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1. Please describe your program’s learning-outcomes trajectory since 2006-07: Has there been a transformation of organizational culture regarding the establishment of learning outcomes and the capacity to assess progress toward their achievement? If so, during which academic year would you say the transformation became noticeable? What lies ahead; what is the next likely step in developing a learning-outcomes organizational culture within the program?

The Department of Anthropology reformulated its undergraduate major curriculum effective Fall 2008. The changes introduced to the major locates our curriculum squarely within the American tradition of Anthropology – a four field approach to anthropology that views Archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology and Linguistic Anthropology as four distinct but integrating perspectives that investigate and better understand the human condition. While reworking the curriculum we also made space for more electives without increasing the overall requirement of the program, thus contributing to the university’s graduation initiative.

It is our opinion that the changes introduced to the major in 2008-09 represents a critical moment in the recent history of the department. While reconfiguration of the Major curriculum created space for a formal presence of Linguistic Anthropology. As a result students are required to that at least 9 units of Linguistic Anthropology courses to major in Anthropology. At the same time, we also increased the number of elective units from 3 to 12 by reducing the number of required courses overall. This curriculum as it stands today provides a good exposure to all sub-disciplines in Anthropology and enables our majors to take more courses in their area of emphasis. All these were made possible without increasing the overall requirements of the curriculum which is 49 units.

The Department of Anthropology has produced two formal assessments, one in 2006-07 and another in 2009-10. The 2006-07 assessment was more discipline focused. The 2009-10 revisions reflect the mapping of our disciplinary Learning Outcomes to the Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals.

In Fall 2011, the department decided to further refine its assessment strategy by instituting a Writing Intensive Senior Seminar that integrates the four sub-fields of Anthropology and ensure that our majors have a more coherent sense of the discipline and provides the faculty the academic space to deploy a more robust assessment strategy. We are currently in the process of developing this course and plan on running a section of this seminar as an experimental
course starting Fall, 2012. We expect this seminar to provide our majors the space to integrate the diverse bodies of anthropological knowledge they have accumulated. Secondly, we expect the proposed seminar to be the focal point of our assessment in the future.

2. Please list in prioritized order (or indicate no prioritization regarding) up to four desired learning outcomes (“takeaways” concerning such elements of curriculum as perspectives, specific content knowledge, skill sets, confidence levels) for students completing the program. For each stated outcome, please provide the reason that it was designated as desired by the faculty associated with the program.

The following are the four takeaways (presented in no particular order) that inform the Department of Anthropology’s assessment plan:

1. **Use Anthropological Perspective (AP)**
   
   REASON: Students should be able to apply anthropological theory to an understanding of the human condition.

2. **Written Communication (WC)**
   
   REASON: Students should be able to articulate their knowledge and understanding of the discipline clearly and effectively.

3. **Inquiry and Analysis (IA)**
   
   REASON: Student should be able to identify problems, formulate questions, articulate relationships among variables and recognize connections between evidence and arguments/explanations.

4. **Critical Analysis (CA)**
   
   REASON: Students should be able to evaluate merits of arguments and explanations.
3. *For undergraduate programs only*, in what ways are the set of desired learning outcomes described above aligned with the University’s Baccalaureate Learning Goals? Please be as specific as possible.

**AP** = Anthropological Perspective  
**WC** = Written Communication  
**IA** = Inquiry and Analysis  
**CA** = Critical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Anthropology Desired Learning Outcomes:</th>
<th>Sacramento State Baccalaureate Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology is a holistic discipline, the four sub disciplines of which are archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology and Linguistic Anthropology. All of which use our diverse Learning Outcomes to develop in-depth knowledge of Human Cultures and the Natural World.</td>
<td>Competence in the Discipline</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Students are able to use anthropological concepts and theories to analyze, explain and address the diversity in human experience in the past and present. (**AP, CA**)  
• Students can develop effective comparisons and contrasts between various anthropological ideas, concepts and theories. (**CA**)  
• Students can critically analyze, explain and address socio-cultural, economic and political issues and problems. They approach issues through scientific and humanistic lens and articulate the ways in which nature culture and society intersect and inform human experience. (**IA**)  
• Students can think in complex ways and contribute to on-going debates and discussions in the field through the development of strong analytical skills and arguments. (**CA**)  
• Students can write sophisticated research papers that are clear, organized, and free of grammatical errors. (**WC**)  
• Articulate knowledge and understanding of anthropological scholarship through effective written communication. (**WC**)  
• Explain key theoretical concepts and debates within anthropology clearly and effectively. (**CA, WC**)  
• Students are successful in using anthropological knowledge to explain historic legacies, scientific discoveries and contemporary issues that impact human societies. (**CA**)  
• Students can effectively use anthropological concepts, frameworks and/or theories to develop intercultural competence and address the diversity in human experience. (**AP**) | Intellectual and Practical Skills |
| | Personal and Social Responsibility |
4. For each desired outcome indicated in item 2 above, please:
   a) Describe the method(s) by which its ongoing pursuit is monitored and measured.

   The undergraduate program in Anthropology is based on a four-field approach to the study of
   the human condition. The four fields include: Archaeology, Biological Anthropology, Cultural
   Anthropology and Linguistic Anthropology. The curriculum is divided into Required Lower
   Division Courses, Upper Division Foundational Requirements and Electives. The Department
   intends to assess one Programmatic Learning Goal and Objectives in any given academic year

   The Department of Anthropology uses one procedure to assess student competency in each of
   the Four Program goals and objectives set forth:

   The Department Faculty draw three writing samples from each of the four Upper Division
   Foundational Courses across the discipline. The sample includes 12 unmarked essays. Any
   identifying information such as student name or number is removed and the essays are coded
   from number 1 to 12. Each essay is assigned to at least 4 faculty members, one from each sub-
   discipline. Faculty members use an Outcome specific assessment rubric [Please see Attachment
   1: Grading Rubric (Anthropological Perspectives)] to evaluate each of essay assigned to them for
   evaluation. Following the rubric, the faculty could assign numbers 1- 4 (including decimals such
   as 1.5) to each essay. Being the highest score, 4 would indicate that the essay is exemplary
   whereas 1 would be an essay that barely meets the bench mark.

