

**CHICO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**ASSESSMENT SUMMARY UPDATE**

PROGRAM: MA in Anthropology

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
2013-2014	ANTH SLO #1 “Reasoning/Scholarship” ANTH SLO #2 “Methods” ANTH SLO #4 “Professionalism”	<p>For SLO #1 and #2, a major semester-long research paper was selected from the ANTH 601 Graduate Seminar in Physical Anthropology. For SLOs 1 (a) and (b), there were 11 papers that were measured against a scoring rubric that measured for a well-structured research question, originality, writing style, adequacy of the bibliography, and the proper citation and referencing of sources. The final oral presentation assessed three main areas: organization, content, and presentation delivery.</p> <p>For SLO #4, student prepared and delivered a lecture to the large introductory cultural anthropology class taught by Dr. Schaefer, ANTH 113 (Human Cultural Diversity). This presentation was measured against a rubric developed for this assessment, which included non-verbal eye contact, vocals, organization, content, and presentation aids.</p>	<p>Overall, students wrote very solid research papers Student performance was lowest (93%) for originality and was highest for the thoroughness of the bibliography (96%). All 11 student presentations were of high quality, and students put forth an enormous amount of effort in making the presentations appear professional. In comparing the differences between the practice and actual oral presentations in ANTH 113, the findings show an overwhelming improvement in student skills for developing and delivering a professional lecture in the field of anthropology.</p>	<p>No improvement actions were planned at the conclusion of the academic year.</p>

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
2014-2015	ANTH SLO #1 “Reasoning/Scholarship” ANTH SLO #2 “Methods”	For SLO #1, a major semester-long research paper was selected for all three graduate seminars (ANTH 601, 602, and 603) done in multiple drafts. Papers were measured against a scoring rubric that measured for a well-structured research question, originality, writing style, adequacy of the bibliography, and the proper citation and referencing of sources. For SLO #2, the final oral presentation assessed three main areas: organization, content, and presentation delivery.	Overall, students wrote very solid research papers, with strong evidence for originality, consulting peer-reviewed literature, good organization, and providing logical argumentation, resulting in a mean of 93%, with a high of 98% and a low of 83%. All student presentations were of high quality, and students put forth an enormous amount of effort in making their presentations appear professional for all three seminars. Therefore, the oral component for all three seminars reveal a mean of 95%, with a low of 87% and the highest at 100%. In sum, the quality of the students' work had improved by the end of the semester in all three graduate core seminars.	No improvement actions were planned at the conclusion of the academic year.
2015-2016	ANTH SLO #2 “Methods”	For this SLO, the assessment activity is an evaluation of the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 candidacy exams. The candidacy exams were assessed using a 6-component rubric: 1) Clearly outlined research question; 2) Originality in thought; 3) Organization of the paper; 4) Proper writing style and structure; 5) Adequate/appropriate source material used; and 6) Correct citation of source material. Each component was given a score between 0-10.	Fall 2015: 62.5% (5/8) of the students passed the exams with either “pass” or “provisional” as scores. 37.5% (3/8) of the students had one “no pass” and passed a retake exam the subsequent semester. The overall mean score was 82.36%.  Spring 2016: 100% (1/1) passed the exams. The mean score was 94.40%.	As the candidacy exams are a standardized program requirement, no improvement actions are planned at this point for the exams themselves.

Year of review	Student Learning Outcome	Describe assessment activity done this year for this SLO	Findings	Based on the results or evidence, what action was taken regarding program improvements?
2016-2017	ANTH SLO #1 “Reasoning/Scholarship” ANTH SLO #2 “Methods” WASC SLO Written Communication	For these SLOs, the assessment activity is an evaluation of the Fall 2016 candidacy exams. The candidacy exams were assessed by three assessors using a 4-component rubric: 1) Content; 2) Organization; 3) Sources and Evidence; and 4) Grammar Style. Each component was given a score between 1-4.	Fall 2016: 80% (8/10) of the students passed the exams with either “pass” or “provisional” as scores. 20% (2/10) of the students had one “no pass” and required a retake exam the subsequent semester.	This year’s assessment prompted a discussion of how to have students sit for the exams earlier than the 3 <sup>rd</sup> semester of their graduate program so issues, like those highlighted in the “no passes” given, can be addressed sooner. Starting Spring 2019, the department will test a new candidacy system with those students in their 2 <sup>nd</sup> semester of the program.
2017-2018	ANTH SLO #3 “Communication” WASC SLO Oral Communication	For these SLOs, the assessment activity is an evaluation of 2 Spring 2018 oral thesis defenses. The defenses were assessed by two assessors using a 3-component rubric: 1) Content; 2) Organization; and 3) Delivery. Each component was given a score between 1-4.	Spring 2018: 100% (2/2) of the students passed the oral defenses with average scores of 3.7 and 3.8 respectively.	As the oral defenses are a cumulating activity for the program, they assessed competency in professional presentation of original research. The results showed strong competency overall but differences in delivery and organization. One program improvement moving forward is to use the same rubric to assess earlier program oral presentations to allow students to become more familiar with program expectations.