2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT TEMPLATE

This template intends to make our annual assessment and its reports simple, clear, and of high quality not only for this academic year but also for the years to come. Thus, it explicitly specifies some of the best assessment practices and/or expectations implied in the four WASC assessment rubrics we have used in the last few years (see the information below* that has appeared in Appendices 1, 2a, 2b, and 7 in the *Feedback for the 2011-2012 Assessment Report;* Appendix 2 in the *Feedback for the 2012-2013 Assessment Report*, and Appendices 5 to 8 in the *2013-2014 Annual Assessment Guideline)*.

We understand some of our programs/departments have not used and/or adopted these best practices this year, and that is okay. You do not need to do anything extra this year, and ALL YOU NEED TO DO is to report what you have done this academic year. However, we hope our programs will use many of these best practices in the annual assessment in the future.

We also hope to use the information from this template to build a digital database that is simple, clear, and of high quality. If you find it necessary to modify or refine the wording or the content of some of the questions to address the specific needs of your program, please make the changes and highlight them in red. We will consider your suggestion(s). Thank you!

If you have any questions or need any help, please send an email to Dr. Amy Liu (liuqa@csus.edu), Director of University Assessment. We are looking forward to working with you.

*The four WASC rubrics refer to: 1) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Quality of Academic Program Learning Outcomes"; 2) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Capstone Experience for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; 3) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Use of Portfolio for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes"; and 4) WASC "Rubric for Assessing the Integration of Student Learning Assessment into Program Reviews".

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [Anthropology]

B2. Report author(s): [Raghu Trichur]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [189]
*Us*e the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed ==in 2013-2014.==

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess ==in 2013-2014==? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) *
X	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
X	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
X	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
X	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
X	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
X	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were **assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above:** a. b. c.

* One of the WASC's new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance **at graduation** in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:
Criteria 1,2.3,4,6, 8, 18 above were assessed using the following criteria:
1. **Critical Analysis**
2. Anthropological Perspectives and
3. Written Communications.
(See 2.1.1 for more detail).

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q1.4)**

	3. Don't know (**Go to Q1.4)**

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile* (DQP)[*] to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

[*] **Degree Qualifications Profile** (**DQP**) – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:
http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and
http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html.

Grading Criteria	4-Capstone	3 – Milestone	2 – Approaching Milestone	1 – Benchmark
Critical Analysis: Explain issues and Problems	Investigates important & relevant problem or issues. Constructs a sophisticated, clear and focused analysis.	Identifies and investigates a relevant problem or issues. Analysis of issues is coherent.	Identifies a somewhat relevant problem or issues. Analyzes it in a general way.	Identifies problem or issues in a general way. Analysis is too general.
Argument	Develops a strong argument that contributes to on-going debates in the field.	Develops argument in a clear and somewhat focused way.	Argument has little focus or development.	There is no focused development of argument.
Intersection	There is strong evidence of the complex ways in which nature, culture and society intersect.	There is some evidence of the intersection of nature, culture and society.	There is little evidence of the intersection of nature, culture and society.	There is no evidence of intersectional approaches to human experience
Anthropological Perspective: Scholarship	Critically evaluates & compares theoretical texts, establishing clear connections.	Evaluates theoretical perspectives without fully establishing their connection.	There is an attempt to explain theories and concepts within anthropology.	There is limited understanding of anthropological ideas and concepts.
Perspectives	Effectively engages in debates regarding different perspectives, developing a strong argument.	Engages, with some success, in debates between various anthropological perspectives.	There is an effort to establish connections between theories.	No effort to establish connections.
Research Evidence	Excellent research on institution or cultural processes; successfully applies anthropological perspective to individual research.	Good research on institution or cultural processes; fairly successful in applying anthropological perspective to individual research.	Somewhat succeeds in applying anthropological perspective to individual research.	Makes an effort to apply feminist theory to individual research topic.
Draws Inferences and Identifies Limitations	States a clear and insightful conclusion from analysis. Identifies limitations and/or implications of current theories.	States a clear and appropriate conclusion from analysis. Identifies apparent limitations of current theories.	States a somewhat clear and appropriate conclusion from analysis. Identifies some limitations of current theories.	States an ambiguous, illogical, or unsupportable conclusion. Does not identify limitations of current theories.

Written Communication: Organization	Assignment is sophisticated, clear, cohesive & well-organized, with a clear central purpose.	Assignment is clear, well-organized & contains a central purpose; it needs development.	Assignment has clarity & organization problems; needs development of central purpose.	Assignment is confusing; lacks organization, clarity & a central purpose.
Grammar and Spelling	The Assignment is free of spelling and grammatical errors.	Assignment has a few typos, but no major grammatical errors	There are some grammatical and spelling errors, and awkward phrases	There are several spelling and grammatical errors impeding understanding of assignment.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed **in 2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **ALL** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for **SOME** PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
X	3. No (**If no, go to Q2.2**)
	4. Don't know (**Go to Q2.2**)
	5. Not Applicable (**Go to Q2.2**)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s) you assessed in 2013-2014**?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q3.1)**

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	1. In **SOME course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In **ALL course syllabi/assignments** in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents

	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Part 3)**
	4. Not Applicable **(Go to Part 3)**

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Part 3)**
	4. Not Applicable **(Go to Part 3)**

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. [WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

The Department of Anthropology is ran a team-taught ANTH 196S an experimental senior seminar exploring in lieu of a capstone course in Fall 2013. At least one faculty representing each sub-discipline participated in teaching this course. This course was only open for enrollment to students who are scheduled to graduate during the AY 2013-14. Student's oral and written performance in this course was used to assess all four Learning Goals and Objectives namely, Inquiry and Analysis, Critical Analysis, Use of Anthropological Perspectives and Written Communications.