   After grading the Faculty meets to discuss each paper and the scores assigned to them.
   Discrepancies if any are further discussed to improve assessment and strategies are devised to
   address obstacles to student learning.

   b) Include a description of the sample of students (e.g., random sample of transfer students
   declaring the major; graduating seniors) from whom data were/will be collected and the
   frequency and schedule with which the data in question were/will be collected.

   The current assessment plan targets anthropology majors in their junior or senior year. Program
   Assessment Time-Line is as follows:

   Year One:
   • Assessment Committee focused on assessing students’ Written Communication. The
     committee met at the end of Spring 2010 to assess and discuss selected final assignments.

     Based on the discussion of the problems identified by the evaluation, it was decided that
     students in all upper division anthropology courses be given a grading rubric that will clearly
     indicate the department’s expectations with respect to written assignments. Additionally,
     Term Paper Style Sheet and Guide for Tables and Figures were also circulated among all
     students attending upper division anthropology courses starting Fall 2010.
Year Two:

- Assessment Committee focused on assessing students’ ability to use Anthropological Perspectives. The committee met at the end of Spring 2011 to assess and discuss selected final assignments.

Out of the 12 essays evaluated, 9 essays had difference in assigned grade ranging from 1 point to 2 points, 3 had assigned grades where the difference was less than 1 point. This variation in the grades suggested the existence of some possible problems.

Lengthy discussions followed the listing of grades. In light of the concerns voiced and identification of possible reasons, it was decided that the Department reevaluate the manner in which “Anthropological Perspectives” are assessed.

Year Three:

- The Department decided to experiment with a Senior Seminar that will integrate four sub-fields of anthropology as well as address the learning outcomes listed above. The development of this Senior Seminar course is the focus of the department’s assessment efforts during the academic year 2011-2012. This has contributed to extending the originally established time line by a year.

AY 2012-13: Based on the outcomes of the Writing Intensive Senior Seminar, we will review our assessment strategies for the Year Four and Year Five.

c) Describe and append a sample (or samples) of the “instrument” (e.g., survey or test), “artifact” (e.g., writing sample and evaluative protocol, performance review sheet), or other device used to assess the status of the learning outcomes desired by the program.

Please see Attachment 2: Essay Prompts and 4 randomly picked writing samples used for assessment in Spring 11.

d) Explain how the program faculty analyzed and evaluated (will analyze and evaluate) the data to reach conclusions about each desired student learning outcome.

See Attachment 3: Department of Anthropology Assessment Report 2009-10 and Department of Anthropology Assessment Report 2010-11

The following outcomes have yet to be assessed:

- Anthropological Perspectives
- Inquiry and Analysis
- Critical Analysis

Over the next couple of years, we hope to simultaneously assess all Learning Outcomes using the proposed Writing Intensive Senior Seminar.

5. Regarding each outcome and method discussed in items 2 and 4 above, please provide examples of how findings from the learning outcomes process have been utilized to address
decisions to revise or maintain elements of the curriculum (including decisions to alter the program’s desired outcomes). If such decision-making has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.

Three years of sustained vigorous Departmental discussions about curricular change concluded in the academic year 2006-2007. These resulted in the current formulation of the Anthropology major (effective 2008). The change of major and associated assessment tools were specifically crafted to meet the demand of the University and students to graduate in a timely manner. New learning outcomes and goals associated with the new major began to be assessed using our new assessment tool (starting 2009).

Following discussions at Faculty meetings and Faculty Retreat, we decided to develop a Writing Intensive Senior Seminar that will assess all our Learning Outcomes simultaneously. We plan on teaching the course starting Fall 2012. After assessing the course for a couple of years, the department will decide if it could serve a capstone seminar course.

6. Has the program systematically sought data from alumni to measure the longer-term effects of accomplishment of the program’s learning outcomes? If so, please describe the approach to this information-gathering and the ways in which the information will be applied to the program’s curriculum. If such activity has not yet occurred, please describe the plan by which it will occur.
   Not with the current Learning Outcomes.

During the upcoming academic year 2012-13, the Department will be initiating another program review. We plan to use this opportunity to engage extensively with our alumni to assess the longer term effects of our Learning Outcomes.

7. Does the program pursue learning outcomes identified by an accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization as important? Does the set of outcomes pursued by your program exceed those identified as important by your accrediting or other professional discipline-related organization?
   Not Applicable

8. Finally, what additional information would you like to share with the Senate Committee on Instructional Program Priorities regarding the program’s desired learning outcomes and assessment of their accomplishment?

   We are currently developing an experimental senior seminar that we plan on offering starting Fall 2012. There are two objectives guiding the proposed Senior Seminar. Firstly, to provide our majors an opportunity to integrate the knowledge from our four-field curriculum to better understand/ explain various natural, cultural and historical forces that are or have influence over the world we are living in or have influenced the world our ancestors lived in. Secondly, this seminar is geared to help the department develop a comprehensive assessment of how our majors are achieving the Department’s Learning Outcomes.
Attachment 1: Grading Rubric (Anthropological Perspectives)
Grading Rubric

**Anthropological Perspectives:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholarship/Existing Knowledge/Research</th>
<th>4 – CAPSTONE</th>
<th>3 – MILESTONE</th>
<th>2 – MILESTONE</th>
<th>1 – BENCHMARK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perspectives</strong></td>
<td>Critically evaluates &amp; compares theoretical perspectives, establishing clear connections.</td>
<td>Evaluates theoretical perspectives without fully establishing their connection.</td>
<td>There is an attempt to explain anthropological theories and concepts.</td>
<td>There is limited understanding of anthropological ideas and concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Effectively engages in debates regarding different perspectives, developing a strong argument.</td>
<td>Engages, with some success, in debates between various anthropological perspectives.</td>
<td>There is an effort to establish connections distinguish between perspectives.</td>
<td>No effort to establish connections/distinguish between perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Draws Inferences and Identifies Limitations</strong></td>
<td>Excellent research on anthropologically relevant issues/processes</td>
<td>Good research on anthropologically relevant issues/processes</td>
<td>Somewhat succeeds in addressing anthropologically relevant issues/processes</td>
<td>Makes an effort to address anthropologically relevant issues/processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draws a clear and insightful conclusion from analysis. Identifies limitations and/or implications of current theories.</td>
<td>Draws a clear and appropriate conclusion from analysis. Identifies apparent limitations of current theories.</td>
<td>Draws a somewhat clear and appropriate conclusion from analysis. Identifies some limitations of current theories.</td>
<td>Draws an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion. Does not identify limitations of current theories.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anthropology 111:
CALIFORNIA ARCHAEOLOGY
First Essay – Fall 2010

