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Overview

The Undergraduate Program Assessment focuses on our Anth 100 Introduction to Biological Anthropology course. Concerns center on the high DFW rates (27% 2011-2017) In AY 17-18, the college provided support for a graduate TA in one of the two Anth 100 sections. MA assessments focus on the culminating experience as in 2017. Finally, follow-through on the 2017 assessment recommendations are reviewed.

Mission Statement

The mission statement for the department covers the graduate and undergraduate programs, but the learning goals are program specific. Both the mission and learning goals were last revised and approved by the department in Spring 2017.

Anthropology at SFSU focuses on the study of human beings from archaeological, biological, cultural, and visual perspectives. Faculty at SF State have research programs in the Bay Area, across the United States, and internationally. We bring this experience to the classroom and into the community. The location of the campus in San Francisco, a diverse, cosmopolitan, urban setting, also enables strategic linkages with local premier universities where our students can take courses and pursue advanced graduate studies. Moreover, the San Francisco Bay Area offers countless occupational opportunities in both the public and private sector, ranging from high-tech and bio-technological industries to public social services working with diverse communities. Our setting also provides unique opportunities for students to learn by engaging directly with local resources and institutions.

To that end, the Anthropology Department offers a rigorous program with practical training in four sub-fields, identified as dynamic applied specializations. These both reflect the strengths of the faculty and prepare students for practical and creative occupational opportunities in the San Francisco Bay Area. The four subfields the department is committed to are:

- **Medical anthropology:** public health, human rights, community-based participatory research, and health of migrant populations;
- **Visual representation:** ethnographic and applied film making, critique of visual ideology, origins of art, still image and photography;
- **Bioarchaeology:** contextualized skeletal and dental analyses, health of past populations, and osteology in a medico-legal context; and
- **Political Archaeology:** historical archaeology, indigenous/native archaeologies, political uses of the past, ancient political systems, the archaeology of the contemporary past.

Our students explore the theoretical foundations and ethical obligations of the discipline, gain an appreciation for diversity in lifeways, and acquire an understanding of how anthropology can benefit their own communities. Our department creates opportunities for students to practice experiential learning, carry out hands-on field research, and develop independent research. The training students receive reflects the University mission of serving communities, promoting mutual respect, and fostering social responsibility.
Part I Undergraduate Assessments

Learning Goals for the UG Major

I. Diversity: Have an awareness and knowledge of a culturally and biologically diverse world. (Intro Core Courses 100, 110, 120; elective courses)
   a. Describe the field of anthropology and its objectives.
   b. Demonstrate knowledge of how culturally informed beliefs, behaviors, and perspectives vary between diverse global societies.
   c. Demonstrate understanding of how anthropologists study diversity in race, class, gender identity, and age.
   d. Demonstrate comparative understanding of how material culture and symbolic representations vary across diverse societies over time.
   e. Explain the basic processes of biological evolution and the general course of human evolution.

II. Theory: Understand the fundamental principles of the three major subfields. (Anth 300, Area 1 Theory and Foundations; upper division requirement in the 3 subfields)
   a. Characterize the distinctive theoretical and methodological approaches of anthropology.
   b. Critically examine one’s own cultural and social identities and understand how those identities shape beliefs and attitudes.
   c. Understand major causes of social inequality and how to address them through civic engagement.
   d. Articulate a scientific understanding of human biological diversity and the ethical concerns arising from studies of that diversity.
   e. Demonstrate knowledge of the wide range of past and present human biocultural systems, including ecological relationships, social and cultural organization, and processes of cultural change.

III. Method: Use theoretical knowledge to critically analyze and interpret anthropological evidence. (Area 2 Methods and Practicum - Culminating Experience)
   a. Understand research project design and the role of data analysis or qualitative analysis.
   b. Present opposing viewpoints and alternative hypotheses on various anthropological issues.
   c. Gather and interpret information from diverse sources, including local resources of the Bay Area where relevant.
   d. Demonstrate applied skills in at least one of the subfields of anthropology.
   e. Write concisely and logically, incorporating relevant data and knowledge.

