4950 (1-3) ADVANCED ANTHRO FIELD TRIPS	II	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
ANTHRO 4990 (1-3) SEMINAR IN ANTHROPOLOGY	V	V	V	V	V	H	H	V
REQUIRED OUTSIDE COURSE: SOC SI3600 (3) SOCIAL STATISTICS	I		L	M	H	11	M	L
EXTRA-CURRICULAR: ANTHRO CLUB	H	M	L		L		L	L

ANTHROPOLOGY ASSESSMENT PLAN

<u>Persons Responsible for Collecting and Analyzing the Data:</u> The full-time faculty of the anthropology program will serve as the Assessment Committee to oversee and implement the department's assessment plan, with the Coordinator of Anthropology serving as the committee chair.

<u>Assessment Measures to be used:</u> The Anthropology assessment plan as used to date examines student outcomes for majors using the following direct and indirect measures.

Direct Measures (DM):

1. Grade point averages of graduating seniors, both in Anthropology and Cumulative GPAs.
2. Grades of graduating seniors:
 A. Per course in required core courses and specific courses designated with High ratings in achieving Program Learning Outcomes 4.
 B.Cumulative grade patterns of the required core courses and those courses with High ratings in achieving central Program Learning Outcomes.

Indirect Measures (IM):

1.Student course evaluations: For core and specific courses with High ratings in achieving central Program Learning Outcomes
2. Periodic focus groups of majors
3.Exit interviews of graduating seniors Alumni surveys
4.Institutional data on job placement; graduate and professional school acceptance; other significant accomplishments.

Current and Planned Additions:

Beginning with the new assessment cycle in 2010-2011, we have added in direct measures of each of our 8 learning goals on a course by course basis. In 2010-2011 we assessed our general education courses in this way; in 2011-2012, we will assess courses required by either or both of our two majors; in 2012-2013 we will assess our high Impact courses, and in 2013-2014 our electives. These involve primarily direct measures and some secondary indirect measures.

Program Outcomes Assessment Report 2010-11
ANTHROPOLOGY

This was the eleventh year the Anthropology Program participated in the university's formal outcomes assessment program. In AY2000-01 Anthropology developed its current mission statement, identified eight central learning objectives for the major, constructed a curriculum outcomes grid, and developed and administered an exit interview as a measure of student learning outcomes, which continues to be administered before each graduation. In 2002-2003, the curriculum grid was amended slightly to more accurately reflect course foci, a formal "assessment plan" was articulated, and an initial alumni data assessment plan was made. The program participated in general education and diversity assessment of specific courses in 2003-04 and again in 2011. In 2010-2011, data were collected using the exit interview, student grades, and graduation and retention rates of graduating majors. Here is a brief discussion of the results of these outcomes measures, and the program's plans for assessment in the future. (See the **Attachments** of this report for further details.)

1. <u>Summary of Data Collected:</u>

 <u>Exit Interview:</u> The survey-style, written exit interview was first developed in 2000-01, based on the program's learning objectives and outcomes. (See copy of interview instrument below.) It has been distributed each year

before the December and April graduations. In 2010-11, of the **24** graduating seniors**,** 12 majors and 12 minors/BIS, 5 majors and 1 minor responded. A summary of the <u>responses from **Majors only**</u> is provided here. As the following description demonstrates, the overall conclusion to be drawn from the results of this interview is that the program mission is being well executed, the learning outcomes are being effectively accomplished, and the students appear to be highly satisfied with the existing program.

a.   Every respondent reported a significant increase in their understanding, proficiency, and knowledge within the eight desired learning outcomes of the program as measured from the time before they began the program to their completion of the program. (See the numeric results of the interview below in this report.) The overall mean shift was 3 scale steps on a 5-step model, with students typically claiming to have achieved a "high to very high" acquisition of skills and knowledge at completion of the program.

b.   Respondents indicated they selected anthropology as a major primarily because of personal interest in the subject, a desire to better understand humans, the discipline's unique insights, and their enjoyment of the classes and the professors.

c.   All five respondents chose either cultural anthropology or archaeology as their primary field of interest within anthropology, followed by linguistics, with biological anthropology last. However, all four fields were appreciated by the students.

d.   All of the respondents indicated they planned to attend graduate school some time after graduation, and all of them intended to pursue anthropology.

e.   All respondents (100%) indicated that the greatest strength of the program was the faculty (with their knowledge, experience in the field, teaching expertise, high expectations, diversity in specialization, and friendly personalities). Some also mentioned the variety of learning experiences provided to students, the small, intimate classroom environment, and the philosophical nature of the program's perspectives on the world.

       j.   Most respondents felt that the greatest weaknesses of the program pertain to the limited number and variety of courses offered — especially in biological anthropology and linguistics, as well as the small number of faculty and the difficulty in scheduling classes more frequently and without competing against each other. Several felt that no changes were necessary — they liked it as is.

g.   The changes most often suggested for the program's courses or requirements were to: a) split the theory course into two courses (e.g., classical and contemporary); b) add more courses for variety, especially in biological anthropology, linguistics, and region-specific courses, and c) provide even more research experiences to students. Several mentioned the need for more faculty and more funding. Most, however, felt satisfied with the program as it is.

h.   All respondents (100%) indicated that their WSU anthropological education has opened their eyes and minds and positively changed their views of the world and human diversity. They expressed how the program transformed their awareness and attitudes toward greater cultural relativism and racial equality and to use a holistic perspective in understanding humans and behavior. All expressed the belief that they were better able to participate in a global society due to their anthropological background.

i.   The results of this year's exit interview are remarkably consistent with those obtained from previous years. This tends to reaffirm the conclusion that students are very satisfied with the program and that our expectations of program outcomes are being met.