Anthropologists and historians have arrived at two competing perspectives regarding how Native California populations articulated with their environments. On the one hand, some researchers have argued that indigenous peoples had attained some kind of ecological balance, conserving resources and ensuring that their economic pursuits never taxed plants and animals to the extent of threatening their survival and persistence. According to this view, the natural environment of California was a largely unaltered and plentiful one prior to the arrival of Europeans, who initiated the long decline that we are familiar with today. The other perspective sees the same articulation quite differently, arguing that Native California populations exploited their local environments at high intensity, over-hunted large game resources, burned over habitats to increase the yield of various food products, and employed technologies that served to wring as much from the wild as they could. The fact that the extent of alteration and destruction was not as profound as that precipitated later by Euroamericans is a more a result of technological limitations than a dramatically different attitude about conservation and environmental preservation.

Two of the class readings serve to characterize these competing views. Anderson et al. (2001) offer a portrayal of abundance and plenty at the time of Euroamerican contact, while Preston (2002) suggests that this is a false impression, that it was only because of the spread of introduced diseases and the resulting human depopulation that early historic animal populations were as abundant as they were. Prior to the arrival of Europeans in the New World, indigenous cultures had impacted local resources severely due to over-population and increasingly intensive economic pursuits. In effect, natural resources had a chance to recover and rebound between the 16th and 18th centuries.

For this essay you are to (1) summarize the basic arguments made in each of the two papers, (2) review the empirical basis for each of the two perspectives (the kinds and quality of information the authors review in support of their arguments), (3) assess how successful the authors have been in presenting their case, and (4) offer your own, personal determination regarding which, if either, of the positions seems to have more or better merit. As with most such exercises, there is no right or wrong position in regard to this last part of the essay – the truth often lies somewhere in between – but there are better and worse justifications for taking a position. It may prove useful for you to point out any shortcomings in the various arguments and to identify issues or data that require further consideration or study.

The essay should be no more than 5 pages in length (and you’ll probably need that much), double spaced, and will require no additional research beyond reading and thinking about the two papers. I do suggest that you spend some time organizing your thoughts before starting to write as there is a lot to cover in a fairly short essay. I’m sure you have all already obtained these readings from the reserve room, but be sure to let me know by the end of this week if you are having difficulty getting the papers; they are both in edited volumes (books) and are not, to my knowledge, available online. The essay will be due in class on Monday, October 26th. Late papers will not be accepted unless there are extremely extenuating circumstances and no email submittals without prior permission.


Final Examination

Following our consideration of key anthropological concepts in anthropology, as well as the possibilities and limits of participant observation and other approaches used in ethnographic field research, we have read and discussed in class two recently published ethnographies about religious ritual in Latin American indigenous communities -- *Days of Death: Days of Life: Ritual in the Popular Culture of Oaxaca*, by Kristin Norget, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), and *Ritual Encounters: Otavalan Modern and Mythic Community*, by Michelle Wibbelsman, (Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2009).

In line with contemporary cultural anthropological approaches, both authors write of ritual as "lived experience," experience that not only reflects social organization and cultural patterns, as earlier ethnographers would have understood, but that also is integral to the construction of community and the shared identity which emerges from that community. In both cases this lived experience is produced, at least in part, through the mechanism of reciprocity. Moreover, in each case, identity construction appears antithetical to some extent. That is to say, contemporary indigeneity in Latin America appears to be formed in response to the hegemony of Church and State as embodied in local or regional elites.

As our final assignment, your task is (1) to write a well-organized essay in which you explain the above-mentioned process of community formation as described for the communities in question and then (2 & 3) describe how each author accomplishes this through her choices regarding the organization (or structure) of the book, as well as the "voice" or type of discourse she uses. Be as clear and explicit as possible in making your points; use good examples from the ethnographies as appropriate. Finally, please conclude your essay with a personal or reflexive comment: What aspects of the ethnographies did you find most and least effective? Which ethnography did you enjoy the most? Why?

Format: Please refer to the accompanying style sheet and adhere closely to the instructions therein. This should be your most professional effort in every way.

Due date: This essay is due in the classroom at noon on Friday, December 17.
ANTH 190  Fall 2010  Final Exam

Take a home exam. Please answer the following questions below. For questions 1, please limit your answer to no more than 2 pages, typed, double-spaced. Please distinguish each question from the other. For question 2, the format and page limit are embedded in the question. Final exams may not be sent via email. They are due Wednesday December 15 by 2:30 pm (in my office).

Question 1: (20 points)
Consider the many examples of "junk writing" we have seen over the course of the semester. Choose one example to focus on and address the following questions: (a) What meanings are transferred to mundane consumer objects through the use of appropriation in the writing? (b) How do consumers derive aesthetic energy out of writing that has meaninglessness? (c) To what degree are these representations of "Other" scripts part about the display and verification of difference.

Please put a page break between your answers for Q1 and Q2.

