

Program Assessment Plan
 American University
 Academic Program: CAS: Anthropology - PhD

Academic Program: CAS: Anthropology - PhD

Contact Person for Delores Koenig

Assessment:

Unit's Primary Department: Anthropology

Learning Outcome: Theory

Students graduating with a PhD in Anthropology will be able to demonstrate familiarity with the major arguments shaping the classic and contemporary debates in anthropological theory, and in the particular area of anthropology of interest to each student's dissertation project.

Outcome Year: 2008-2009

2009-2010

2010-2011

Start Date: 04/01/2009

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Evaluation of the third written doctoral program comprehensive examination. Students write this comp during their last year of doctoral coursework and often during their last semester of course work. For most of our doctoral students, this is a watershed moment in their doctoral study: They have completed all (or almost all) of their course work and are beginning to write their dissertation proposal. The third comprehensive exam, usually a literature review on a topic related to the dissertation project, bridges the gap between classroom's supervised study and the independent work which the dissertation requires. This position makes the third comprehensive exam an especially appropriate resource for purposes of program assessment. We expect that a review of aggregate scores will allow faculty to set criteria defining effective levels of performance on each learning outcome, e.g. How many students satisfied the expectations of each learning outcome with an aggregate score of 3.0 or better? Was the mean aggregate score for the student cohort higher or lower than the idealized (3.0) mean? An individual student's performance can then be tabulated, in comparison to the other students, and the student cohort as a whole, in terms of such measures. Additionally, constructing these aggregate values allows us to propose improvements in the academic component of the PhD program. If, for example, the aggregate scores for one of the learning outcomes is far lower than the aggregate score for the other learning outcomes, we may infer that students are not as familiar with the academic content associated with the learning outcome. (There many be other reasons for the lower scores, of course, and those reasons need to be explored.) We need to review the courses in the PhD curriculum where the outcome-related academic content is addressed and, as appropriate, propose changes in the syllabus/ lesson plans in those courses to ensure that students are receiving appropriate instruction. The third comp is evaluated by two readers with each reader assigning the portfolio a 1-5 score (1-minimal evidence that outcome has been met; 5--ample evidence that outcome has been met) for each learning outcome. Reader scores will be averaged to obtain an aggregate scoring for each outcome.</p> <p>Measure Type: Quiz/ Exam</p>	<p>No target set: Since we have not yet implemented this measure, we need to see the overall profile of the student scores for each learning outcome, before making further statements about implications of outcome.</p>	<p>Third Comp is offered each semester. The readers will be the student's advisor and one other member of the faculty familiar with the student's indicated subject area.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Meeting between PhD students and members of the department's Graduate Studies Committee to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes have been met.</p> <p>Student concerns provide focus for course selection and other curricular modification, and suggest areas of unmet instructional need to be addressed through adjunct appointments or new faculty hiring.</p> <p>Measure Type: Focus Group</p>	No target identified.	Each semester.	Yes

Learning Outcome: Inquiry

Students graduating with a PhD in Anthropology will be able to use key ideas from those debates to develop problem statements, plans for data-gathering and data-analysis, and statements of conclusion/ implications relevant to the student's research interest in archaeology or social-cultural anthropology.

Outcome Year: 2008-2009
2009-2010
2010-2011

Start Date: 04/01/2009

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Evaluation of the third written doctoral program comprehensive examination. Students write this comp during their last year of doctoral coursework and often during their last semester of course work. For most of our doctoral students, this is a watershed moment in their doctoral study: They have completed all (or almost all) of their course work and are beginning to write their dissertation proposal. The third comprehensive exam, usually a literature review on a topic related to the dissertation project, bridges the gap between classroom's supervised study and the independent work which the dissertation requires. This position makes the third comprehensive exam an especially appropriate resource for purposes of program assessment. We expect that a review of aggregate scores will allow faculty to set criteria defining effective levels of performance on each learning outcome, e.g. How many students satisfied the expectations of each learning outcome with an aggregate score of 3.0 or better? Was the mean aggregate score for the student cohort higher or lower than the idealized (3.0) mean? An individual student's performance can then be tabulated, in comparison to the other students, and the student cohort as a whole, in terms of such measures. Additionally, constructing these aggregate values allows us to propose improvements in the academic component of the PhD program. If, for example, the aggregate scores for one of the learning outcomes is far lower than the aggregate score for the other learning outcomes, we may infer that students are not as familiar with the academic content associated with the learning outcome. (There many be other reasons for the lower scores, of course, and those reasons need to be explored.) We need to review the courses in the PhD curriculum where the outcome-related academic content is addressed and, as appropriate, propose changes in the syllabus/ lesson plans in those courses to ensure that students are receiving appropriate instruction.</p> <p>The third comp is evaluated by two readers with each reader</p>	<p>No target set: Since we have not yet implemented this measure, we need to see the overall profile of the student scores for each learning outcome, before making further statements about implications of outcome.</p>	<p>Third Comp is offered each semester. The readers will be the student's advisor and one other member of the faculty familiar with the student's indicated subject area.</p>	Yes

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>assigning the portfolio a 1-5 score (1-minimal evidence that outcome has been met; 5--ample evidence that outcome has been met) for each learning outcome. Reader scores will be averaged to obtain an aggregate scoring for each outcome.</p> <p>Measure Type: Quiz/ Exam</p>			
<p>Meeting between PhD students and members of the department's Graduate Studies Committee to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes have been met. Student concerns provide focus for course selection and other curricular modification, and suggest areas of unmet instructional need to be addressed through adjunct appointments or new faculty hiring.</p> <p>Measure Type: Focus Group</p>	No target identified.	Each semester.	Yes

Learning Outcome: Communication

Students graduating with a PhD in Anthropology will be able to construct effective presentations of findings from research projects in written, oral, and visual media formats.