Course requirements for the major are in Appendix 1.
Anth 100 DFW Rates

Anth 100 has DFW rates of 27% (2011-2017) with enrollments of 3,100 during that same time period\(^1\), which is significantly higher than our other two introductory courses, Anth 110 Intro Archaeology (11%) and Anth 120 Intro Sociocultural Anthropology (12%). In the College of Liberal and Creative Arts, the only courses with higher DFW rates were two upper division courses PHIL 680 (30%) and THA454 (39%). For other lower division GE courses in the college, the next highest DFW rates were for CWL260 (22%); PLSC 275 (21%); and for CLR 250 and MUS 120 (18%). While not a traditional assessment measure targeted at specific learning goals for our majors, it is unlikely that students are meeting the associated goals if they are not successful in the course. Furthermore, this evaluation aligns with the CSU and University Graduation Initiative 2025.

The Program Learning Goals that are mapped with Anth 100 are:

1. Describe the field of anthropology and its objectives.
2. Demonstrate understanding of how anthropologists study diversity in race, class, gender identity, and age.
3. Explain the basic processes of biological evolution and the general course of human evolution.
4. Articulate a scientific understanding of human biological diversity and the ethical concerns arising from studies of that diversity.

The course also fulfills GE LD-B2: Life Science and must meet the following learning outcomes:

1. Gather and interpret scientific information from a variety of sources and use that information to discuss scientific issues.
2. Describe ethical or sociological dilemmas arising out of scientific research and applications, which may include those related to social justice, and may have implications for local and/or global communities.
3. Use scientific theories and methods of inquiry to explain phenomena observed in laboratory or field settings.
4. Discuss the relevance of major scientific theories and/or research to modern day life.

Assessment Methods

Anth 100 has two sections per semester with enrollments between 75-125 students per section. Here we compare DFW rates from one of the sections each semester in AY16-17 and AY17-18. All sections were taught by the same instructor with no major changes in content or method of evaluation between the two years. In all four sections, 50% of the grade was based on responses to daily clicker questions at the start and end of each lecture and 50% was based on the scores of five announced tests administered throughout the semester. Students can miss some classes or answer incorrectly and still perform well on the daily response questions because the points available to earn (~225 pts) exceed the 150 points comprising the final grade.

---
\(^1\) All DFW data, apart from that collected in the targeted sections is from the CSU Student Success Dashboard.
The only major difference across the two years was that a GA was assigned to the course for AY17-18. The GA attended all lectures for content preparation. The duties directly impacting students were in holding weekly office hours for one-on-one tutoring and in leading group review sessions before each of the five exams. Results of analyses were similar when done by semester and by academic year so only the results by academic year are presented. Overall DFW results were compared in the year with and without a GA. Further analyses looked at the interaction of class attendance and class performance to identify subgroups of students where different intervention strategies might be appropriate.

Results

*Impact of a GA in improving on student outcomes:* DFW rates were slightly higher in AY17-18 with a GA than in AY16-17 without a GA but this difference was not significant (chi-square, 1-sided, $p = 0.339$). It is concerning that the DFW rates in both years exceed even the 2011-2017 average rate of 27%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Grades</th>
<th>No GA (N=155)</th>
<th>GA (n=193)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/F/W</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In considering the lack of GA impact, the instructor and GA reported low utilization of both GA office hours and exam review sessions. While numbers of students meeting during office hours was not tracked, sign-in sheets were used for most the review sessions. In F17, an average of six students attended review sessions 2-5, thirteen were unique because some students attended multiple sections. In Sp18, the instructor suggested to low-performing students that they use the GA hours, but this had no impact on the number of students going to review sessions with an average of 5.5 students attending review sessions 1-5, eleven of whom were unique.

The 24 students who did attend at least one review session in Fall and Spring were self-selected, and they differ from the rest of the student population in being more likely to do well in the course and in attending significantly more of the lectures. Only two of the 24 failed the course (8.3% D/F/W) and both missed three of the five exams while attending 26% and 76% of the lectures. The other students had an average attendance of 91% (80-100%). More engaged students were more likely to attend the review sessions, but did attendance impact their grades? Eliminating two students who attended all review sessions and one who attended review sessions but did not take that exam, the average grades of the remaining 21 were compared when they did and did not come to review sessions. Six students did worse (mean = - 5.9%) and fifteen did better (mean = +7.2%) when they attended review sessions before the exams. Without even considering other factors such as students attending reviews covering material they find more difficult, it does suggest review sessions benefitted students who attended. Unfortunately, the low participation means most students did not receive these benefits.
Lecture attendance and Grades: Average attendance was 80% but with considerable variation (s.d. = 21.7%). There is a strong correlation (r = 0.918) between lecture attendance and grades, but these are not independent measures because clicker questions given during lectures total 50% of the final grade (Figure 1). Further analysis looked at exam grades separately to remove the dependent effects of attendance on final grades.