<u>Data on Graduates and Program Retention Rates</u> : We have now collected data on all 141 anthropology majors who have graduated since the inception of the major in Spring 2000. These data provide some direct measures of student learning outcomes and depict a very positive picture of the program. These measures include: (1) graduates' overall cumulative graduating grade point averages (GPAs); (2) graduates' cumulative GPAs in just anthropology courses; (3) graduates' grades earned in the two program exit courses required of all majors: ANTH 4200 (Anthropological Theory) and ANTH 4300 (Anthropological Research Methods); (4) the length of time to graduation measured from two datum points: (a) from date of entry to WSU until graduation, and (b) from date of declaration as an anthropology major until graduation; and (5) the graduation and retention rates of the program. Here is a summary of this data:

(1) **Cumulative GPA:** The mean overall graduating GPA of the 141 anthropology majors who have graduated from the program is **3.38** (GPA range = 2.52-4.00).

(2) **Anthropology GPA:** The mean GPA of the 141 anthropology graduates in just their anthropology courses is **3.60** (GPA range=2.71-4.00) which is significantly higher than their overall mean GPA. This

figure indicates a very high level of performance by these students in their anthropology coursework and demonstrates significant competency with the course content and the desired learning outcomes as specified for these courses.

(3) **Grades in Exit Courses:** The ultimate measure of competency for majors in this program is their performance in the two required exit courses: ANTH 4200 (Anthropological Theory) and 4300 (Anthropological Research Methods). These two courses provide high levels of five of the eight program learning objectives to be achieved (see Anthropology Course Outcomes Grid). The grades earned in these courses are believed to be a direct measure of student attainment of these program learning objectives. Because it is mandatory, by program requirement, that students must pass all anthropology courses with grades of C or better to be counted toward their major, it is expected that all graduates have, indeed, earned grades of C or better in these two required courses to graduate. Hence, it is possible to conclude that those who graduate have performed at least average or better in these courses and have met the minimum standards for attaining the learning objectives designated for these courses. A measure of even higher levels of competency of the graduates can also be ascertained, however, by looking at those graduates who perform above the minimum standard of a C grade. The data indicate that 95% of the 141 graduates earned grades of B- or better in both courses, with 62% having earned grades of A- or better in ANTH 4200 and 81% having earned A- or better in ANTH 4300. This is a very high record of achievement in meeting the program's learning objectives by these students and equally demonstrates that the program is graduating very well-prepared students in anthropology.

Graduation Rates: The median time to graduation for the **66 anthropology graduates from 2005-6 to 2010-11 was 6 years** since entering the university. The institutional average length of time to graduation for all other bachelor degree graduates is higher than this (6.58 years) as reported by the WSU Office of Institutional Research. Fifty-eight (58) percent of Anthropology majors graduate within 6 years, as opposed to 38-45% of all WSU students.(See below.)

WSU Graduation Rates

	Anthropology	WSU Overall
Within 4 years	33%	11-13%
Within 5 years	44%	19-30%
Within 6 years	58%	38-45%

MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL ANTHROPOLOGY GRADUATING SENIORS

FROM: Linda B. Eaton, Coordinator of Anthropology
                   Department of Sociology & Anthropology - WSU

DATE: November 20, 2010 and April 8, 2011

RE: ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM EXIT INTERVIEW

We are delighted that you have completed your anthropology degree at WSU, and now we need your help to assess our program. Your feedback is valued and essential for us to learn what we are doing well and where we may need to make adjustments. This information will be kept confidential, and you will be able to make your comments anonymously due to the two-sealed envelope process described below. Your responses are very important to us, and we encourage you to return this survey as quickly as possible, hopefully by **Tuesday, December** 1/ **Thursday, April 15.** If you have any questions, please call Dr. Eaton at 626-6244.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SURVEY:
 (1) Please fill out the survey - your opinions and information are valuable and the program is small, so every
                   survey counts significantly.
 (2) Seal the completed survey in the smaller envelope provided with these instructions.
                   As instructed, **do NOT sign** this inner envelope.
 (3) Seal this a second time in the larger envelope and **SIGN THIS** before returning it so that Carol Jensen (the
                   department secretary) can track respondents to assure a high return rate and remind those who
                   fail to submit.
 (4) By December 1/April 15, bring this to: CAROL JENSEN: SS114
                   Or mail survey to:
                                  DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY & ANTHROPOLOGY
                                  c/o CAROL JENSEN
                                  1208 UNIVERSITY CIRCLE
                                  WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY

                                  OGDEN, UT 84408-1208

The anonymity of surveys will be maintained by Carol by removing the outer envelope before submitting the unidentifiable, unsigned surveys over to me for review and compilation.