Outcome Year: 2008-2009

2009-2010

2010-2011

Start Date: 04/01/2009

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Evaluation of the third written doctoral program comprehensive examination. Students write this comp during their last year of doctoral coursework and often during their last semester of course work. For most of our doctoral students, this is a watershed moment in their doctoral study: They have completed all (or almost all) of their course work and are beginning to write their dissertation proposal. The third comprehensive exam, usually a literature review on a topic related to the dissertation project, bridges the gap between classroom's supervised study and the independent work which the dissertation requires. This position makes the third comprehensive exam an especially appropriate resource for purposes of program assessment. We expect that a review of aggregate scores will allow faculty to set criteria defining effective levels of performance on each learning outcome, e.g. How many students satisfied the expectations of each learning outcome with an aggregate score of 3.0 or better? Was the mean aggregate score for the student cohort higher or lower than the idealized (3.0) mean? An individual student's performance can then be tabulated, in comparison to the other students, and the student cohort as a whole, in terms of such measures. Additionally, constructing these aggregate values allows us to propose improvements in the academic component of the PhD program. If, for example, the aggregate scores for one of the learning outcomes is far lower than the aggregate score for the other learning outcomes, we may infer that students are not as familiar with the academic content associated with the learning outcome. (There many be other reasons for the lower scores, of course, and those reasons need to be explored.) We need to review the courses in the PhD curriculum where the</p>	<p>No target set: Since we have not yet implemented this measure, we need to see the overall profile of the student scores for each learning outcome, before making further statements about implications of outcome.</p>	<p>Third Comp is offered each semester. The readers will be the student's advisor and one other member of the faculty familiar with the student's indicated subject area.</p>	Yes

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>outcome-related academic content is addressed and, as appropriate, propose changes in the syllabus/ lesson plans in those courses to ensure that students are receiving appropriate instruction.</p> <p>The third comp is evaluated by two readers with each reader assigning the portfolio a 1-5 score (1-minimal evidence that outcome has been met; 5--ample evidence that outcome has been met) for each learning outcome. Reader scores will be averaged to obtain an aggregate scoring for each outcome.</p> <p>Measure Type: Quiz/ Exam</p>			
<p>Meeting between PhD students and members of the department's Graduate Studies Committee to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes have been met.</p> <p>Student concerns provide focus for course selection and other curricular modification, and suggest areas of unmet instructional need to be addressed through adjunct appointments or new faculty hiring.</p> <p>Measure Type: Focus Group</p>	No target identified.	Each semester.	Yes

Learning Outcome: Praxis

Students graduating with a PhD in Anthropology will be able to apply research findings to critical issues in contemporary society.

Outcome Year: 2008-2009

2009-2010

2010-2011

Start Date: 04/01/2009

Outcome Status: Active Learning Outcome

Assessment Plan			
Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
<p>Evaluation of the third written doctoral program comprehensive examination. Students write this comp during their last year of doctoral coursework and often during their last semester of course work. For most of our doctoral students, this is a watershed moment in their doctoral study: They have completed all (or almost all) of their course work and are beginning to write their dissertation proposal. The third comprehensive exam, usually a literature review on a topic related to the dissertation project, bridges the gap between classroom's supervised study and the independent work which the dissertation requires. This position makes the third comprehensive exam an especially appropriate resource for purposes of program assessment. We expect that a review of aggregate scores will allow faculty to set criteria defining effective levels of performance on each learning outcome, e.g. How many students satisfied the expectations of each learning outcome with an aggregate score of 3.0 or better? Was the mean aggregate score for the student cohort higher or lower than the idealized (3.0) mean? An individual student's performance can then be tabulated, in comparison to the other students, and the student cohort as a whole, in terms of such measures. Additionally, constructing these aggregate values allows us to propose improvements in the academic component of the PhD program. If, for example, the aggregate scores for one of the learning outcomes is far lower than the aggregate score for the other learning outcome is far lower than the aggregate score for</p>	<p>No target set: Since we have not yet implemented this measure, we need to see the overall profile of the student scores for each learning outcome, before making further statements about implications of outcome.</p>	<p>Third Comp is offered each semester. The readers will be the student's advisor and one other member of the faculty familiar with the student's indicated subject area.</p>	Yes

Assessment Plan

Assessment Measure	Target	Schedule/Cycle	Active
--------------------	--------	----------------	--------

the other learning outcomes, we may infer that students are not as familiar with the academic content associated with the learning outcome. (There many be other reasons for the lower scores, of course, and those reasons need to be explored.) We need to review the courses in the PhD curriculum where the outcome-related academic content is addressed and, as appropriate, propose changes in the syllabus/ lesson plans in those courses to ensure that students are receiving appropriate instruction.

The third comp is evaluated by two readers with each reader assigning the portfolio a 1-5 score (1-minimal evidence that outcome has been met; 5--ample evidence that outcome has been met) for each learning outcome. Reader scores will be averaged to obtain an aggregate scoring for each outcome.

Measure Type:

Quiz/ Exam

<p>Meeting between PhD students and members of the department's Graduate Studies Committee to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes have been met. Student concerns provide focus for course selection and other curricular modification, and suggest areas of unmet instructional need to be addressed through adjunct appointments or new faculty hiring.</p> <p>Measure Type: Focus Group</p>	<p>No target identified.</p>	<p>Each semester.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	------------------------------	-----------------------	------------