



WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY

Program Review Self-Study

Academic unit: Anthropology

College: Liberal Arts & Sciences

Date of last review: 2009

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant): n/a

List all degrees described in this report (add lines as necessary)

Degree: Anthropology - BA CIP* code: 45.02

Degree: Anthropology - MA CIP code: _____

Degree: _____ CIP code: _____

Faculty of the academic unit (add lines as necessary)

Name

Signature

Dr. Peer H. Moore-Jansen

3-31-14

Dr. David Hughes

3-31-14

Dr. Angela Demovic

3-31-14

Dr. Donald Blakeslee

3-31-14

Dr. Jens Kreinath

03/31/2014

Dr. Lisa Overholtzer

3/31/2014

Dr. Sarah R. Taylor

3/31/2014

Jerry Martin

3/31/14

Submitted by: Peer H. Moore-Jansen, Professor & Chair

Date _____

(name and title)

Department of Anthropology
Programs: BA in Anthropology; MA in Anthropology
2010-2013 Self Study

Part 1. Departmental Purpose and Relationship to the University Mission

1a. University Mission:

Wichita State University is committed to providing comprehensive educational opportunities in an urban setting. Through teaching, scholarship and public service the University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national and global community.

1b. Program Mission:

The mission of the anthropology department's undergraduate program is to offer programs and facilities at a nationally competitive level consistent with the needs of the local communities in south-central Kansas while 1) providing a comprehensive curriculum for undergraduate students and an opportunity for non-majors to learn about the history and diversity of the human experience; 2) contributing to a liberal education in the arts and sciences of all students by providing exposure to diverse cultural experiences, developing critical thinking skills and teaching an understanding of the complexity of human diversity; 3) promoting scholarly and applied research by the faculty and students; 4) providing assistance and public service to law enforcement, medical, education, cultural resource management, and multicultural organizations in the local and regional communities.

Graduate, M.A. Program

In addition to the general departmental mission (above), the Mission of the MA program in anthropology has three primary components: 1) preparing students for employment in anthropology as technicians and teachers or in such related areas as international business, multicultural educational programs and healthcare delivery programs, and preparing students who wish to pursue the Ph.D. in anthropology for entry into the programs of their choice; 2) Engaging students in research under the supervision of their faculty mentors; and 3) Providing service to the University, the community and the discipline through the active involvement of both faculty and students.

1c. The role of the program (s) and relationship to the University mission

In addition to satisfying its role in the university mission statement particular to the metropolitan area, the program directly addresses the stated mission of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences that is "to cultivate intellectual curiosity and foster contemplation of the human experience and the natural world." As it administers its curriculum to students locally and state-wide, the program has become an essential part of the intra- and inter-state educational and research linkage between programs and governmental agencies at the local, state and federal level. It works with agencies including: local museums and organizations, the Kansas State Historical Society, the Kansas Department of Transportation, Medical Examiner's Offices of Sedgwick and Shawnee Counties, The Wichita Police Department, The Wichita City Planning Commission, and the various local and federal agencies within Kansas or the surrounding states, the program addresses the University mission preparing students for and facilitating their placement in comprehensive and unique course work opportunities and

providing them with an understanding of cultural diversity needed to appreciate and succeed in an increasingly complex world of the local, national and global community.

1d. Has the mission of the Program (s) changed since last review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

The program mission has not changed, but along with significant change in the composition of faculty, details of the goals and objectives are in the process of being reconsidered, modified and adjusted to optimize how the department positions itself relative to the university model for applied learning and research.

1e. Have measurable goals and objectives of the program(s) changed (both programmatic and learner centered) changed since the last review? ☐ Yes ☒ No .

1e. Program description(s):

Undergraduate Program (BA, field major, BGS-Anthropology):

Program objectives are: to employ and maintain a high quality faculty to teach and advise students in teaching and research; to maintain appropriate facilities for research and instruction; to teach students to command basic concepts, theories and subject matter in the three major anthropological subfields of socio-cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, and archaeological anthropology; to develop student appreciation of a variety of human social systems; to prepare students for employment and/or graduate work.