Thank you for the time you spend on this survey. The Anthropology faculty wish you well with your future plans and look forward to hearing from you over the coming years. We are very proud of you and sincerely hope we have made some positive contributions to your educational experiences at WSU.

ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM EXIT INTERVIEW   **4-8-11**

A. <u>Assessing Main Program Objectives:</u> The anthropology program at WSU is designed to provide students with appropriate undergraduate-level educational experiences, skills, and knowledge to achieve eight identified learning outcomes. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being "lowest" and 5 being" highest"), please comparatively assess your knowledge of the following areas before and after completing the program by circling the appropriate rating.

1. (a) **Before you began** the program your level of understanding of human biological and cultural
    differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological description
    (data) and
    explanations (theories) was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low	low	medium	high	Very high

   (b) **After completing** the program your level of understanding of human biological and cultural differences
    and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological description (data) and
    explanations (theories) is now:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

2. (a) **Before you began** the program your understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within
    anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural
    anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human
    differences and similarities across the world and through time was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

   (b) **After completing** the program your understanding of the nature of the four specialized fields within
    anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural
    anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human
    differences and similarities across the world and through time is now:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

3. (a) **Before you began** the program your level of proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and
    terminology was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

   (b) **After completing** the program your level of proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and
    terminology is now:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

4. (a) **Before you began** the program your knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various
    theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of
    anthropology was:

1	2	3	4	5
Very low				Very high

   (b) **After completing** the program your knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various
    theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of

anthropology is now:

1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

5. (a) Before you began the program your knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis were:

     1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

(b) After completing the program your knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis are now:

     1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

6. (a) Before you began the program your abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues were:

     1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

(b) After completing the program your abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues are now:

     1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

7. (a) Before you began the program your abilities to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues were:

     1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

(b) After completing the program your abilities to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues are now:

           1   2   3   4 5

Very low   Very high

8. (a) Before you began the program your awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, anthropocentrism), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations was:

           1   2   3   4   5

Very low   Very high

(b) After completing the program your awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, anthropocentrism), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations is now:

B. <u>Additional Questions:</u>

1. Why did you choose anthropology as a major or minor?

2. Which field(s) of anthropology interested you most? Place in numeric order 1 through 4 (with 1 being most

personally interesting and 4 being least interesting):
   / / Archaeology / / Biological Anthropology / / Cultural Anthropology   / / Linguistics

3. What are your plans after graduation?
   A. Attend graduate school: / / Yes   / / No
      Where?_____
      What discipline/field?_____
         (If Anthropology indicate the subfield: _____
      What degree? _____

   B. Intend to pursue a career in anthropology: / / Yes   / / No

   C. Intend to pursue a career in some field <u>other than anthropology</u> (please specify):

   D. Other plans?

4. What do you believe to be the greatest strengths of the WSU Anthropology Program?

5. What do you believe to be the greatest weaknesses of the WSU Anthropology Program?

6. Do you think the WSU Anthropology Program should add, delete, or change any courses or requirements in its curriculum?
   What? (please specify) Why? (please explain)

7. How has your WSU anthropological training changed the way that you view the world and peoples of different cultural
   and ethnic backgrounds?

8. Any further comments or suggestions?

**NUMERIC RESULTS OF PART A. OF THE ANTHROPOLOGY EXIT INTERVIEW FOR 2010-2011
ANTHROPOLOGY <u>MAJORS</u>**

The following contains the compiled data of responses obtained from 5of the 12 total graduating majors The rating scale used for each question was: 1 = Very Low, 2 = Low, 3 = Medium, 4 = High, and 5 = Very High.

(1) Level of understanding human biological and cultural differences and similarities across the world and through time in terms of anthropological description (data) and explanations (theories)...

(a) Before beginning the program:
Majors' response: = **2.0**

Mode = Low
100% selected Very Low to Medium

(b)   After completing the program:
Majors' response: x = **4.6**

Mode = Very High
100% selected High to Very High

(2) Understanding the nature of the four specialized fields within anthropology (archaeology, biological anthropology, anthropological linguistics, and cultural anthropology), and how these interrelate to provide a holistic approach to understanding human differences and similarities across the world and though time...

(a) Before beginning the program:

Majors' response: x = **2.0**

Mode = Low
60% selected Very Low to Low

(b)   After completing the program:
Majors' response: x = **4.8**

Mode = Very High, 100% selected High to Very High

(^{3}) Level of proficiency in basic anthropological concepts and terminology...

(a) Before beginning the program:
Majors' response: x = **1.8**

Mode = Between Very Low to Low, 80% selected Very Low to Medium

(b)   After completing the program:
Majors' response: x = **4.2**

Mode = Very High, 80% selected High to Very High

(4) Knowledge of the processes of theory formation and how various theories have been developed, applied and evaluated throughout the history of the discipline of anthropology...

(a) Before beginning the program:
Majors' response: x = **1.2**

Mode = Medium
100% selected Very Low to Low

(b) After completing the program:
Majors' response: x = **4.0**

Mode = High, 80% selected High to Very High

(5) Knowledge and skills of anthropological research methods and techniques of analysis were...

    (a) Before beginning the program:
        Majors' response: x = **1.0**

    (b) Mode = Very Low, 100% selected Very Low
        Majors' response: x = **3.8**
                Mode = High, 80% selected High to Very High

(6) Abilities in critical thinking and reasoning as applied to anthropological problems and issues...