Students not Dropping the Course: The data point at the zero intersection in Figure 1 represents 29 students who received no clicker grades and no exam scores, although they did attend the first day of class. The analyses that follow exclude those students who did not attend beyond the first class.

Exam Grades and Attendance: Students who miss lectures also tend to perform poorly on the exams (r = 0.653, Figure 2). The graph shows attendance cut-offs (<50%, 50-75%, >75%) with student populations that may need different strategies to address D/F/W rates.

Attendance and Missed Tests: Some students miss exams although dates are clearly given on the syllabus (Table 1). Of interest are students who attend >50% of the lectures, but still do not take all of the exams. When more than one exam is missed it is generally a drop off at the end of the semester as students have stopped participating in the course or it is a cluster in the middle. The latter cases might signal student having a personal issues mid-semester that they try to recover from but too late in the semester to have an impact. Even some of the students attending >75% of the lectures are also missing exams, which greatly impacts the final grade.
Students who miss none or only one of the tests and attend greater than 50% of the lectures (in red on Table 1) are potential targets for interventions to increase their performance in the class such as pointing out the impacts of missing lectures and encouraging them to take advantage of tutoring. Together with administrative drops, the D/F/W rates could be decreased to as low as 16.5% if all of these students successfully completed the course.

**Comparison to Anth 110 D/F/W:** We had data on performance and attendance in Anth 110 Intro to Archaeology, which is also a large LD-GE course (Area C2 Humanities). Data are from two sections taught by the same instructor in AY17-18. Grades are structured much differently than Anth 100 with final grades comprised of 10% attendance/daily clicker responses, 20% weekly on-line quizzes and 70% three in-class exams. Scheduling also differs considerably with Anth 100 on MWF 11:00-11:50 am and Anth 110 on Th 4:00-6:45 pm.

**Table 2. Anth 100 Attendance and Missed Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Number of Missed Tests (N = 182)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/F/W</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/F/W</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/F/W</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only two students stopped attending before the drop period and they were excluded from the rest of the analysis. The D/F/W rates were considerably lower than for Anth 100 (23%, Table 3) but show the same trend of being higher than the 2011-2017 average of 11%. It will be interesting to see if this trend is apparent in the D/F/W data for LD-GE courses in other departments when the data is available.

**Table 3. Anth 110 D/F/W**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Grades</th>
<th>AY17-18 (N =178)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D/F/W</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/B/C</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anth 110 Attendance:** Attendance comprises only 10% of the Anth 110 grade so the percentage earned on the tests and assignments alone was not separately analyzed. Average lecture attendance was lower at 71% (s.d. = 20.6) than in Anth 100 at 80% This may reflect that Anth 110 is a once a week class and excluding test dates, missing only one lecture day decreases percentage attended by 23%. Anth 110 also shows a weaker correlation between attendance and the final grades, 90% comprised of tests
Anthropology and assignments (Figure 3; \( r = 0.525 \)). This suggests students are able to do more self-teaching from the text and other materials for the Anth 110 course. Differences in attendance vs performance are also clear in comparison of the graphs where more students attending <75% of the time in Anth 110 were able to pass the course with a C or better than in Anth 100 (Figure 3; see also Figures 1 & 2).