The undergraduate program identifies strongly with the (College) mission to "cultivate intellectual curiosity and foster contemplation of the human experience and the natural world." The department offers a diverse undergraduate curriculum open to integrate with programs across the departments and colleges. It is designed to provide quality educational and research facilities to the meet educational needs of the student community and to off campus communities in the region of South Central Kansas. By providing quality education to majors and non-majors, students are afforded theoretical foundation and practical skills, independent initiative, keen critical thinking, leadership and team work capacities as outlined in our mission statement.

In addition to a comprehensive curriculum designed for the major, the department offers anthropology courses designed for non-majors of diverse backgrounds, thus allowing them to incorporate course work for a minor, as electives, requisites or complementary course work across majors and special programs (e.g. Forensic Science, Criminal Justice, Global Studies, General Studies, International Studies, Asian Studies, Linguistics, Forensic Science Certificate, Plains Certificate, History, Religion, Biology, College of Education).

The department's contribution to the undergraduate general education curriculum comprises introductory and further study courses in cultural, archaeological and biological anthropology. These courses span social and biological sciences and provide students from every field of study with educational experiences and challenges based in holistic anthropological perspective. Exposures to global history and diversity of past and present socio-cultural, culture-historical and biological aspects of the human experience provide students with comprehension and appreciation of the complexity of human diversity.

Graduate Program (MA):

The program aims to 1) recruit a pool of well qualified student applicants who align themselves with the department admission requirements; 2) and to admit, in full standing, an average of at least six new students per year; 3) to involve students in original or faculty-generated research projects, or internship placements, depending on student track.

Student roles may include, but are not limited to: fieldwork and data collection; laboratory analysis; museum exhibit design and production; curatorial activities related to collections; theoretically driven anthropological or ethno-historical library research; appropriate internships, apprenticeships, or volunteer positions; managing or planning the management of cultural resources

The graduate faculty affords students with unique opportunities to collaborate with faculty in presentation and publication of research, helping them to build a strong professional foundation. The graduate program includes advanced educational experiences, seminars, lab and field work, and interdisciplinary educational experiences, where students are engaged in research under the supervision of their faculty mentors. The program is designed to prepare them for employment where they can fulfill needs for highly trained and experienced professional anthropologist in academic or applied positions in anthropology and related fields (e.g. medicine, international business, multicultural educational programs and healthcare delivery programs, forensic science, government agencies, policy-making agencies, law-enforcement, social services, etc.).

The department is currently housed in Neff Hall and occupies part of two floors. The museum, the department office, a conference room, a city archaeologist office, an equipment room, and one large archaeology lab is housed on the first floor. The second floor is home to two additional archaeology labs, a biological anthropology lab, four faculty offices, a small lecture room and a faculty/student/reading facility. The second floor is also the home of two federal artifact collection curation facilities. The hall on both floors of the building are lined with museum exhibits and are an extension of the larger exhibit facility, a museum work shop, and a collection storage facility in the south end of the building. An eight acre off-campus research facility for research and teaching in biological anthropology (Skeleton Acres) provides unique learning opportunities for students in specialized class or research settings, while also serving as a training facility for regional law enforcement.

The department provides considerable support to the community in many capacities. The role faculty have played on local education at the elementary, middle, and high school levels is evidenced by professional presentations, including but not limited to the financially endowed David and Sally Jackman Speaker Series, giving museum tours and developing exhibits, building and providing educational components (teaching kits and web-sites), teaching and engaging in human diversity and globalization events, archaeological service, long term and highly technical services in medico-legal investigation and training of law-enforcement, and participation in local community groups. One of the older community activities led by program faculty includes the local archaeological association (AASCK) which attracts local archaeology enthusiasts.

Through its teaching efforts, the department serves the university educational objectives at different levels. The program contributes significantly to general education, offers service courses (e.g. Interdisciplinary courses taught in service to other departments) within and outside the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Anthropology regularly and successfully teaches World Cultures and Intercultural relations to large bodies of students in the College of Education. We also teach Anthropological Linguistics to help student satisfy program requirements in Teacher Certification programs. The anthropology program also teaches multiple (cross-listed) sections for the department of Women's Studies and for the Criminal Justice Program and service course for Forensic Science. With new initiatives including a curriculum in GIS and Museum Science, we expect additional service in teaching by anthropology will involve other departments.