    (a) Before beginning the program:
        Majors' response: x = **1.8**
                Mode = Low, 100% selected Very Low to Low

    (b) After completing the program:
        Majors' response: x = **4.4**
                Mode = High, 80% selected High to Very High

(7) Abilities to write, speak and communicate about anthropological issues...

    (a) Before beginning the program:
        Majors' response: x = **1.4**
                Mode = Very Low
                100% selected Very Low to Medium

    (b) After completing the program:
        Majors' response: x = **4.8**
                Mode = Very High
                80% selected High to Very High

(8) Awareness of the existence of human prejudice and discrimination (e.g., racism, ethnocentrism, sexism, anthropocentrism), and the anthropological insights and alternatives which value the broad range of human behavior and adaptations...

    (a) Before beginning the program:
        Majors' response: x = **2.8**
        Mode = Medium, 100% selected Low to High
                (With 80% Low to Medium)
    (b) After completing the program:
        Majors' response: x = **5.0**
        Mode = Very High
                100% selected Very High

For Anthropology majors: The overall statistical mean of the mean answers for the questions pertaining to "before beginning the program" is **2.75** (between Low and Medium), The overall mean of the mean answers pertaining to "after completing the program" is **4.5** (between High and Very High).

In **all cases** there is a **significant positive ratings shift** acknowledged by students between their level of anthropological skills and knowledge before they began the program and the level reported after completing it, with responses showing an overall mean shift of **2.73 scale steps** from lower to higher status as they completed the program. The actual range of shift varied per question set: Questions 8 had the least degree of shift, 2.2, and question 7 the greatest, at 3.4. The first six questions were all in the 2.6-2.8 shift range. All questions, however, showed statistical modes of high to very high ratings in acquisition of skills and knowledge at completion of the program.

STUDENT RESPONSES TO PART **B.** OF THE ANTHROPOLOGY EXIT INTERVIEW - <u>Additional</u>
<u>Questions</u>:

1. Why did you choose anthropology as a major or minor?
>100% of respondents indicated their primary reason for selecting anthropology was personal interest of anthropology's subject matter and perspective. Additional reasons stated were enjoying the classes and the professors; learning about cultures and their past; and being fascinated with understanding humans.

2. Which field(s) of anthropology interested you most? Place in numeric order 1 through 4 (with 1 being most personally interesting and 4 being least interesting):
>These students ranked Cultural Anthropology first, Archaeology second, Linguistics third, and Biological Anthropology fourth.

3. What are your plans after graduation?
>A. Attend graduate school: / 5 / Yes / 5/ Maybe/0, Later/ 0 / No 0
>>Where? Not yet known. _____
>>What discipline/field? _____All indicated anthropology; either ₁
>> Cultural Anthropology most numerous) or Archaeology
>>What degree? Most indicated M.A., some Ph.Ds._

B.   Intend to pursue a career in anthropology: 5 Yes

> C. Intend to pursue a career in some field <u>other than anthropology</u> : None
> D. Other plans? Examples: travel, teaching, Peace Corps, family

4. What do you believe to be the greatest strengths of the WSU Anthropology Program?
>100% of respondents indicated the professors were the greatest strength (their knowledge, expertise, experience, personableness, availability, high expectations, and helpfulness). Other answers mentioned the small, intimate size of program, strong advisement, clarity of structure and requirements of program, and subfields such as archaeology and cultural anthropology were strong in the program.

5. What do you believe to be the greatest weaknesses of the WSU Anthropology Program?
>Most often mentioned were: (1) a limited number of courses/classes and a very small program; (2) not enough funding;

6.   Do you think the WSU Anthropology Program should add, delete, or change any courses or requirements in its curriculum?   What? (please specify) Why? (please explain)
>One student indicated there should be no changes. Other recommendations were to add more courses in general and more hands-on student research whenever possible. Two cultural students suggested stronger encouragement to learn archaeological skills as well, to add flexibility to their abilities.

> 6.   How has your WSU anthropological training changed the way that you view the world and peoples of different cultural and ethnic backgrounds? Students repeatedly talk about the personal growth in open-mindedness, curiosity, tolerance and consciousness of problems and myriad possible solutions.

7. Any further comments or suggestions? All were very positive, stressing the caring faculty, personal attention, new windows on the world, etc. A typical quote: "This is an <u>amazing</u> program. No other department on campus is so good—my friends in other fields are baffled by and jealous of the attention I get individually, and the amount of commitment, fun, and general close-knit community that is here. Thank you <u>so</u> <u>much</u> for a wonderful experience!"