*Figure 3. Anth 110 Scatterplot of Final Course % and % of Lectures Attended (N = 178)*

D/F/W rate comparisons

We have considered course content a major factor in the high D/F/W rates for Anth 100 because many student struggle more with math and science classes. The data from other GE B2 (Table 4) courses was somewhat of a surprise given that the course most similar in content (Bio 101 Human Biology) has a D/F/W rate of only 8% (Table 4) and Anth 100 rates exceed all other GE B2 courses. Differences in students taking the course may explain some of the differences. Anthropology may attract students who think it will be less difficult for a science course, especially since we are in LCA and biology is in COSE. But given the wide difference in D/F/W rates, other courses may utilize more efficient teaching strategies that we could apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFSU GE B2: Life Sciences</th>
<th>Intro Bio Anth: Other</th>
<th>D/F/W %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTH 100 Intro Bio Anth</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 100 Human Biology</td>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 150 The World of Plants</td>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 160 Marine Biology</td>
<td>Bakersfield</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 170 Animal Diversity</td>
<td>Fullerton</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL 176 Sci &amp; Politics of Stem Cell Bio</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL 105 History of Life</td>
<td>Nothridge</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOG 160 Intro to Environ Sci</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRS 276 Race Activism &amp; Climate Justice</td>
<td>San Bernadino</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also compared data from Intro Bio Anth courses from across the CSU where there is an extremely wide range (8-35%), but our Anth 100 is still in the top 25% for D/F/W rates. While there are many differences in student populations (e.g., academic preparation; % of commuters; individual program rigor) that can impact these data, it nonetheless suggests improvements could be made.

Anthropology 2018
Discussion
The suggestions below are a starting point for addressing D/F/W rates. Strategies to implement will be discussed throughout the academic year, particularly among instructors who have taught the Anth 100 course. However, given the trends of higher D/F/W rates also seen in Anth 110, there is a wider discussion to be had across the department about teaching the large introductory courses.

GA utilization: Given the Anth 100 lecture attendance results, it is not surprising that few students attended extra sessions for help. In some cases, this could be due to scheduling conflicts given the time demands of commuting, jobs and other classes that our students often face. It is possible that the use of technology for virtual meetings and review sessions could have increased access and utilization rates. Having the GA contacting specific students to set up individual appointments might also increase the rate at which students come in for tutoring. This might be very effectively targeted toward those students attending >75% of the lectures but still struggling with their grades.

Administrative Course Drops: If the 29 students only attending the first lecture had dropped the course, the D/F/W rates would decrease from 36.3% to 32.4%. Students should be followed up more closely in the first two weeks and syllabus policy established for administrative drops.

Attendance: Attendance is one of the most crucial issues that needs to be addressed. Although the syllabus for Anth 100 states that attendance is critical to passing the course, actually showing students this data linking attendance to final course grades at the start of the semester might make a bigger impact.

Some students attending >50% of lectures and missing multiple tests may have personal issues that fall beyond the scope of faculty interventions, although outreach to these students could cause them to rethink taking the course in that semester or direct them to campus resources if they are having difficulties. Unfortunately students not coming to > 50% of lectures may be the most difficult to reach. The group attending 50-75% of the lectures could be a better target; clear warnings that their grade is in danger because of attendance could yield some improvements. Even though the consequences of non-attendance should be clear in their cumulative iLearn grades, students can be in denial about such issues. The daily clicker question grades are also very high stakes at 50% of the grade. Is it possible that students who have attendance difficulties for a part of the class become discouraged that they can not make it up? While difficult to say with the data we have, such questions merit discussion.

Engagement: Attendance can also be linked to engagement. While clickers are used in both Anth 100 and 110, they are no longer a “novel” item and need to be used interactively if they are to promote engagement. The instructor for Anth 100 encourages students to discuss the clicker questions amongst themselves, which provides an opportunity to score more questions correctly. However, in the most recent year or two, the instructor has noted students have a greater tendency to “go it alone” and forego peer-to-peer learning (digital society effect??). Once that dynamic is set up, it can be difficult to overcome so it must be addressed at the beginning of the semester. Getting students to introduce themselves and form “group clusters” to answer a few initial questions, while monitoring to make sure no students are left out, would need to start in the first class. Once established, since students tend to sit in the same area, stable groups can form. This could also boost attendance because peers will notice another students absences and the social aspects of peer interactions could provide incentives to attend.
Students who Struggle: Students who are attending lecture (particularly >75%) and taking most or all of the tests can be targeted for tutoring and extra help. If they are identified early in the semester, they can be directed to come to review sessions for the course, but also be advised about the help available to develop study skills through LAC and CARP. While all students could benefit from these services, the greatest impact would be for students whose main issue is academic performance not attendance.