Method of Assessment

ANTH 196S: Senior Seminar was team-taught by 5 full-time faculty members. The 4 main categories were assessed through 2 direct measures: the final research paper for the senior seminar in Anthropology and oral presentation of the final research. All students who enrolled for the class were evaluated. The Grading Rubric generated by the five faculty members and was made available to the students enrolled. Students were encouraged to develop their own topics for the assignment based on specific instructions provided in the prompt.

Findings

Students are comfortable thinking within the dominant methodological framework of their sub discipline of their preference. Students, while meeting minimal standards, did experience

difficulty in articulating a holistic anthropological perspective that brings together quantitative and qualitative skills; empirical and theoretical perspectives.

Conclusion

It was concluded that the department take a careful evaluation of the curriculum.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [_____Critical Analysis_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_Anthropological Perspectives_]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Q3.4.3. Second PLO: [_Written Communications_]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs **in total** did your program **assess in the 2013-2014 academic year**? [_3_]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO **in 2013-14**, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)

	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.4)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.4)**

Q4.3.1. Which of the following DIRECT measures were used? **[Check all that apply]**

X	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) **[key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)]** that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

ANTH 196S: Research Essay (Fall 2013)

Each student will conduct a research essay. There will be three parts to this essay:

1. Research proposal (10%): Due October 21

2. Research In Class Presentation (15%): Conducted on Dec. 2 and 9.

3. Final Paper (35%): Due on Dec 13 (Friday, the final week of class instruction)

The proposal should be a one-page abstract of your proposed research topic, including a preliminary thesis statement. You should include a bibliography with a minimum of 10 sources, 5 of which should be annotated and the other 5 can be the bare citation. Please use AAA style (see style guide link below). The format of the proposal should follow that given for the final essay below.

The final paper should be 20 pages in length plus a bibliography. It should be typed, double-spaced, 12-pt Times New Roman font, use page numbers, 1-inch margins. It should use AAA style (please see www.aaanet.org/publications/style_guide.pdf). The paper should have your name, course number, and date running as a header across the top of the first page. You will be uploading your paper to WebCt. Please be sure to save your document in the following manner (as a *Word* document, not any other format): LASTNAMEANTH196SF13.doc

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [**key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s**)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion**?**

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [**Select one only**]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
X	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [**Select one only**]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
X	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
X	3. Don't know

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

Final assignments submitted by ALL students registered in Anth 196S senior seminar were used for assessment.

Indirect Measures
Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.5)**

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?
N/A

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(If no, go to Q4.6)**

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

	1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
	2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g., CLA, CAAP, ETS PP, etc)
	3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g., ETS, GRE, etc)
	4. Others, specify:

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No **(Go to Q4.7)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q4.7)**

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The VALUE critical thinking rubric has been used to collect data in order to directly assess All student papers submitted for the ANTH 196S: Senior Seminar. Each paper was assessed using three program learning objectives: 1) Scholarship and Critical Thinking; 2) Anthropological Perspectives, and 3) Written Communication, on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being highest and 1 being lowest. Both the assignment used as a direct measure, as well as the grading rubric, were discussed with the students well ahead of time.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [_1__]
==NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.==

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? **[CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]**

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses			X		
2. Modifying curriculum	X				
3. Improving advising and mentoring			X		
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals				X	
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations				X	
6. Developing/updating assessment plan				X	
7. Annual assessment reports				X	
8. Program review				X	
9. Prospective student and family information					X
10. Alumni communication					X
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring				X	
21. Professional development for faculty and staff					X
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.
We have been trying to evaluate PLO #2: Anthropological Perspectives in the last two assessment cycles. The development of the experimental course was a response to the conclusion we arrived at in our assessment for 2012-13. The methods deployed then were not satisfactory. The department-wide discussion of the curriculum is in part a response to what was learnt from the 2013-14 assessment.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No **(If no, go to Q5.3)**
	3. Don't know **(Go to Q5.3)**

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The department has voted to develop concentrations within the major. We are in the process of reconfiguring our major. We will reevaluate our PLOs in light of the anticipated curricular changes and develop complimentary assessment strategies.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don't know

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

Given the on going focus on the reevaluation of our curriculum, we have not yet decided on what it is that we will be focusing on for assessment in 2014-15. The whole process of reevaluation of the curriculum might be a possible focus in addition to one or two other items (to be decided).

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) [1]
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to **assess but not included above:** a. b. c.

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **developed** a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
X	6. 2011-2012
	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet **updated** the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_____]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

	1. Yes
X	2. No
	3. Don't know

A7. Name of the academic unit: [_ANTH_____]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [_Anthropology____]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [_Raghu Trichur___]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [_1__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
X	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

==Undergraduate Degree Program(s):==
A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [_1_]
A12.1. List all the name(s): [B.A. in Anthropology]
A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [___ ___]

==Master Degree Program(s):==
A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__1 ___]
A13.1. List all the name(s): [M. A. in Anthropology]
A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [_____]

==Credential Program(s):==
A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [_____]
A14.1. List all the names: [_____]

==Doctorate Program(s)==
A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [_____]
A15.1. List the name(s): [_____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: _____
16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____