Data on Anthropology Graduates Spring 2006-Spring 2011

	Date Grad	Cum GPA	Anth GPA	Anth 4200	Anth 4300	Date Began WSU	Date Began Anthro	Yrs to Grad	Transfer
141	22-Apr-2011	3.71	3.56	A	A	Aut 2009	Aut 2009	2	Yes
140	22-Apr-2011	3.14	3.53	C	A	Aut 2006	Aut 2007	5	No
139	22-Apr-2011	2.64	2.78	B -	A -	Aut 2005	Spr 2008	6	Yes
138	22-Apr-2011	2.56	3.50	C +	C	Spr 1999	Spr 2004	7	No
137	5-Aug-2011	3.51	3.92	A	A	Aut 2001	Aut 2007	10	No
136	22-Apr-2011	3.44	3.75	A	A	Spr 2004	Aut 2005	7	No
135	22-Apr-2011	2.92	3.15	B +	B +	Spr 2004	Aut 2005	7	No
134	10-Dec-2010	3.27	3.42	A	A	Spr 2009	Spr 2009	1.5	Yes
133	10-Dec-2010	2.82	3.60	B +	A -	Aut 2005	Aut 2005	4.5	No
132	23-Apr-2010	3.72	3.68	B -	A	Aut 2004	Aut 2004	5	No
131	23-Apr-2010	3.74	3.93	A	A	SU 2007	SU 2007	3	Yes
130	23-Apr-2010	2.76	3.43	B	B+	Aut 2008	Aut 2008	2	Yes
129	23-Apr-2010	3.25	3.56	A	B+	Spr 2003	Spr 2004	7	No
128	11-Dec-2009	3.03	3.05	A	A -	Aut 1998	Spr 1999	11	Yes
127	11-Dec-2009	3.03	3.15	A -	A -	Spr 2002	Aut 2003	6.5	Yes
126	11-Dec-2009	2.95		B	B	SU 2007	Aut 2007	2	Yes
125	14-Aug-09	2.83			A	Winter 1993	Aut 1996	16	No
124	14-Aug-09	3.14		B -	B +	Aut 1980	SU 2007	29	Yes
123	1-May-09	3.18	3.78	A	A	Spr 2003	Aut 2005	6	Yes
122	1-May-09	3.32	3.48	B -		SU 2006	SU 2007	3	Yes
121	1-May-09	3.49	3.70	A	A	Spr 2000	SU 2000	8.5	Yes
120	1-May-09	3.51	3.64	B +	A	Spr 2000	Aut 2000	8.5	No
119	1-May-09	3.73	3.87	A	A	Aut 2001	Aut 2004	8	No

	Date Grad	Cum GPA	Anth GPA	Anth 4200	Anth 4300	Date Began WSU	Date Began Anthro	Yrs to Grad	Transfer
118	1-May-09	3.43	3.45	B +	A	Aut 2006	Aut 2006	3	Yes
117	1-May-09	2.75	3.83		A	Spr 2004	Aut 2004	4.5	Yes
116	1-May-09	3.73	3.89	A	A	Aut 2004	Aut 2004	5	No
115	12-Dec-08	3.60	3.82	A	A	Sum 2005	Spr 2006	2.5	Yes
114	12-Dec-08	3.81	3.85	A -	A	Spr 2001	Aut 2005	6.5	No
113	1-Aug-08	3.09	3.61	B +	A	Aut 2003	Aut 2003	5	Yes
112	1-Aug-08	3.84	3.89	A -	A	Aut 2006	Aut 2006	2	Yes
111	2-May-08	2.52	3.36	B +	C	Spr 1997	Sum 2000	11	No
110	2-May-08	3.20	3.35	B	A	Spr 2001	Aut 2002	6	Yes
109	2-May-08	3.50	3.76	A	A	Aut 2005	Aut 2005	3	Yes
108	2-May-08	3.53	3.81	A	A	Aut 2002	Spr 2007	6	No
107	2-May–08	3.80	3.88	B +	A	Aut 2001	Spr 2002	7	Yes
106	2-May-08	3.76	3.78	A	A	Aut 2004	Aut 2004	4	Yes
105	2-May-08	3.39	3.46	A -	B	Aut 2006	Aut 2006	2	Yes
104	2-May-08	3.14	3.48	B +	A	Aut 1983	Spr 1991	17	Yes
103	14-Dec-07	3.38	3.44	A	A -	Aut 2004	Aut 2004	4	Yes
102	14-Dec-07	3.95	4.0	A	A	Aut 1997	Sum 2003	11	No
101	14-Dec-07	3.54	3.81	A	A	Aut 1999	Aut 2002	9	Yes
100	14-Dec-07	2.74	3.17	A -	C	Aut 1991	Aut 1992	16	No
99	14-Dec-07	3.67	3.98	A	A	Spr 1998	Spr 2002	10	No
98	3-Aug-07	3.78	3.74	B +	A	Spr 2005	Aut 2005	2	Yes
97	3-Aug-07	3.77	3.81	A	A -	Aut 2001	Aut 2001	6	Yes
96	3-Aug-07	2.89	2.71	B	A	Spr 2001	Spr 2002	6	Yes
95	3-Aug-07	3.64	3.87	A	A	Aut 2003	Spr 2005	4	No
94	4-May-07	2.92	3.24	C +	A	Aut 2004	Spr 2005	3	Yes
93	4-May-07	3.43	3.82	A	A	Aut 2000	Aut 2003	7	No