Teaching Strategies: The Department has already been planning to invite CEETL for at least one workshop in the Fall semester. Given the data on the Anth 100 course, we will be specifically asking them to facilitate a discussion on engagement and teaching strategies in large lecture courses. The Biology Department, whose content in Anth 101 Human Biology has some parallels with the Anth 100 course are also a potential resource for successful teaching strategies.

Data Collection: Why don’t students come to class? If we identify this as a key factor in D/F/W rates, finding out why is importance. Is it the delivery of the course a problem? Are students discourage early in the semester? How many of the students are impacted by the financial challenges of the Bay Area, which can link to student homelessness, food insecurity, long commute times, and more hours working? Collecting this data will help us to better direct our efforts toward what we can control to improve student performance.
Part II MA Program Assessment

Learning Goals for the MA Program

The successful graduate student will:

1. Possess advanced knowledge and understanding of the concepts and theories of the three sub-disciplines covered by the Department.
2. Have the ability to analyze and evaluate complex data about human biological and cultural systems.
3. Have the ability to employ a comparative approach and make meaningful cross-cultural comparisons.
4. Demonstrate an advanced ability to perform all phases of anthropological fieldwork in one of the three sub-disciplines, including but not restricted to archaeological fieldwork, collection of biological data, ethnographic participant observation, interviewing, audio-visual and archival research methods.
5. Have skills at levels sufficiently high to allow them access to Ph.D. programs in their sub-field, or move directly into a professional employment in their sub-discipline.

Requirements for the MA program are given in Appendix III.

Thesis or Creative Work Evaluations

This assessment is a continuation of our 2017 assessment focused on the evaluations of MA culminating experiences, which are aligned with learning goals 4 and 5. While the results from last year were quite good, 2018 was the first time all graduating MA students had matriculated after our revisions to the graduate curriculum in AY2015-2016.

Methods of evaluation

The data were compiled from theses or creative works evaluations of MA students completing the program in 2018. Rubrics for individual students are completed by the student’s thesis advisor with input from the 2nd reader. Six theses and four creative works (films) were evaluated and compared to the 2014-2017 data previously complied. Each criterion was scored in four categories: inadequate, minimal pass, adequate pass, and pass with distinction.

Results

No student was scored inadequate for any criterion in either set of data so that category is eliminated from the results in Tables 5 and 6. This is not surprising because if a student were judged inadequate in any area, they would be asked to revise and resubmit before the thesis or creative work would be approved (the rubric is often used in draft evaluations). Minimal passes are also infrequent, although they can be sufficient to grant approval to a thesis.

Creative works: In general, the results indicate strong creative works projects in 2018 and in previous data. We did see some decrease in technical mastery, but for criteria 4-10 there is either continuation of high scores or an improvement as all 2018 earned a pass with distinction. Criterion 6-10 are particularly pertinent in terms of the required seminar and skills courses, which are preparations for these aspects of the Creative Works projects.
Table 5. MA Creative Works Evaluations1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Mastery</th>
<th>Minimal Pass</th>
<th>Adequate Pass</th>
<th>Pass with Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mastery of lighting, exposure, focus and camera movement</td>
<td>25% (17%)</td>
<td>25% (17%)</td>
<td>50% (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mastery of all necessary editing elements in the field</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25% (28%)</td>
<td>75% (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mastery of audio recording quality</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75% (70%)</td>
<td>25% (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Log, capture, and transcription of documentary video footage.</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>100% (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrated mastery of the digital editing software</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>100% (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Demonstration of proper fieldwork and research techniques, including ethnographic sensitivity.</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film’s Overall Applied Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Efficacy of strategic intervention plan and successful communication of ethnographic nuances.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(33%)</td>
<td>100% (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written User’s guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Relevance and quality of citations that establish the film’s scholarly foundation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0 (17%)</td>
<td>100% (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effective selection and summary of the film’s major points.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality of suggestions provided for facilitators of post-screening discussion.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100% (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Data 2018, n = 4; Percentage in parentheses data from 2014-2017, n = 6; dashes indicate no students in category in either year.

