

**College of Letters & Science  
Assessment Report**

*(Due May 1, 1998)*

**Department of Anthropology**

**Abstract**

In assessing our undergraduate and graduate curriculum it has become clear that we will need to ensure that our program of advising is widened to include vocational and professional advice, and that advisors and advisees need to have closer working relationships. Also problematic was the lack of notice that some faculty gave advisees of their intended absence from campus. Both these problems will be addressed through a clear statement of rights and responsibilities that will be drawn up next semester in consultation with student representatives.

**Assessment Tools Used:**

***Direct Indicators***

	Undergraduate Major	Graduate Program
National Exams	_____	_____
Local Exams	_____	_____
Capstone Course(s)	_____	_____
Embedded Testing	_____	_____
Student Portfolios	Yes _____	Yes _____
Review theses & dissertations	Yes _____	Yes _____
Performance Evaluations	Yes _____	Yes _____
Pre and Post Testing	_____	_____

***Indirect Indicators***

	Undergraduate Major	Graduate Program
Student Surveys	Yes _____	Yes _____
Exit Interviews	_____	_____
Alumni Surveys	_____	_____
Employer Surveys	_____	_____
External Reviews	_____	_____

Narrative:

The assessment plan for our undergraduate and graduate programs was established with the central aim of making existing measure and means of assessment relevant to our understanding of the working of our curriculum as a whole. To this end we concentrated on developing a view of the student body through a number of measures (n.b. only partly indicated in the College's checklist of indicators).

Firstly, we paid close attention to progress through the curriculum, as reflected in the timely taking of required courses, the pursuit of honors, evidence of distinctions and routine competencies (as with the English requirement). In order to generate the appropriate data we abstracted various statistical measures. For undergraduates these were; date of graduation, multiple majors, progress in sectional requirements, in seminar requirements, English competency, number of credits (including advanced credits), percentage of honors students and distinctions gained.

We also sought to achieve a close monitoring by advisors of the progress of their advisees in anticipation of this assessment exercise. We combined this active measure with a specific initiative to canvass student opinion as to the effectiveness of advising. We felt that this would complement these faculty derived measures and so provide of more rounded picture of our advising.

To this end, both undergraduate and graduate student bodies were polled and interviewed by the student representatives to our Curriculum Committee (thereby hopefully ensuring candid disclosure of any problems). Their responses were redacted and given to the Curriculum Committee as a verbal report. We also accepted individual observations by faculty, staff and students that were submitted.

In addition we took close note of the student evaluations of our courses over the last two semesters. We found a consistent pattern of lower rating for the larger courses. However, this is consistent with our teaching experience over many years and we feel reflects the inevitable distance that opens up in courses with registration of 200 upwards. None the less, we do take satisfaction in the consistently high quality of instructor performance (over 4.5 is not unusual for our department) that students consistently note in classes under 50.

A number of particular measure were also used for assessing the effectiveness of the graduate curriculum. In particular we looked at financial support finding some 30% of our graduates receiving financial support from the department or university. This is an increase on the 1994-5 figures. This we feel is reflected in the relatively steady progress our graduates display with a mean time to the Master's at 2.9 years and to the PhD 8 years. Again these figures are an improvement on those for 1994-5.

**From:** Carolyn Hager <chager@facstaff.wisc.edu>  
**To:** LetSci1.Admin(ATkinson)  
**Date:** 5/4/98 8:45am  
**Subject:** Assessment Report

Hi Deanna,  
 Once more I'll send this. Let me know if there are problems.  
 Carolyn

Curriculum Assessment Report

>  
 > Department of Anthropology

> Abstract

> In assessing our undergraduate and graduate curriculum >  
 it has become clear that we will need to ensure that our program of  
 advising is widened to include vocational and professional advice,  
 and  
 > that advisors and advisees need to have closer working  
 > relationships. Also problematic was the lack of notice that  
 some faculty gave advisees of their intended absence from campus.  
 Both these problems will be addressed through a clear statement of  
 rights and responsibilities that will be drawn up next semester in  
 consultation with student representatives.

>>Assessment Tools Used: >>Direct Indicators

	Undergraduate	Graduate
	Major	Program
>>National Exams##	##	##
>>Local Exams###	##	##
>>Capstone Course(s)#	##	##
>>Embedded Testing##	##	##
>>Student Portfolios##	yes	##   yes
>>Review theses & dissertations#	yes	#   yes
>>Performance Evaluations#	yes	##   yes
>>Pre and Post Testing##	##	##
>>Indirect Indicators		
>>#####	Undergraduate	Graduate
>>#####	Major	Program

>>Student Surveys## \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_ ## \_\_\_\_\_ yes \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>>Exit Interviews## \_\_\_\_\_ ## \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>>Alumni Surveys## \_\_\_\_\_ ## \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>>Employer Surveys# \_\_\_\_\_ ## \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>>External Reviews## \_\_\_\_\_ ## \_\_\_\_\_  
>>  
>>

> Narrative of the Assessment Plan

>  
> The assessment plan for our undergraduate and graduate  
> programs was established with the central aim of making  
> existing measure and means of assessment relevant to our  
> understanding of the working of our curriculum as a whole.  
> To this end we concentrated on developing a view of the  
> student body through a number of measures (n.b. only partly  
> indicated in the College's checklist of indicators).  
>  
> Firstly, we paid close attention to progress through the  
> curriculum, as reflected in the timely taking of required  
> courses, the pursuit of honors, evidence of distinctions and  
> routine competencies (as with the English requirement). In  
> order to generate the appropriate data we abstracted various  
> statistical measures. For undergraduates these were; date of  
> graduation, multiple majors, progress in sectional  
> requirements, in seminar requirements, English competency,  
> number of credits (including advanced credits), percentage  
> of honors students and distinctions gained.  
>  
> We also sought to achieve a close monitoring by advisors of  
> the progress of their advisees in anticipation of this  
> assessment exercise. We combined this active measure with a  
> specific initiative to canvass student opinion as to the  
>  
> effectiveness of advising. We felt that this would >  
> complement these faculty derived measures and so provide of  
> more rounded picture of our advising. >  
> To this end, both undergraduate and graduate student bodies  
> were polled and interviewed by the student representatives  
> to our Curriculum Committee (thereby hopefully ensuring  
> candid disclosure of any problems). Their responses were  
> redacted and given to the Curriculum Committee as a verbal  
> report. We also accepted individual observations by faculty,  
> staff and students that were submitted.  
>  
> In addition we took close note of the student evaluations of  
> our courses over the last two semesters. We found a  
> consistent pattern of lower rating for the larger courses.  
> However, this is consistent with our teaching experience  
> over many years and we feel reflects the inevitable distance  
> that opens up in courses with registration of 200 upwards.  
> None the less, we do take satisfaction in the consistently

> high quality of instructor performance (over 4.5 is not  
> unusual for our department) that students consistently note  
> in classes under 50.

>  
> A number of particular measure were also used for assessing  
> the effectiveness of the graduate curriculum. In particular  
> we looked at financial support finding some 30% of our  
> graduates receiving financial support from the department or  
> university. This is an increase on the 1994-5 figures. This  
> we feel is reflected in the relatively steady progress our  
> graduates display with a mean time to the Master's at 2.9  
> years and to the PhD 8 years. Again these figures are an  
> improvement on those for 1994-5.

>  
>  
Carolyn Hager  
Department Administrator  
UW - Dept. of Anthropology  
5243 Social Science Bldg.  
Madison, WI 53706

Phone: 608-262-2869  
FAX: 608-265-4216