Program Goal and Objectives

1. To recruit a pool of applicants who are well-qualified in terms of the department's stated admission requirements and to admit, in full standing, an average of at least six new students per year.
2. To involve students in original or faculty-generated research projects, or internship placements, depending on student track. Student roles may include, but are not limited to:
 - a. fieldwork and data collection
 - b. laboratory analysis
 - c. museum exhibit design and production

- d. curatorial activities related to collections
 - e. theoretically driven anthropological or ethno-historical library research
 - f. appropriate internships, apprenticeships, or volunteer positions
 - g. managing or planning the management of cultural resources
3. To produce students who can demonstrate proficiency in each of the three subfields of Anthropology (Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology, and Archaeological Anthropology) in terms of knowledge of:
 - a. The major historical developments within each subfield
 - b. The contemporary theoretical positions and debates within each subfield
 - c. Current and past methodological approaches employed within each subfield
 3. To produce a minimum of five MA graduates per year.
 4. To prepare those students interested in continuing education for entrance into Ph.D. programs
 5. To periodically review, re-evaluate and, if necessary, revise the program objectives and the curriculum.

Part 2. Faculty

The department accomplishes teaching research and services in a multitude of ways (Table x). The past review period represents a time of dramatic change in faculty and in curriculum orientation. During the reporting period of 2010-2013, the department experienced one phased-retirement; the unexpected death of a faculty member; and two semester-long medical leaves, and a partial leave (FMLA). With the support of the College, two adjunct instructors per semester were employed to help cover classes to limit increases to the work-load on the remaining faculty. Changes in staffing and different levels of maturation in the professional development and their adjustment to the program have also had a major impact.

Professional experience:

The faculty is composed of nationally renowned authorities and scholars on the subjects of human social systems, human diversity and skeletal biology, historic and prehistoric archaeology. Individual faculty is widely recognized for their contributions and research publications in a wide variety of journals, books, professional proceedings, and professional newsletters. The department is also the home a nationally and internationally recognized scholars and researchers in sociocultural anthropology (religion, NGO and applied research, ethnographic field work); biological anthropology (human skeletal biology, forensic anthropology, morphometrics, and mortuary and cemetery anthropology); archaeological anthropology (culture-historical reconstruction, prehistoric archaeology, ceramics analysis, household archaeology, archaeological dating techniques, historic trails, cultural resource management). The faculty expertise covers geographical areas including Mexico/ Central and South America, Africa, Europe and Middle East, Great Plains and Southern Plains of North America.

Teaching

In addition to three tenured faculty members and a Museum Director, the composition of the faculty currently reflects one recently tenured faculty and three un-tenured faculty members. The department chair/biological anthropologist (1.0 FTE) also teaches a full-course load every semester. Three archaeologists (3.0 FTE) and three socio-cultural anthropologists (2.5 FTE; 3 FTE starting fall 2013) teach the curriculum of both the undergraduate and graduate programs and the program contributions to the general education program. All four tenured faculty members have a record of strong professional experience in research and service within their respective professional societies, to the university and the college, the department, and to local, regional, national, and international communities. The department successfully hired two strong and committed faculty members, including an archaeologist and a sociocultural anthropologist in the past two years restoring the faculty ranks to three sociocultural anthropologists, three archaeologists and one biological anthropologist. The last two hires also aimed at shifting the department focus from an orientation toward Pacific studies to South and Central America. Other changes include a renewed focus on application and skills in anthropology, including development of GIS applications and course-work in the sub-disciplines of anthropology and teaching of GIS across university-curricula within or among colleges. New course proposals were developed and subsequently approved to facilitate this change in focus.

Seven faculty members (7.0 FTE), include two tenured full professors, two tenured Associate Professor, three tenure-track (un-tenured) Assistant professors. Six faculty members taught a course load of 3 courses (1 FTE) per semester. Exceptions include illness or Family Leave. One faculty member taught 3 sections per year (0.5FTE) (phased-retirement) during the entire review period and phase-retirement (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1. Program quality (Major and MA Program) as assessed by the strengths, productivity, and qualifications of the faculty in terms of SCH, majors, graduates and scholarly productivity.