Question 2: (80 points)
Consider attached examples 1-3; which, if any, represent a writing system? Drawing on the concepts, information, and ideas we have explored over the semester, discuss in essay form, the process you would use to make a decision regarding whether any (or all or none) of the examples are a writing system. Include in your answer a brief but clear discussion of what qualifies as a writing system. Justify your answer, providing evidence for your conclusion. I expect to see evidence of your reasoning with regard the decision you make. You may choose to focus on just one of the examples for your justification. Evidence for your arguments should be cited in the following way: direct quote: "blah blah blah" (Gnanadesikan 2009:45). Indirect quote: X and Y but sometimes Z (Gnanadesikan 2009: 45). If you cite a source outside of our class texts, please include a bibliography page at the end. Web sources are discouraged. The essay should not exceed 5 pages in length. It should be double spaced and have at least 1-inch margins. Grammar and style will be part of the overall grade.
Example 1

Example 2

Example 3
Part 2 writing systems

To try and decipher the three examples given one must first look for similarities, and quickly it is noted that all three examples have markers in common. The markers that all three of these systems have in common are marks to start and stop the sentence as well as a marker to break words apart, a space. The next thing that is noticed is that the systems all have the same number of symbols represented, and that there are symbols repeated throughout the three examples. Even though the three are different logographic systems they all represent the same "language". The three examples have eleven words and they do not repeat on any of the three sentences. It can be inferred that the three examples are not a number system due to this fact, as well as there are a number of breaks in the chain, and there are very few repeating symbols. The next step is to try to decipher the system type used in all three. There are a few different ideas here, but I would argue that the three are all logographic systems, but the third example is a pictographic system; however, the pictographs represent only graphemes not entire concepts like many other pictographic writing systems that have been seen throughout the content of the class. From the material provided it can be concluded that the three systems are related and
that the three systems are logographic alphabetic writing forms.

The three systems may be written differently, but the content is the same pattern in the three examples. If these three examples were not related it would be anticipated that they would have different spacing between symbol clusters, but we see an identical one to one correlation between the three, they are copied into the three different "languages" to a T. The lack of repetition between the three in the words would make it hard to argue that there is a syllabary present in any of the three.

Like we saw in class with Ethiopic language, there are often times when written language has many different dialects that do not look alike in the written language, but in this case there is a lot in common the only difference is the symbols used. There a lot of determiners being used in these examples supports the claim that it's a logographic system, for many of the logographic systems in use have a basic form that is then changed by adding to it. In example two we see the "language" uses an arrowed system, but depending on the direction of the arrow or the shape of the arrow itself there can be an entirely different meaning associated with the symbol. Example one have the same idea in the use of the circle with a number in it, and the "artistic note" when they change their orientation they change meaning.

The writing systems here do not provide any way to tell if there is inflection in the writing. There are no pre, post, sub, or super scripts present which would be expected in a logographic system. Even in logographic alphabets like Hangeul there are inflection marks that could be recognized and these examples
do not show any.

We can tell from this writing that all three systems read in a linear format, whether from top to bottom like English does, or from bottom to top. The structure of the grammatical markers lets us know that there is a better chance that it is an alphabetic system, and that its structure can be read like English.

The use of these few symbols in each example could mean that the system is using a syllabary supported language. There are no one syllable groupings presented in these examples however, so it would be a bit more difficult to argue the use of them in these examples. I would argue that there are in fact no syllabary being used in these examples. The number of different symbols used here would also lead me to believe that there is no use of syllabary. To note there would also appear to be no use of constonational wording, the symbols being used at the end of the word clusters do not share any relationship to other symbols in the word. If it were constontanatnal there would be a correlation between the symbols being used, at the end of the word grouping

Because the examples have so much in common it would be impossible to say one is a writing system and not say the same thing about the other two. From all the information in the class I would have to say that these three systems are in fact logographic alphabetic with determiners being used without the support of inflection markers. What we are seeing could very well be three dialects of the same language being used at the same time like that of Ethiopic language today.
Final Examination

Ritual behavior is a powerful force for strengthening and reinforcing community bonds. As described in the contemporary ethnographies *Days of Death, Days of Life: Ritual in the Popular Culture of Oaxaca*, by Kristin Norget, and *Ritual Encounters: Otavalo Modern and Mythic Community*, by Michelle Wibbelsman, the "lived experience" of cultural rituals practiced by members of the Latin American communities detailed in each book unifies the community and fortifies each population against hegemonic pressures applied by both church and government institutions. Norget and Wibbelsman each illustrate the regenerative effect of ritual practices that simultaneously reinforces and recreates each community, thereby forging powerful social structures which are capable of enduring immense hardships that many individuals would find unbearable. Though the communities the authors discuss are different, the parallels between the behavioral practices reveal how important rituals can be to the perpetual existence of a culture.

An important aspect of the cultural behaviors that develop the strength of each community’s social structure is reciprocity. Both the indigenous Oaxacans and the Otavaleños from Ecuador engage in reciprocal relationships with many members of their communities. From an etic perspective, it might be difficult to reconcile a social system of owing debts with the enhancement of community strength, but once this structure is seen in process, the connection becomes very clear. Reciprocity is the means for one community member to aid another at a time
when such help is possible or necessary, such as when funding a ritual. The process of debt sharing creates bonds between members of a community, and it stabilizes the social structure.

In *Days of Death, Days of Life: Ritual in the Popular Culture of Oaxaca*, Kristin Norget describes these effects of reciprocity in her descriptions of rituals pertaining to death in the indigenous communities on the periphery of the city of Oaxaca. When an individual dies, it is important that community members observe the proper ritual behavior to give the person a good death. This includes praying for the deceased person’s soul, the *difunto*, for nine evenings, which is called the *novenario*. These prayers not only mitigate the punishment the *difunto* will receive in the afterlife for sins committed by the individual in life, but they also work to protect the community from the *difunto*’s malevolence should it not be properly cared for (Norget: 159-160). The proper observances during the funeral and the wake for an individual often require large expenditures to cover the costs of food and funerary implements; these costs frequently require the hosts of the funeral rituals to receive aid from other community members. Such was the case with a man named Wilfrido, who died with no relatives alive to ensure he received proper funeral rites. Members of the community took it upon themselves to give Wilfrido a “good” death (Norget: 157-159).