	Date Grad	Cum GPA	Anth GPA	Anth 4200	Anth 4300	Date Began WSU	Date Began Anthro	Yrs to Grad	Transfer
92	4-May-07	3.10	3.53	B +	A	Aut 2001	Spr 2002	6	Yes
91	4-May-07	3.94	3.87	A	A -	Spr 2005	Spr 2005	2	Yes
90	4-May-07	3.42	3.57	B +	C	Spr 1999	Spr 2005	8	Yes
89	4-May-07	3.86	3.93	A -	A	Spr 2004	Aut 2005	3	No
88	4-May-07	3.82	3.91	A	A -	Aut 2001	Aut 2001	6	No
87	3-May-07	2.55	2.86	B -	A	Aut 2001	Aut 2001	6	Yes
86	15-Dec-06	3.17	3.48	A	B	Aut 1995	Spr 1996	11	No
85	15-Dec-06	3.49	3.74	A	A	Aut 2002	Aut 2005	4	No
84	15-Dec-06	3.36	3.41	B +	A	Spr 1997	Spr 2001	9	No
83	5-May-06	3.36	3.3	A -	A -	Aut 2000	Spr 2003	2.5	No
82	5-May-06	3.03	2.95	C +	B	Aut 2002	Aut 2002	4	Yes
81	5-May-06	3.36	3.6	A -	B +	Aut 2001	Aut 2001	5	Yes
80	5-May-06	3.05	3.4	B	A	Aut 2003	Spr 2004	3	Yes
79	5-May-06	3.94	4.0	A	A	Win 1982	SU 2004	23.5	No
78	16-Dec-05	3.38	3.65	B	A -	Aut 1988	Aut 2002	20	No
77	16-Dec-05	3.82	4.00	A	A	Win 1990	Spr 2004	18	No
76	16-Dec-05	3.95	3.98	A	A	Spr 2000	Spr 2000	8	No

Grades for ANTH 4200 – Anthropological Theory

Table H1: Graduates 2005-2006 through 2010-2011

Grade Earned	Number of Students	Percent of Students
A	34	48%
A-	8	13%
B+	11	19%
B	5	7%
B-	4	6.5%
C+	3	5%
C	1	1.5%
Total:	66	100%

Table H2: Grades for ANTH 4300 – Anthropological Research Methods

Graduates 2005-2006 through 2010-2011

Grade Earned	Number of Students	Percent of Students
A	44	67%
A-	11	15%
B+	4	6.5%
B	3	5%
B-	0	0%
C+	0	0%
C	4	6.5%
Total:	66	100%

Appendix I: Strategic Plan and Long-Term Goals of the Program

Program Development and Assessment:
a. Continue to refine and implement program assessment and modify the program as necessary.

Plan for Action: Employ annually our program assessment plans and collect more data. Continue to refine our established assessment procedures and revise our outcomes measures. Alumni tracking and data gathering need to be initiated and other more direct measures of assessment need to be explored. Exit interviews need to be revised. Other measures to be considered include using exams, course grading patterns, institutional research data, alumni surveys, and senior research projects.

(1) Revise our curriculum and program based on assessment results. Linking outcomes data with appropriate actions for change requires recognizing how and what to "fix" without being premature or overly aggressive to take action. We plan to engage in extensive faculty discussion and interpretation in combination with seeking professional training and help from others on campus and national organizations like the American Anthropological Association (AAA), and other appropriate groups like the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE).

(2) Monitor institutional changes in general education and other requirements which may impact the program.

Responsible Entities: All faculty, especially Program Coordinator.

b   Create more integration and interaction between the departmental programs.

   Plan for Action:

(1) Develop more collaborative efforts in the curriculum, more cross-discipline interaction with students, and create additional shared activities and projects among the faculty which conjoin or cross-cut the two disciplines in the department.

(2) Enhance the department social events, student clubs, and Student Research Conference.

   Responsible Entities: Everyone in the department, especially the Department Chair, Program Coordinators, Student Clubs and Advisors, and Student Research Conference Committee.

c   Develop better program tracking techniques.

   Plan for Action:

(1) Continue to update and create more efficient and systematic data bases of the declared students in the program and alumni with personal contact information to be continuously updated.

(2) Integrate the Lynx/Banner system with the department tracking system.

   Responsible Entities: Department Secretary, Department Chair, and Program Coordinator.

d   .Continue to explore on-line and multi-media instruction.

   Plan for Action:

(1) Evaluate On-line offerings and assess departmental needs and abilities.

(2) Provide equipment training for faculty and staff and develop appropriate and creative pedagogical techniques for its use.

(3) Assess the use of multimedia techniques within courses.

(4) **Responsible Entities:** Department Chair, Program Coordinator, and Faculty

e. Continue to expand and build our program on the Davis Campus and other off-campus sites.

   Plan for Action:

Develop an Anthropology position at the Davis campus and build an off-campus program.

   Responsible Entities: Department Chair and Program Coordinator.

.   Student and Alumni Relations:

   a   Develop better student recruitment and retention techniques.

      Plan for Action:

(1) Revise our Program Declaration Forms as needed, and continue   to use these in classes.

(2) Continue to participate in the annual WSU Major Fest with   displays renewed annually.

(3) Strengthen and annually renew contacts with the campus Advisement Office.

(4) More thoroughly advertise the program and classes through electronic means, mailings,

bulletin board and electronic sign announcements, case displays, as well as through phone contacts to inform students of department activities and deadlines (e.g., about scholarships, parties, research opportunities, advisement sessions, awards).

(5) Continuously update and restock semester schedules and program descriptions for distribution in hallway locations.