Last 3 Years	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty (Number)	Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty with Terminal Degree (Number)	Instructional FTE (#): TTF= Tenure/Tenure Track GTA=Grad teaching assist O=Other instructional FTE			Total SCH - Total SCH by FY from Su, Fl, Sp	Total Majors - From fall semester	Total Grads - by FY	
			TTF	GTA	O				
Year 1→ 2010-2011	7	7	6.5	3	1	4,409	92	33	
Year 2→ 2011-2012	7	7	6.5	1	2	4,159	90	38	
Year 3→ 2012-2013	7	7	7.0	1	2	3,933	82	39	
Total Number Instructional (FTE) – TTF+GTA+O						SCH/ FTE	Majors/ FTE	Grads/ FTE	
↓									
Year 1→ 2010-2011						11	400.82	8.76	5.07
Year 2→ 2011-2012						10	415.90	9.47	5.85
Year 3→ 2012-2013						10	393.30	8.63	6.00

Scholarly Productivity	Number Journal Articles		Number Presentations		Number Conference Proceedings		Other reports			Number of Exhibits		Creative Work		No. Books		No. Book Chaps.		No. Grants Awarded or Submitted		\$ Grant Value
	Ref	Non- Ref	Ref	Non- Ref	Ref	Non- Ref	Ref	Non- ref	Misc. review	Juried	** **	Juried	Non- Juried							
Year 1 2010-11	3	1	2	5	2		2	3	6				6	4	1	2			\$ 9,900	
Year 2 2011-12	7		7	2	2		1	2	7				3		2	3			\$32,915	
Year 3 2012-13	11		14	8	3		5	3	4			1	4	1	5	5			\$63,632	

* Winning by competitive audition. **Professional attainment (e.g., commercial recording). ***Principal role in a performance. ****Commissioned or included in a collection. KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

All seven (100%) hold graduate faculty membership and all teach courses in the undergraduate major and in the graduate program. Together they taught a total of 4167 credit hours (3-yr average) (not counting occasional adjuncts and GTA support). They taught 37 (3-yr average) graduate students for an estimated teacher/student ratio of 5.24 graduate students per faculty. One unclassified professional with graduate faculty status serves as department museum director and teaches museum courses per year. Three GTA positions include two general GTAs assigned by the chair to provide indirect teaching support to faculty teaching classes with large enrollments (currently on-line classes) and a dedicated third Biological Anthropology GTA providing ½-time indirect teaching assistance for a large introductory class and ½-time direct teaching sections of Anth 106 (Biological Anthropology). Based on enrollment data provided to the department (WSU Program Review Appendix Table 1 and 2) enrollments have dropped almost 10% overall between 2010-11 and 2012-13. The change reflect ca 14% drop in introductory classes; 10% in 2-400 level; 8% in 5-600; 29% increase in 700 level; 19% increase in thesis hours. The observed enrollment trend is consistent with two major factors currently affecting the department, including departmental dynamics of changing faculty and restructuring of the teaching of introductory classes (described above).

Research:

All faculty are engaged in research and several engage students in their efforts. The department provides a graduate research assistant to each faculty to support the faculty and the students in research and learning.

Based on self-reported data, the faculty combined to publish or present 135 scholarly publications (books or articles), refereed reports, professional presentations, exhibits and creative works during the past review period. Of these, 73 were refereed or juried. A total of ten external grant submissions were submitted for a total of \$106,447.00. Additionally, several faculty served on professional conference panels or as officers in professional societies. One faculty organized an annual student conference at WSU. The latter represents an additional 30 student or student/faculty authored presentations. Notably, the student conference, originated at WSU, is now organized on other campuses that maintain chapters of the National Anthropology Honor Society.

Three faculty members carry the larger proportion of SCH or credit hour distribution. Each of these faculty members is assigned a graduate teaching assistant. The majority of faculty members engage in publication activity. One faculty advises a disproportionate number graduate students in the MA program. Three faculty members are the primary contributors to grant submission. Additional support to faculty teaching larger classes or a larger number of graduate students is clearly an issue and has played an important role in faculty retention or overload compensation (the latter has never been possible).

Part 3. Academic Program

3a. Anthropology majors score consistently above the university average and shows a slight increase of the past review period. While the numbers reporting represents only about a third of all students, the results speak to an increasing better prepared student body (Table 3a.1).