Additionally, funeral rites provide a stage for people to act as morally respectable as possible. During the rituals associated with death, people from the indigenous Oaxacan communities set aside grievances and affect demeanors that strictly adhere to the moral codes of their culture. Norget describes this behavior, and the “symbolic sacrifice” of attending the *novenario*, as a process of forging not only a cultural identity but also of maintaining social harmony and reinforcing bonds between community members (Norget: 169-170). The dead are
not immediately removed from the popular communities; they instead retain roles that influence behavior and impact the social structures of the communities.

Similarly, the dead are not immediately excluded from the community of the Otavaleños in Ecuador. As Wibbelsman describes in *Ritual Encounters: Otavalan Modern and Mythic Community*, the people of Otavalo have continued relationships with relatives that have passed away. This relationship involves Otavaleños frequently traveling to the cemetery to bring food for the deceased and to have prayers recited for them. At these gatherings, large quantities of food are brought to the cemetery and shared among the many community members present who are visiting the graves of their dead relatives. Food is exchanged between the living members of the community (Wibbelsman: 124-126). This charitable exchange and sharing of food reinforces social connections and status. Inequalities of wealth can be expressed through the amount and quality of food prepared, but food that is not well made, such as that which is lacking salt, indicates poverty or negligence on the part of the cooks. When the lack of salt is attributable to negligence, gossip about the cook’s poor food preparation will affect that individual’s social status (Wibbelsman: 130-131). Additionally, acceptance of food indicates trust between community members. Issues of cleanliness and the potential transmission of disease require that one be considerate about from whom they take food, although Wibbelsman notes that most of the houses she visited were very clean. The implications of trust that acceptance of food involves reinforce community ties and keep the social structures intact (Wibbelsman: 128-129).

Beyond the fortification of social bonds, ritual activities unite community members against hegemonic pressures and perpetuate ethnic identities. Wibbelsman’s description of the two Stations of the Cross rituals being performed in Cotacachi illustrates this resistance against
governmental and religious oppression. The suffering of Christ during the Crucifixion resonates with the suffering experienced by the Otavaleños. This reinforces the *communitas*, the interrelatedness of the community members (Wibblesman: 145-147). The empathy with Christ is used to illuminate the oppression of Otavaleños by large institutions, such as corrupt bankers, and inspire them assert greater political authority over their own lives (Wibblesman: 151-152).

The differences between the mestizo performance and the indigenous ritual also illustrated a resistance to conformity. Members of the indigenous communities took the Catholic religion that had been forced on them and transformed it into something which they value instead of subscribing to an official representation of Catholicism which would have been devoid of meaning. (Wibblesman: 143-147). This resistance to the hegemony is both made possible by strong social structure and works to reinforce those community bonds.

A similar resistance is described by Norget in her ethnography. The indigenous Oaxacans also practice a popular form of Catholicism. Despite their vicious treatment by the Catholic Church during the colonization of Mexico by Spain and for centuries afterward, the Mesoamericans didn't surrender their spirituality to the Church. Instead, they transformed the religion they were forced to accept and created a unique expression of Catholic faith. Both the Mexican government and the official Catholic Church have attempted to co-opt certain rituals practiced as part of the popular Catholic religion (Norget: 101-109, 232-249). The government desired to use the folk rituals to define an Oaxacan identity and capitalize on tourism surrounding institutionalized festivals. However, the popular religion is naturally protean; it is always being reinvented and, at the same time, it reinforces the strength of community. The governmental representation of folk rituals may be based on reality, but it is a hollow
representation, devoid of actual cultural value. The moment folk rituals were designed for spectators is the moment they were no longer folkloric. Despite Church and governmental pressures to change, the members of the popular communities in Oaxaca maintain their cultural practices, resisting all attempts at spiritual suffocation (Norget: 263-264).

Norget's ethnography uses an effective structure to transmit her descriptions and theories to readers. *Daysof Death, Days of Life: Ritual in the Popular Culture of Oaxaca* is divided into three sections of two chapters each, with an introduction and an epilogue. The presentation of the sections and chapters has three characteristics that facilitate understanding for readers of the subjects presented. First, as Norget states in her introduction, the book transitions from broad, descriptive information to the interpretive, theoretical work later in the book (Norget: 19-22). This gives readers an easy introduction to the more difficult anthropological and theoretical ideas in the book. Secondly, the structure of the book possess a temporal aspect; the book moves from the past, with information about the history of Mexico and Oaxaca, though the present, describing descriptions of calendar rites and rites of passage, to the future, detailing what effects may be brought upon the popular religion through government involvement. The third attribute of the book's structure is the transition from broad subjects to more specific topics, beginning with historical information and ending with a detailed look at the Oaxacan Day of the Dead ritual. These three aspects of the ethnography's structure all help readers acquire the information in the book gradually. Not forcing readers to grapple with difficult concepts early on and without background knowledge makes the book both more accessible and more enjoyable.

Wibbelsman's ethnography has similar structural characteristics to Norget's. In *Ritual Encounters: Otavalan Modern and Mythic Community*, there are also six chapters, an
introduction, and an epilogue. Background information is presented early on in this book as well, giving readers the appropriate knowledge to understand the more detailed anthropological concepts presented later with the descriptions of ritual behavior in Otavalo. The structure of Wibbelsman’s ethnography is also based on the Otavalan cosmology. The first two chapters represent information dealing with the Uku Pacha, the world below. This is the portion of the universe that humans inhabit, and the first two chapters of the book deal with history and social interactions. The second portion of the book relates to the Jawa Pacha, or the supernatural realm. The chapters in this section focus on symbolic rituals, the taking of the plaza and the symbolic violence that occurs during the inti raymi. The final section of the book reflects interactions with dead, corresponding to the Chayshuk Pacha. The association of the structure of the book with the Otavalan cosmology is intellectually interesting, but it also serves a practical purpose. The information introduced earlier is based more in the physical world, which makes it easier to understand. The more spiritual ritual descriptions, which may be harder for some readers to comprehend, come after an introduction to Otavalan life has been established. The harder concepts follow more approachable information, which is an effective presentation for communicating the ideas in the book.

