

ANTHROPOLOGY AND GEOGRAPHY COURSE, PROGRAM AND GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR 2009-2010

Where are Anthropology and Geography in the Assessment Cycle?

We have integrated the comprehensive synthesis measures with the Senior Thesis. The Behavioral Science Senior Thesis data analysis is below. All courses are evaluated by their contribution to some of the values and goals expressed in that rubric.

Evidence is present in the integrated syllabi and course outcomes (along with measured outcomes in all introductory courses and selected upper division courses) which link directly into the assessment measure grid.

The key measure of success at the program level is the rubric developed for the analysis of the Senior Thesis.

We have completed 2 cycles of the assessment process which we began in 9/05.

What evidence supports the progress noted above?

The Senior Thesis data report is attached. All senior theses are on file (back to 1988) and available for review.

How has the program used the assessment evidence to improve the curriculum?

The Senior Thesis Assessment rubric supports the current curriculum.

A number of courses were modified in the period of 2004-2006 as a result of the initial assessment cycle. No major course modifications have been undertaken in the last 4 years, though classroom pedagogy has been moving to a more visually-driven model.

Links to Program Skills/Conceptual Understanding

All Anthropology and Geography courses require essay answers to tests. In the introductory courses these are relatively short answer essays done in class, while the upper division courses all essay exams are 'take-home', due a week after assignment. All essay questions are graded on the student's ability to illustrate their command of the subject matter based on making a synthetic analysis of a situation that was not covered specifically in class. They are graded on 1) their ability to clearly define and use appropriate terminology and related concepts, both in understanding the question and structuring their answer (40% of essay score); 2) their ability to argue a particular point of view in a lucid, clear and concise manner that relates the concepts and terminology to the argument they are developing (i.e., their ability to manipulate and use the course material)(40% of essay score); 3) Developing an analysis or point of view that goes beyond repetition of the material presented in class, developing their own 'voice' which shows command of the material (20% of essay score). Examples of essay questions can be seen in Appendix B.

COURSE-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT

BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE PROGRAM GOALS:

Competent understanding, synthesize, apply theory

Effective command of the subject material/professional terminology

Ability to acquire and apply research materials

Satisfactory level of understanding and application of the scientific method and scientific techniques

Awareness of cultural/ethnic diversity

Awareness of the complex relationship between social/group forces and individual perception
and/or behavior

Awareness of their own life experiences and how they relate to the group

Awareness of ethical issues within the professional discipline

UNIVERSITY GOALS-RELEVANT CORE VALUES TO PROGRAM GEN-ED:

Aware of cultural diversity / ethnocentrism

The student has exhibited the ability to view issues in a holistic form

The student has exhibited an understanding of the Marianist values of community and service
leadership

The Course-Specific Analysis is based on the following points:

1. Is there a relationship between the class 'picture' based on evals in terms of satisfaction levels and the success rate in assessment?
2. In the last 4 years I have moved to a very structured set of expectations in lower division courses with term guides and sample questions as part of initial course syllabus. Does this result in a) better retention (i.e., higher assessment scores); b) higher satisfaction with the course?
3. Has the change to more structured courses resulted in easier courses (measured both in lower scores in 'Course Challenging' on evals and higher % of B+ grades)?
4. Has the assessment/retention rate remained constant? Are there any suggestions that course content or design has changed assessment/retention rates? Is there any way to separate the issue of the validity of the assessment instrument (i.e., the questions used) from the assessment/retention rate? In other words, is it necessary to keep the same assessment questions or can they be changed without artificially compromising the 'apparent' assessment/retention rates?

COURSE-SPECIFIC ASSESSMENT RESULTS:

Lower Division General Education:

AN 200 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Assessments for 2003-05, 2007-08; Grading image for 2001-08. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course appears to do well in the General Education Goal of Marianist Community. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and being challenging. Assessment scores for ethics and ethnocentrism dropped dramatically (from 70% average down to 37%) when the questions were redesigned in 2007-08, so further modification of the questions has to be done. Anthropology conceptual understanding was generally very good. There was no

statistically significant correlation between course success/failure rates and either evaluations or assessment scores.

GE 102 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Assessments for 2004-09; Grading image for 2001-09. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appears to well across the board. It scores consistently well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community and Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and also in being challenging. Assessment scores for developing awareness and sensitivity for ethnocentrism and cultural diversity were good. There was no statistically significant correlation between course success/failure rates and either evaluations or assessment scores.

GE 103 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-08; Assessments for 2004-2008; Grading image for 2001-08. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appears to do well with the exception of the culture questions which were modified in 2007-08, so these will have to be re-examined. It scores consistently well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community and Sensitivity to Cultural Diversity. The course did well in student evaluations both in providing added value and also in being challenging. Assessment scores for developing cultural awareness were good until the question change in 2007, but sensitivity to ethnocentrism continued to do good except for a significant drop in 2008 when the questions was changed. Geography conceptual understanding was good.

Lower Division Courses:

AN 210 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2006, 2008-09; Assessments for 2006; Grading image for 2006-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course appeared to do well across the board. The 2006 assessment scored well in General Education Goals of Marianist Community. The course did well in the 2006 student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. Anthropology conceptual understanding was very good.

GE 204 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-08; Grading image for 2000-2008. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 85%+.

Upper Division Courses:

AN 340 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Grading image for 2001-2008. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 80%+ and course challenging scores at 85%+.

AN 350 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears: The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the valued added scores at 80%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

AN 357 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2000-08; Grading image for 2000-2008.

As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the valued added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

AN 360 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001, 2005-

9. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 90%+ and the course challenging scores at 90%+.

GE/ID 335 Data History: Course evaluations were analyzed for 2001-09; Grading image for 2001-2009. As a result of the combined analysis the following picture appears:

The course does well in student evaluations both for added value and also in being challenging. The goals in this course will be to keep the value added scores at 85%+ and the course challenging scores at 85%+. It should be noted that this course requires a group final project which is evaluated by members of the design and commercial development community on O`ahu so there is direct feedback on the level of competency presented by students. From 2007-2009 (the period in which external review and critique began) most student work has been evaluated at acceptable levels, with some group projects as very good. Usually there is one group per semester that fails the review, in every case due to lack of application and time spent on the project.