Table 3a.1 ACT scores for Anthropology majors compared to students university-wide.

Last 3 Years	Total Majors - From fall semester	ACT – Fall Semester (mean for those reporting)	
		Majors	All University Students - FT
Year 1→2010-11	92 (31 reporting)	24.4	22.7
Year 2→2011-12	90 (34 reporting)	24.8	22.8
Year 3→2012-13	82 (29 reporting)	24.6	23

KBOR data minima for UG programs: ACT<20 will trigger program.

3b. Candidates admitted to the MA program in anthropology continue to hold a GPA of 3.5 (Table 3a.2) and is above the anthropology graduate admission requirement of 3.25. The graduate GPA remains consistent with the university-wide average demonstrating a continued strong academic preparation of our graduate student body.

Table 3a.2 GPA scores for Anthropology graduate admissions compared to students university-wide.

Last 3 Years	Total Admitted - By FY	Average GPA (Admitted) – Domestic Students Only (60 hr GPA for those with ≥54 hr reported) By FY		
		GPA of those Admitted	College GPA	University GPA
Year 1→2010-11	6	3.5		3.5
Year 2→2011-12	12	3.4		3.5
Year 3→2012-13	19	3.5		3.5

*If your admission process uses another GPA calculation, revise table to suit program needs and enter your internally collected data.

Based on data collected within the anthropology office, two students left the program for personal reasons (including one student who changed to Biology). Also, students retained after one year is 95% or greater.

3c. Assessment of Program Objectives Major and Graduate Program and Educational Outcomes

Program Objective one – admissions. To maintain or increase undergraduate enrollments and to recruit a pool of applicants who are well-qualified in terms of the department's stated admission requirements and to admit, in full standing, an average of at least six new graduate students per year. The achievement of objective one will be assessed by keeping a record of the numbers of students admitted in the various admissions categories each year.

- a. Learner outcomes: During 2010-2013, a total of 87 undergraduate majors were admitted to the major. And a total of 84 graduate students were admitted to the program: 76 in full standing and 8 as conditional admissions. Admissions at both the undergraduate and graduate level represent an increase relative to the previous review period.

Program Objective two. To involve students in original or faculty-generated research projects, or internship placements, depending on student track. The achievement of objective two will be assessed as part of annual review of all graduate students by the anthropology graduate faculty.

- a. Learner outcomes: During 2010-2013, 42 graduate students were involved directly involved in faculty generated research and approximate 45 student or faculty/student authored papers and presentations were produced.
- b. Among students enrolled, thirteen students were engaged in Kansas or Plains archaeological research (Fac: Blakeslee and Hughes) and one worked with GIS application to collection management (Fac: Hughes). In Biological anthropology (Fac: Moore-Jansen) four students engaged in skeletal morphometric research at the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, one engaged in research at the Dart collection at Witwatersrand University in South Africa, two engaged taphonomy research, two in site management in Butler County (also, three students from biology engaged in biomass studies) at the WSU-BAL Skeleton Acres Research facility, four students worked on skeletal analysis of material from Poland and West Texas, and six students engaged Kansas cemetery field research. In cultural anthropology, one student engaged audio-visual anthropology in New Guinea, one studied code-switching in Wichita (Fac: Martin/Moore-Jansen), and two students engaged in Museum research (Fac: Martin/Hughes). One student studied in Turkey and one studied health and nutrition in Samoa (Fac: Demovic),

Program Objective three. To produce students who can demonstrate proficiency in each of the three subfields of Anthropology (Biological Anthropology, Cultural Anthropology, and Archaeological Anthropology). The achievement of objective number three will be assessed in the major by a) student grades earned in three undergraduate classes for majors and non-majors (generally education students), b) student grades and c) performance on graded essays earned in a required undergraduate capstone class; and in the graduate program by d) student grades earned in the three required graduate core classes. Student performance in these core undergraduate and graduate classes will be assessed annually, with grades of "70%" or higher in undergraduate courses and grades of "B" or better in graduate courses considered a successful completion of objective number three. Additional assessment of student success reflecting competence in the subfields, especially student in the "Thesis" track (typically those bound for Ph.D. programs), will be further assessed by e) performance on two-day written comprehensive exam which specifically tests knowledge in each of the three subfields. Competence will be demonstrated by the achievement of a grade of 2.5 on a scale of 4 on all sections of the exam based on the mean of evaluation scores by all members of the Anthropology Graduate Faculty.