(6) Continue to revise every two to three years our program brochures.

(7) Complete developing department and program websites.

(8) Make further efforts in improving the advisement process and attend to those students who stop out or are on inactive status.

Responsible Entities: Program Coordinator, Department Secretary, Program Coordinator, with aid from other Anthropology faculty, Anthropology Club Boardmembers.

(9) Complete developing department and program websites.

(10) Make further efforts in improving the advisement process and attend to those students who stop out or are on inactive status.

Responsible Entities: Program Coordinator, Department Secretary, Program Coordinator, with aid from other Anthropology faculty, Anthropology Club Boardmembers.

b   Continue to refine the advisement process.
Plan for Action:

(1) Continue to maintain accurate lists and statistics of declared students in the program.

(2) Continue to review the department processes for advisement.

(3) Develop a better monitoring system to notify and schedule students for advisement and create incentives for motivating them to receive advisement.

(4) Improve consistency of faculty documentation of advisement data to routinize techniques of recording dates and notes for each advisement session per faculty member.

(5) Clarify lines of advisement action and increase efficiency of annual advisement tracking.

(6) Efficiently maintain printed student records for our file system, especially in electronic schedules, catalogs, and student records on campus.

(7) Continue to work closely with our College Advisor and the campus Advisement Office to stay current with changing university requirements.

(8) Become more knowledgeable about career planning and opportunities for students with baccalaureate degrees in anthropology by actively investigating current career opportunities through contacting professional associations and agencies. The AAA and other professional organizations have become active in organizing, discussing, and publishing career planning and employment needs for undergraduate programs with a rising need for majors in many employment sectors in the country. We will also continue to make community contacts with potential employers to explore the emerging availability of job opportunities (with additional help sought through the Career Services Office on campus).

(9) Collect more data as part of our general assessment protocol to assess our advisement system and investigate the use of other measures to be used.

Responsible Entities: Program Coordinator and Anthropology faculty, Department Secretary, and College Advisor.

Create more and better student learning assessment techniques.
Plan for Action:

(1) Investigate and develop additional appropriate methods of measuring student learning outcomes.

(2) Implement these learning assessment techniques in our courses, and seek professional training and help to interpret our findings, and make appropriate changes.

Responsible Entities: All faculty.

Continue to develop student skills and training in research and work experience through workshops, internships, in-service training or other extracurricular opportunities.

Plan for Action:
Continue to provide field research opportunities and work-related experiences, enhance
research opportunities, and develop student internships and service-learning
opportunities.

Responsible Entities: Program Coordinator and faculty.

Create more opportunities for students to engage in the discipline and with each other, and strengthen the roles and
activities of the student club.

Plan for Action:
Seek further involvement opportunities for students (in addition or conjunction with being
Supplemental Instructors, participating in the student Anthropology Club, study abroads and
other fieldtrips, the archaeological field school, and the annual Department Student Research
Conference, being scholarship recipients, and attending departmental parties, fund raising and
service activities).

Responsible Entities: Student Club, Program faculty, and Department

Committees.

f. Continue to refine the scholarship award policies and procedures.

Plan for Action:
(1) Review and adjust the department/program role in scholarship allocation, selection, and
announcement as the university continues to alter its course of action.
(2) Put into place more feedback mechanisms to follow-up on scholarship recipients in terms of
institutional processing of awards and making appropriate responses to donors (i.e., notification and
appreciation).

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator, and Department Student
Scholarships and Awards Committee.

a. Enhance student communication and participation in the program.
Plan for Action:
Develop more efficient ways to communicate with students and alumni concerning
department/program events and activities, advisement, graduation, surveys, and so on. Current
contact information needs to be collected and updated systematically and electronic systems of
contact need to be developed.

Responsible Entities: Department faculty, our student club, and Department Secretary.

g. Develop better tracking and outreach systems of our graduates/alumni.
Plan for Action:
(1) Conduct and analyze an alumni survey developed by the program.
(2) Create a more efficient process with financially feasible methods for contacting alumni on a
regular basis to communicate departmental/program news and events.
(3) Create an alumni database system for longitudinal assessment.

Responsible Entities: Department Alumni Tracking & Outreach Committee, Department Chair,
Program Coordinator, and Department Secretary.

3. Faculty and Staff Development and Assessment:
a. Continue to work on improved methods of faculty and staff evaluation.
Plan for Action:

(1) Continue to review, revise, and streamline all forms of our evaluation processes: i.e., for Merit
Review, Peer Review, Faculty 1' and 2" Year Reviews, Ranking and Tenure Review, Post-tenure

Review, personal goals-setting, and PREP. These are continually revised each time they are used to provide for flexibility and fairness, but we need to continue to monitor the process to ensure objectivity with reliable and valid results.

(2) Refine the adjunct evaluation process to improve feedback and changes.

(3) Provide feedback to Human Resources and suggest changes in the PREP evaluation process.

(4) Continue to work with the university to provide meaningful support, reward, or incentive for evaluation (beyond the intrinsic values of promotion, tenure, and feedback for improvement). This is difficult because there has historically been little or no monetary or teaching /workload compensation attached to these processes.

(5) Strike a desirable balance of evaluating faculty and staff sufficiently and efficiently without this becoming overly burdensome to those being evaluated and those doing the evaluations or without the process of evaluation becoming the ends rather than the means to improvement.