Both ethnographies are highly reflexive. Norget and Wibbelsman add their own opinions and provide firsthand accounts and experience that pertain to the information in the book. Norget’s voice in her ethnography is slightly more detached than the voice Wibbelsman uses. Norget retains some of the characteristics of classic ethnographies, as she provides very detailed descriptions of the rituals she is discussing as well as additional information that is related to each subject. Wibbelsman’s descriptions and details are not as thorough as Norget’s. However,
Wibbelsman's voice is more personable, and her ethnography better conveys her firsthand observation of rituals and cultural practices.

I found both ethnographies enjoyable and informative. Norget's book contained a greater amount of cultural detail, which provided a fuller cultural description than Wibbelsman's book. My favorite aspect of both ethnographies is information regarding the actions undertaken by the authors. Learning what events the authors experienced while conducting their participant observation reveals the actual work of gathering the information to produce an ethnography. I find this information the most fascinating, as I am eager to know the process of doing field work and writing an ethnography. Both books were excellent, though if I were forced to choose a favorite, I would select *Ritual Encounters: Otavalan Modern and Mythic Community*, because I enjoyed reading about the Otavalan cosmology and how the rituals described in the book were influenced by this worldview.
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Models for Modern Human Origins - Essay (18 points)

The debate over modern human origins provides us with an excellent historical development of a major scientific hypothesis in paleoanthropology. Answer ALL PARTS of the following question.

- Describe the two traditional dichotomous models: total replacement and multiregionalism.
  - Who are the proponents of these models? Describe these models in DETAIL, including what they say about modern human origins, and if correct, what they hypothesize about transitional fossils and continuity/hybridization. (6 pts)

- The most genetic variation in mtDNA is found in Africa. What are the two opposing views about the meaning of this sentence? (2 pts)

- How does Smith's Assimilation Model work? (2 pts)

- Choose three of the following genetic studies: Eswaren (2003), Gargnan et al. (2005), Templeton (2002), Yu et al. (2001), Caramelli et al. (2003) or Gibbons (2010) and discuss how their studies impacted the debate, providing support for replacement, continuity, or assimilation. (6 pts)

- How does Zilhao (2006) argue that the explosion of the Phlegrean Fields Caldera in Italy affected the Neanderthals 39,000 years ago? What does he say about the carrying capacity of Africa versus Europe? (2 points)

Total Replacement was proposed by Stringer and Andrews. It states that there was a cladogenetic speciation event that took place 100-200,000 years ago, and that modern humans came from this branch. The moderns left and colonized the world via NO interbreeding. They state that regional variations are because of recent adaptations and genetic drift which are local selection pressures. Absolutely no gene flow. If this is correct, we would find early modern skulls only in Africa, transitional forms only in Africa, and no hybridization or links to early humans.

Multiregional was proposed by Wolpoff and Thorne. They state that in the Early-Mid Pleistocene, H. erectus radiated out of Africa when they got to where they were going, they gradually evolved into moderns. The reason we are all the same species is because of a ton of gene flow (100%). If this is correct, we would expect to find early modern skulls everywhere, transitional forms would be everywhere, and there would be continuity between Archaics and moderns.

The most genetic variation is in Africa; this was proposed by Stoneking, Cann & Wilson. They sequenced mtDNA and found that most variation was in Africa. They found that 94% of variation existed within regional populations and only 6% distinguished the groups. So, mtDNA was tested to host a constant mutation rate of 2.4% every million years which would mean that there was a recent split (~200,000y). They say the most variation in Africa because it is the oldest Nuclear DNA studies support this as well. De et al. came along and scored mtDNA in Nuclear DNA, and the results did not match up. This caused mtDNA to be questioned for many reasons. Relethford & Harpending came along and said yes! there is the most variation in Africa but maybe not a lot. This could be because it has the largest population. Much at demography or phylogeny? Of course Europe has a smaller population because only e.

Smith et al. says Assimilation model states that moderns probably arose in Africa but not necessarily from a speciation event. When they left, there was a ton of interbreeding and this is what spurred modernization. "Resistance is futile."?

Eswaren's diffusion wave model states that there was variable structure and if you inherited a full set of modern alleles, you would have 16% reproductive advantage eventually moderns would have genetically swapped this gene pool and that's how moderns there. Today, Assimilation & Diffusion wave model is what is generally accepted.
Garrigan et al looked at one gene on the X chromosome and found that it had diverged away. They found that the most variation was in Non-African groups, especially East Asia. This study supports continuity.

Gibbons wrote about work that was done using the Draft genome from Neanderthal DNA from Vindija. They found that 1-4% of Asians and Europeans share DNA with Neanderthals! Also, moderns and Neanderthals are 99.8-9% IDENTICAL! Only differences are from metabolism, skin, hair color and cognition. This shows that there was obviously interbreeding which shows Total Replacement needs to be taken off the table!

39 kya, the volcano exploded and this is what caused the Neanderthals to perish. Europe was already very small, but this explosion made even more area uninhabitable. The carrying capacity of Europe obviously lowered and so the Neanderthals started dying off. Zilhao says that it would have only taken 1,000 years for the Neanderthals to completely go extinct.

Happy Holidays!
In an attempt to describe pre-Colombian California, archaeologists have employed several methods to reconstruct the environment and have used ethnography and narrative accounts to recreate the human population's role in California's prehistory. Limitations resulting from the rapid industrial and housing developments of California in the last 150 years, and the lack of emphasis on archaeological projects in the early days of California anthropological inquiry, have posed as difficulties in giving an accurate explanation of California prior to 1848. The perspectives posed by Preston and Anderson et al. serve as characterizing examples of the different approaches archaeology has taken in an effort to explain California cultural and environmental interactions.