Educational outcomes of the Undergraduate program are assessed by a sequence of three knowledge-based assessment instruments measuring the student's coursework and research activities in cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, and archaeological anthropology, throughout their stay in the program.

Transcript Analysis: a) an assessment of learner outcomes was performed by examining the final scores reflecting student performance in multiple section of three introductory anthropology courses in

anthropology. Sections of Anth 102 and 103 comprise twice or more the number of sections of Anth 101 during the entire review period. Anth 102 and 103 includes both on-line and class room sections and the course was also taught by two or more instructors each time the course was offered. A score of 70% or better consistent with student success in the general education program, to master materials and perspectives of a successful college education by broadening and deepening the general education of majors and non-majors at WSU. A score of 70% is also consistent with beginning levels of mastery at the level of introductory anthropology students planning to continue in the major.

Learner outcomes: a) Students (majors and non-majors/general education student). An average of 82.86% of students in Anth 101 completed the class with a score of 70% or better Table 3c.1). Thus demonstrating mastery of the anthropological material and perspective on human diversity and history in the context of general education. The much smaller number of majors in this class (between 5-10% similarly demonstrated mastery of introductory skills preparing them for further study in the major.

Table 3c.1 Aggregate data of student performance in Anth 101, 102, 103 (2011-2013)

Last 3 years	101	102	103
2011	83.4% (n=199)	48.9% (n=397)	78.4% (n=190)
2012	81.3% (n=198)	56.5% (n=310)	69.8% (n=202)
2013	83.9% (n=186)	52.5% (n=255)	68.3% (n=186)

An average of 56.63% of students in Anth 102 completed the class with a score of 70% or better Table 3c.1). Thus demonstrating mastery of the anthropological material and perspective on human diversity and history in the context of general education. The much smaller number of majors in this class (<10%) similarly demonstrated mastery of introductory skills preparing them for further study in the major. The level of students who demonstrated "mastery" at the level of introductory anthropology is far below the expected level of student success. It is recommended that the source of the under-performance of this class be further addressed in the upcoming review period.

An average of 72.16% of students in Anth 102 completed the class with a score of 70% or better Table 3c.1), thus demonstrating mastery of the anthropological material and perspective on human diversity and history in the context of general education. The much smaller number of majors in this class (<10%) similarly demonstrated mastery of introductory skills preparing them for further study in the major. The potential effect of delivery method of this course should be considered in light of additional assessment of both Anth 102 and Anth 103.

Transcript Analysis: b) a cumulative assessment of student progress in the capstone course (Anth 647) is maintained for all majors requiring a passing score of 70% or higher. All undergraduate students must complete a required sequence of courses culminating in introductory core courses—Anthropology 101 - Biological Anthropology, 102 – Cultural Anthropology, and 103 – Introduction to Archaeology. Students are required to select among further study subject, area courses, and history and theory capstone course (Anth 647).

- a. **Learner outcomes:** In Anth 647, our capstone class, an average score of 87 (on a 100 point scale) (student n=18) was recorded among students in the Fall 2012 section of Anth 647, indicating that the objective was met.

Anthropological Essays: c) every fall semester, the undergraduate Coordinator work with individual instructors to administers a direct knowledge-based multi-component assessment of all majors in the program capstone class (ANTHR 647). Committee ratings are averaged for each student and require a 70% rating to meet expectations of demonstrated mastery of the program content.

- a. **Learner outcomes:** Data were only recorded for fall 2011 and 2012. In Fall 2011, fifteen students (62.5%) met or exceeded minimum expectations, demonstrating that they mastered anthropological

theory and appreciation of diverse human social systems. In Fall 2012, fifteen students (83%) met or exceeded the minimum expectations, thus returning to the level of success observed during the prior review period. Observed course results are returning to their pre-review period levels and the "hic-up" observed during Fall 2011 is ascribed to circumstances related to course instructor illness.