(6) Communicate with the Human Resources department and administration about our concern that there is a mismatch between the department secretary's job description and the realities of the job's tasks being evaluated and try to correct this problem by the institution re-analyzing the job description and process.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, the Department Ranking and Tenure Committee, and the Department Faculty Peer Review Committee.

b. Continue to create more integration and interaction among the faculty.

Plan for Action:
Continue to provide further opportunities for faculty interaction and exchange: e.g., team-taught classes, cross-listed courses, guest lecturing in classes across the programs, collaborative research projects and proposals, engaging in department and program meetings, social events, and sharing departmental tasks and projects through creating department committees composed of faculty from both programs.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, all department faculty.

c. Continue to review and implement the adjunct policy and procedures recruit more adjuncts.

Plan for Action:
(1) Continue to monitor the department adjunct policy and procedures through program assessment and adjunct interviews. The department Adjunct Policy and Procedures Committee should be reactivated to oversee this.

(2) Recruit more adjuncts based on program needs and budget availability.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator

d. Seek more opportunities for faculty and staff professional growth.

Plan for Action:
(1) Seek new resources and avenues of growth. This will probably require reactivating the Department Professional Growth and Development Committee.

(2) Develop ways to compensate the program for faculty who are reassigned to engage in professional activities.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator, Department Secretary

f. Seek additional avenues of teaching load flexibility.

Plan for Action:
Work with the Dean, Provost and other parties who govern teaching assignments and loads in the university to explore ways to achieve teaching load flexibility for multiple purposes.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator

4   Resources:

   a   Obtain an increased departmental E&G/Legislative-derived operating budget.

      Plan for Action:

      Work with the college and university on fiscal planning and annual budget allocations to obtain more money for current expenses, as the department is continuously being expected to absorb additional costs with no budget increase for such items and activities as recruitment, equipment maintenance (e.g., light bulbs in classroom projects cost nearly $400 apiece), year-end graduation functions, etc.

      Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator, and Dean.

   b. Help the university to: improve faculty and staff compensation: increase rates of adjunct/overload pay; increase budget for offering more courses on and off campus; reduce teaching/workload; and secure additional faculty positions.

      Plan for Action:

      (1) Continue effort in improving salaries, especially in achieving appropriate staff compensation and equity pay for senior faculty. Overload pay rates also need to be addressed.

      (2) Acquire additional adjunct monies to expand and strengthen the course offerings. We need to more successfully recruit and adequately compensate adjunct and part-time or non-tenure track faculty. We have difficulty maintaining an adequate adjunct pool. There are very few anthropologists to be found in the region (usually only a few in Salt Lake City or Logan), and it becomes especially challenging to attract adjuncts with the low pay scale at WSU.

      (3) Maintain the positive aspects and growth of our programs by seeking ways to increase the number of faculty (full time and adjuncts) and/or increase the budget for offering more classes. This would allow for sustaining enrollment growth through providing more class/course offerings on and off campus, and enhancing opportunities for expanding program activities and expertise. The Davis Campus is of special concern in this respect.

      (4) Obtain adequate program compensation for sabbatical leaves or reassigned time needed for professional growth and service. The department currently has to absorb these opportunities for faculty with no compensation.

      Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator, and Dean.

   c.   Improve our departmental equipment and capital resources.

      Plan for Action:

      Develop a more systematic equipment maintenance and replacement/acquisition schedule. The department operates a growing amount of equipment and teaching resources (e.g., copy machines, printers, faxes, portable computers, refrigerator, microwave, scanner, projectors, portable video machines), which have become its responsibility to maintain and replace with no increased budget to do so. For the programs to grow, there will be ever-greater equipment demands on both campuses.

      Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Dean, and College Development Officer.

   d   Create better avenues and strategies for external fund raising.

      Plan for Action:

      (1) Locate, contact, and encourage more community members, alumni, and others interested in the department to make contributions for program development.

      (2) Obtain more funding for student scholarships.

      (3) Obtain increased funding for field school and field trips.

      (4) Obtain permanent funding for such annual department activities as our Student Research Conference, Awards Program, and special workshops.

      (4) Obtain funding for student research support, and enhancing learning resources.

      (5) Create a Board of "Friends of the Department/Program" who can advise us and help us in these fund raising efforts.

Responsible Entities: Department Chair, Program Coordinator and other faculty, and the College Development Officer.

5. University/Community Service and Interaction:
   a. Continue to build ties and communication with other campus programs, sister programs in other state institutions, and the community.

   Plan for Action:
   Establish improved inter-institutional interactions for purposes of expanding resources, expertise, and program offerings. This would prove beneficial to students, faculty, and institutions.
   Responsible Entities: Faculty and Program Coordinator.

   b. Develop and/or enhance advisory boards for the programs.

   Plan for Action:
    (1) Seek more involvement from the defunct advisory board of the Archaeological Technician Program Advisory Board beyond that of assessment (e.g, recruitment, fund raising, job placement assistance, networking).
    (2) Create program or department community-based board to facilitate recruitment, assessment, fund raising, job placement, and communication with the off-campus community.

   Responsible Entities: Program with Program Coordinator and College Development Officer.