Thesis evaluations: Unlike 2014-2017, in 2018 there were no minimal passes for any criteria (Table 6). The biggest gains were in criterion under the Research and Literature categories. We do believe that the 1-unit skills courses introduced in the 2015 curriculum revision are working as intended by preparing students in the research skills needed before they undertake their thesis work.

Discussion

Overall MA students are performing well and show signs of continued improvement in their culminating experience work. The biggest challenge our MA program currently faces is in the recruitment of qualified applicants, which is where our efforts will be focused in AY 18-19. In addition to decreases in the number of applicants, MA students matriculating in 2017-18 were more underprepared for graduate work and faced more personal crises impacting their academic progress in comparison to past cohorts. How we handle cases such as these will be under discussion. We will also review syllabi and expectations for the required graduate seminars and 1-unit skills courses based on faculty experiences since these courses were introduced three years ago.
Recommendations 2018 Summary

Undergraduate Assessments

1. Discuss the results of the analyses in Anth 100/Anth 120 and develop ideas for targeting the different student populations to increase attendance and engagement and to encourage students who struggle to access resources.

2. Provide faculty teaching development opportunities focused on large lecture course strategies. Involve CEETL and consult with other departments such as Biology.
Table 6. MA Thesis Evaluations¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Minimal Pass</th>
<th>Adequate Pass</th>
<th>Pass with Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thesis develops a clear sense of core arguments</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>50% (55%)</td>
<td>50% (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The relationship between the core arguments and the question or</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>50% (45%)</td>
<td>50% (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research problem being posed is clearly established</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A focused development of the argument is sustained throughout the thesis</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100% (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thesis demonstrates a thorough and critical use of all of the</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>17% (40%)</td>
<td>83% (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>literature pertinent to the stated research problem(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion and synthesis of the literature pertinent to the thesis is both historical and synthetic</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100% (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The entire breadth and depth of the published literature is</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>17% (55%)</td>
<td>83% (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The thesis takes up an independent position in relation to the</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>66% (55%)</td>
<td>33% (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant literature on the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The thesis establishes a clear relation between the literature and the research, drawing conclusions and making connections not immediately evident in the existing literature itself</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50% (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The thesis demonstrates an appreciation of the range of different methodologies and of how the chosen research design suits the topic, as well as its possible limitations.</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83% (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The data generated and discussed are consistent with and support the arguments and interpretations put forward</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50% (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spelling, grammar, correct use of citations and construction of a bibliography is free of errors</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>33% (20%)</td>
<td>67% (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Material contained in tables or graphs is clearly and adequately presented, and sources provided</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(53%)</td>
<td>100% (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All components are integrated into a cohesive unit with a logical progression from one section/chapter to the next</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17% (50%)</td>
<td>83% (50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Data 2018, n = 6; Percentage in parentheses data from 2011-2014, n = 20

Collect data to determine why students do not attend class.
Graduate Assessments

Efforts this year will be focused on recruitment of qualified applicants. Decreased numbers of continuing students also provide the opportunity for us to:

1. Discuss how we can better serve students who struggle with work at the graduate level after admission into the program.

2. Revise and update our baseline syllabi for our graduate courses, map course and program learning outcomes, and identify overlaps and gaps in the curriculum.
Appendices

Appendix I. Undergraduate Major Requirements - 39-40 units

Core: All courses are required (18 units)
- Anth 100 Introduction to Biological Anthropology (3 units)
- Anth 110 Introduction to Archaeology (3 units)
- Anth 120 Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (3 units)
- Anth 130 Introduction to Visual Anthropology (3 units)
- Anth 300 Foundations of Anthropology: History (3 units)
- Anth 305GW Writing Anthropology (3 units)

Area 1: Theory and Foundations (Choose 1 course - 3 units)
- Anth 301 Foundations of Archaeology (3 units)
- Anth 302 Foundations of Human Variation (3 units)
- Anth 303 Foundations of Visual Anthropology (3 units)