Anderson et al. argue that Native Californians "were an integral and essential agent in the creation of a balance of land, vegetation, and animal life," (Anderson 2001:16). Anderson et al. describe California's environment as a rich bounty maintained and enhanced by human manipulation. The practice of fire suppression, the conversion of grasslands into industrial agricultural use, the housing and commercial development, logging, and damage caused to desert ecology by recreation vehicles are all transformations that have altered the equilibrium of Anderson et al.'s California. They argue that California's environment was not a wilderness, but a sustainable landscape created by "tradition and understanding derived through observation and traditional practice," (Anderson 2001:33). Anderson et al. criticize an approach that categorizes indigenous Californians as either hunter-gatherers or agriculturalists, instead of acknowledging the "continuum of human-nature interactions" that enhanced California ecology and resource availability (Anderson 2001:34).
Using a combined approach to reconstruct prehistoric California, Anderson et al. have relied on ethnography, biological analysis of vegetation trends and distribution, and inference based on current data involving native and non-native plant species. The accounts of early explorers were lacking in their ability to critically describe the landscape because of the dramatically different ecology that they were encountering, and are therefore not used as a strong point of reference. Anderson et al. stress the significance of California's unique ecological diversity, attributed to the geomorphic variation and the stewardship of Native Californians. The abundance of plant and animal resources at the point of contact is explained in the "indigenous folklore [which] is rich with messages concerning the dire ecological consequences of excessive consumption of resources," (Anderson 2001:33). The authors argue that it was this culturally derived ethos that governed resource exploitation and conservation. Anderson et al. describe each California vegetation type in terms of soil composition, weather cycles, geography, and human intervention in order to explain the manipulation of the environment by Native Californians and to account for the interruption to this equilibrium at the point of contact and beyond.

Other than the assertion that the projected prehistoric landscape was supportive of large herds of game and human populations, Anderson et al. do little to explain how the environment supported such abundance. Instead, they rely on an ethic of sustainability to account for the dynamic interplay between Native Californians and the resources they relied upon. While there is extensive information about soil composition, plant distribution, and Native uses of these resources, there is very little mention of the struggle over meat and plant resources with other predatory animals. There is no mention of
resource over-extraction occurring in the archaeological record, only the affirmation that Native Californians understood the delicate balance of ecology and human interaction. The authors' arguments are based on the rate of change experienced in California since the point of contact, but do not account for dramatic intervals of change prior to this period.

Preston, alternatively, characterizes the human impact on California's prehistory as a traditional predatory-prey relationship. He argues that "the wildlife and the associated human habitat interrelationships that were observed during the late Colonial period were anything but endemic and were, instead, aberrations rather than mirrors of pre-Colombian conditions in California," (Preston 2002: 111). He criticizes Anderson and others for their descriptions of equilibrium and highlights the "curious omission" of wildlife in their analysis of pre-Colombian stewardship (Preston 2002: 119). Preston attributes the abundance of game observed by early explorers to the population explosion resulting from a decrease in predation. He argues that the diseases that historically preceded contact between the colonial population and the native population lessened the pressure on large game animals and allowed their numbers to grow rapidly. He denounces the "ethic of sustainability" that is proposed by Anderson et al. by asserting, "competition between animals and people for both floral and faunal resources tends to negate any culturally induced tendencies toward conservation," (Preston 2002: 123). While Preston acknowledges the dramatic changes induced by the colonization of California, he is insistent that the prehistoric landscape was always in flux.

Preston uses Optimal Foraging models to describe the relationship between Native Californians and the environment. He describes the exploitation of different
resources based on their energetic output and nutritional returns, which would have varied in periods of overpredation, and those of abundance. He cites archaeological projects that have shown patterns of overpredation of marine resources and game animals. Preston uses the first hand accounts of early explorers that describe the abundance of large animals to theorize that these animals must have been in a period of rebound following a period of heightened predation. Using the “epidemiological precedents” for infectious disease contraction by Native populations in North America, he recreates the scenario for early contact in California. These extrapolations bolster his position that the abundance witnessed by the first explorers in California was not a static scenario. He emphasizes the accounting of other predatory animals in archaeology’s attempt to reconstruct California prehistory. “The notion that both species may have benignly shared the same location at the same time with human predators is an unreasonable stretch of the imagination and not supported by archaeological evidence or regional precedent,” (Preston 2002:127). While Preston is skeptical of the faunal interpretations made by Anderson et al., he undoubtedly acknowledges the integral role humans played in the environment that characterizes prehistoric California.

Preston’s analysis of the dynamic interspecies relationships in California is much more grounded in archaeological evidence than that of Anderson et al. His use of Optimal Foraging models to explain the trends in population fluctuations is far more convincing than a reliance on ethnographic accounts of harmonious resource procurement. He is able to account for the human impact on both floral and faunal species, while acknowledging the other predators with which Native Californians would have to compete. Preston is seemingly dismissive of the cultural aspect playing much of
a governing role in resource selection, except to reflect on spiritual consequences of
scarcity instigating a more intense pursuit of critical resources. Where Anderson et al.
regard spiritual belief to be a contributing factor towards sustainability, Preston argues
that “these acts do nothing ecologically to preserve game or diminish predation pressure,”
(Preston 2002:124). Preston’s energy-return focused interpretation of pre-Colombian
California provides us with a more plausible recreation of prehistoric practices.

If we were to look at Anderson et al.’s and Preston’s papers as two points on a
continuum of explanation, we would come to fuller understanding of Native Californians’
relationship with the environment. It is unreasonable to imagine an environment that was
constantly being enhanced by its human inhabitants, and never degraded. The
ethnographic support that Anderson et al. used to justify the image of an ever-deliberate
human steward seems lacking in its explanation of how people were able to arrive at such
extensive knowledge of their role as agents in the environment. Such an important
cultural tradition could only be cultivated by generations of experience with
overpredation and overexploitation of critical resources; Preston’s argument supports this
position. Reliance on conservation ethics, including a reference to a prominent
environmental activist’s writings (see Notes, Anderson 2001:39), weakened the scientific
value of Anderson’s research. Sifting through the sentiment in Anderson et al.’s paper,
and critically combining its strong cultural element to Preston’s more linear analysis
could design a clearer understanding of California’s past, enabling us to identify trends
that may be crucial knowledge for moving forward.
Attachment 3: Assessment Reports for AY 2009-10 and 2010-11
For the academic year 2009-10 the Department of Anthropology focused on the 3rd element of the Department Learning Goals and Objectives: Written Communication. The assessment was designed to meet the following objective: “Students who graduate with a baccalaureate degree in Anthropology will demonstrate strong written communication skills. They will be able to effectively present anthropological perspectives through sophisticated, well-organized and clearly developed research papers.”