Area 2: Methods and Practicum (Choose 1 course - 4-6 units) Students who take the 6 unit Anth 595 course will reduce their required Anth electives to 12 units. The methods and practicum course fulfills the university culminating experience requirement.
- Anth 333 Primate Behavior (4 units)
- Anth 530 Human Osteology Practicum (4 units)
- Anth 531 Human Evolution Practicum (4 units)
- Anth 592 Archaeological Methods (4 units)
- Anth 594 Zooarchaeology (4 units)
- Anth 557 Ethnography of the Inner City (4 units)
- Anth 595 Visual Anthropology I (6 units)
- Anth 596 Visual Anthropology II (4 units)
- Anth 651 Ethnographic Field Methods (4 units)
- Anth 652 Anthropological Statistics (4 units)

Electives, Anthropology (12-15 units): Electives are any upper division course with an ANTH prefix, including those from the two areas that have not been used to fulfill the Area requirements. Most students will need 12 units in ANTH, but students who complete 6 units from Area 2 reduce the Anth electives to 12 units.

No more than 6 units can be taken in Internships (695), Independent Study (699) and Teaching Assistantships (685) combined. (Note: Students may only receive credits toward the major for a total of 4 units of 685).

Subfield Requirement: At least 1 upper division course (Area 1, Area 2 or electives) must be taken in three subfields: Biological, Cultural/Visual, and Archaeology.
Appendix II. Culminating Experience

**Definition of the Culminating Experience from the Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees, Academic Senate Policy #S11-255**

**Culminating Experiences**

A culminating experience will be required of all students as part of all major programs. Departments and programs will design and implement capstone courses or other culminating experiences for major students at the senior level by Fall 2015. Maximum flexibility will be given to programs and departments in the design of these courses or other experiences, so long as they fulfill the spirit of the culminating experience concept.

**Definition:** The culminating experience requires students nearing the end of their college years to create a project that integrates and applies what they have learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of “best work”, or an exhibit. It might be attached to a formal course for credit, or might not. Culminating experiences should offer some hands-on element such as internship, study abroad, application of learned skills, or research within the field.

The following additional recommendations pertain:

1. Ideally, the culminating experience will integrate learning from the general education program and major as well as co-curricular activities.
2. It is further recommended that it include a significant writing component appropriate to the discipline.
3. The culminating experience may be designed as either individual or collaborative courses or projects.
4. Departments shall self-evaluate their culminating experience requirements at each program review.

**Anthropology Culminating Experience**

The culminating experience requirement for the B.A. degree in Anthropology is met by completing the Area 2: Methods and Practicum requirement.

To meet the culminating experience expectations, all Area 2 courses must include:

1. The use of applied skills in at least one of the subfields such as data collection, video production or other appropriate methodologies.
2. A final paper, portfolio of assignments, or creative works project that meets the following guidelines:
   a) A minimum 3000 words or the completion of a creative works project accompanied by a minimum 1500 word narrative.
   b) Incorporation of a major theoretical perspective of the field.
   c) A literature review that uses diverse sources and evaluates opposing arguments.
   d) Demonstration that the student understands data analysis or the appropriate construction of media representation.

Instructors are encouraged to incorporate Bay Area Resources if appropriate.
Appendix III MA Program Requirements (30 units)

Core: All courses are required (15 units)

Seminars
- ANTH 710 Proseminar in Anthropological Methods (3 units)
- ANTH 720 Foundations in Visual Anthropology (2 units)
- ANTH 721 Seminar in Archaeological Problems (2 units)
- ANTH 722 Seminar in Biological Anthropology (2 units)
- ANTH 723 Seminar in Problems in Cultural Anthropology (2 units)

Research Skills (1 unit each)
- ANTH 715 The Craft of Anthropological Writing
- ANTH 716 The Literature Review
- ANTH 717 The Research Proposal
- ANTH 718 The Grant Proposal

Electives (8-12 units)

To reach the minimum number of units required for the degree (30 units), students must:

- Take graduate elective classes (numbered 700 and above) selected from those offered in the Anthropology Department or, with approval, from other departments at SF State.

- Students are advised to take ANTH 899 Independent Study (1, 2, or 3 units) as part of their area of specialization. Students may take ANTH 899 no more than twice for a maximum total of six units.

- With approval, students may take upper division undergraduate classes.

NOTE: no more than 30% (nine units) of undergraduate course work may be included on the ATC. (Prerequisite course work may not be included on the ATC.)

Culminating Experience (3 units)

- ANTH 894 Creative Works Project OR ANTH 898 Master’s Thesis