Method of Assessment:

Nine papers were selected from three foundational requirement classes taught during the Fall 2009 semester. The nine papers comprised three each from three of the four subdisciplines: archaeology (ANTH 109 - Ecological and Evolutionary Approaches to Anthropology), cultural anthropology (ANTH 146 - Ethnographic Analysis) and physical/biological anthropology (ANTH 155 - Method and Theory in Physical Anthropology). Additionally, for each course the papers represented A, B, and C quality work.

Three copies of each paper were made. Twelve full-time faculty members were assigned three papers, one from each course (Table 1). Further, each faculty member had one A paper, one B paper and one C paper. All 12 faculty members were given the attached rubric (modified from the Written Communication VALUE rubric) with which they were to score their papers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Paper #1</th>
<th>Paper #2</th>
<th>Paper #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barata, Data</td>
<td>109_1</td>
<td>146_2</td>
<td>155_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basgall, Mark</td>
<td>109_2</td>
<td>146_3</td>
<td>155_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishop, Joyce</td>
<td>109_3</td>
<td>146_1</td>
<td>155_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biskowski, Martin</td>
<td>146_1</td>
<td>155_2</td>
<td>109_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castaneda, Terri</td>
<td>146_2</td>
<td>155_3</td>
<td>109_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delacorte, Michael</td>
<td>146_3</td>
<td>155_1</td>
<td>109_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hens, Samantha</td>
<td>155_1</td>
<td>109_3</td>
<td>146_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy, Liam</td>
<td>155_2</td>
<td>109_1</td>
<td>146_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strasser, Elizabeth</td>
<td>155_3</td>
<td>109_2</td>
<td>146_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SturtzSreetharan, Cindi</td>
<td>109_1</td>
<td>146_3</td>
<td>155_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, Roger</td>
<td>109_2</td>
<td>146_1</td>
<td>155_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trichur, Raghuraman</td>
<td>109_3</td>
<td>146_2</td>
<td>155_1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the Department Faculty meeting on March 26th, 2010, each paper was discussed and the scores assigned by each faculty members were written on the board to see how much discrepancy there was between scorers (Figure 1). With the exception of one paper (146_3), there was no more than a 1 point difference in the assigned scores, suggesting some consistency among the faculty scorers. This was welcome news, as there was no norming prior to grading the papers.
Conclusions

Based on the discussion of the problems identified by the evaluation, it was decided that students in all upper division anthropology courses be given a grading rubric that will clearly indicate the department’s expectations with respect to written assignments. Additionally, a Term Paper Style Sheet and a Guide for Tables and Figures will also be circulated among all students attending upper division anthropology courses starting Fall 2010.

In addition to discussion of the papers and scores that were assigned, the faculty discussed the rubric. A number of the faculty felt a more anthropology-centric rubric might be more useful. There was a useful discussion about whether the department should institute a writing intensive course in the major, which might be taught every semester; and, about the possibility of introducing developing a capstone course. These discussions with be taken up again for discussions by the faculty in Fall 2010.
Department of Anthropology Assessment Report (2010/11 AY)
Submitted on June 29th, 2011

For the academic year 2010-11 the Department of Anthropology focused on the 3rd element of the Department Learning Goals and Objectives: Use Anthropological Perspectives. The assessment was designed to meet the following objective: Students who graduate with a baccalaureate degree in Anthropology will demonstrate strong critical analytical skills. They will be able to effectively analyze and develop arguments regarding complex issues from an anthropological perspective.

At the conclusion of last year’s assessment a number of the faculty felt that a more ‘anthropology-centric’ rubric might be more useful. Following up on this suggestion the Department Assessment Committee revised the assessment rubric pertaining to Anthropological Perspectives. The revised rubric which is consistent with AACU definitions was unanimously approved by the department faculty.

Method of Assessment

Early in the Fall semester, the Department Faculty selected 4 foundational courses from the Anthropology Curriculum for this year’s assessment. Each of these four courses was representative of one sub-discipline within Anthropology. The courses selected are:
- Anth 111 – California Archaeology (Archaeology)
- Anth 151 – Human Paleontology (Biological Anthropology)
- Anth 146 – Ethnographic Analysis (Cultural Anthropology)
- Anth 190 – Advanced Topics in Linguistic Anthropology (Linguistic Anthropology)

A total of 12 unmarked essays (three from each of the above mentioned courses) were selected for assessment. Any identifying information such as student name or number was removed and the essays were coded from number 1 to 12. Each essay was assigned to at least 4 faculty members, one from each sub-discipline. Faculty members used the revised assessment rubric to evaluate the essays. Following the rubric, the faculty could assign numbers 1-4 (including decimals such as 1.5) to each essay. Being the highest score, 4 would indicate that the essay is exemplary whereas 1 would be an essay that barely meets the bench mark.

At the Department Faculty meeting on March 18th, 2011, each paper was discussed and the scores assigned by each faculty members were written on the board to see how much discrepancy there was between scorers (See Table 1 below).

Table 1: Scores assigned Scores to Anthropology Student Essays submitted in Fall 2010 Semester:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essay No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Assigned scores</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = assigned faculty member was on Sabbatical

Out of the 12 essays evaluated, 9 essays had difference in assigned grade ranging from 1 point to 2 points, 3 had assigned grades where the difference was less than 1 point. This variation in the grades enthused a discussion about a range of issues pertaining to assessment.
Conclusions
Lengthy discussions followed the listing of scores on the blackboard. One of the factors that emerged as possibly influencing the variation in assigned scores was the difference in the way in which faculty from different sub disciplines within Anthropology would interpret “Anthropological Perspectives”. This difference had a strong influence on each faculty member’s assessment of the essays. In light of the engaged discussion that followed, it was decided that the faculty reevaluate our approach to assessing “Anthropological Perspectives”. This would entail fine tuning the existing methodology or developing new methods for implementation during the academic year 2011-12. It was agreed that this task will be part of the agenda for the Department Faculty Retreat scheduled for August 26th, 2011.