Educational outcomes of the Graduate program are assessed by a knowledge-based assessment instrument used in three advance core courses in the graduate program, thus measuring the student's coursework, comprehensive examinations, and research activities in cultural anthropology, biological anthropology, and archaeological anthropology.

Transcript Analysis: d) a cumulative assessment of student progress in the three advanced core anthropology classes (Anth 736, 746, 756) in the graduate program is maintained for all graduate students requiring a passing score of 80% or higher. All students must complete the sequence to continue in the program.

- a. Learner outcomes: In 2010-2013, a total of 90 students (98%) in the Anthropology advanced core courses of the graduate program obtained grades of "B" or better (below), as noted below:

Course	Grades \geq B	Grade < B	Incomplete
ANTH 736	30	0	0
ANTH 746	29	0	1
ANTH 756	31	0	1

Transcript records of three core advanced graduate courses returned to 83% who met or exceeded minimum expectations (Fall 2012) with an average score of 87 (on a 100 point scale), thus demonstrating mastery of anthropological foundation, method, and theory at MA level. The goal is met.

Comprehensive exam (MA exams):

- a. Learner outcomes: e) In AY 2010-2013 Eleven students took and passed the comprehensive exams. Initial plans to rate students by a numerical score were discussed and identified to be inappropriate based on the subjective format of essay questions and multiple graders, including all faculty members. All students demonstrated comprehensive mastery of anthropology at the MA level, as determined by the entire faculty giving each student a passing grade.

Program Objective four. To produce a minimum of five MA graduates per year. The achievement of objective four will be assessed by tracking the numbers of degrees awarded annually.

- a. Learner outcomes: In AYs 2010-2013 24 MA students graduated from the anthropology program (avg: 8/year) including six in Spring 2010, three in Summer 2010, five in Fall 2010, two in Spring 2011, one in Summer 2011, two in Fall 2011, three in Spring 2012, and two in Fall 2012, (and four in Spring 2013).

Program Objective five. To prepare those students interested in continuing education for entrance into Ph.D. programs The achievement of objective number five will be assessed by tracking the number of student who progress from the WSU MA program to doctoral programs in other universities, in anthropology or related fields.

- a. Learner outcomes: At least five 2010-2013 graduates have matriculated or are in the process of matriculating in PhD programs in anthropology. Three teach at community colleges, one works in a museum (in Kansas), three work as archaeologists for government or private cultural resource management firms, three are in law enforcement, two work in related fields for a nonprofit organization, one is in a physical therapy program, one matriculated in law school, and two returned for a second degree.

Program Objective six. To periodically review, re-evaluate and, if necessary, revise the program objectives and the curriculum. The achievement of objective number six will be through tracking of student progress over time, official and unofficial feedback from faculty, students, and the graduate school, and annual reviews of the program assessment.

- a. **Outcomes:** The faculty regularly implements curriculum changes to better reflect the individual strengths of faculty. New courses include Anthropological Linguistics, Archaeology and Ethnicity, Cultural Resource Management, Beginning and Advanced GIS Applications. New seminar courses include Mortuary and Cemetery Anthropology and Biocultural Anthropology. Other course developments include courses in Islam, religion, Anthropology of the Middle East, Gender studies, and African Ethnography.
- b. **Additional Results.** In response to dramatic changes in faculty and changing enrollment patterns, the department considering several changes to reflect the department "make-up". This process will continue into the upcoming review period. Some changes include consideration of a switch to a stronger indirect teaching support model in the use of the majority of GTA positions, further evaluating on-line an experimental course offerings in light of course integrity (content), delivery, student success, enrollment demands, budgetary constraints, and instructor support.

3d. Student satisfaction.

Student responses from graduates of the major in anthropology indicate a very high level of satisfaction exceeding the outcomes from the college and the university (Table 3d.1). This speaks to the quality and energy of the undergraduate program and the program overall.

Table 3d.1 Student satisfaction - Major.

Student (UG) Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction). [*] If available, report by year, for the last 3 years			Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)	Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
10-11		n/a	1				
11-12		Mean: 4.6; median: 5.0; (Progr: 91.3%; Coll: 83.7%; Univ: 79.5%)	2				
12-13		Mean: 4.4, Median: 5.0; (Progr: 95.2%; Coll: 89%; Univ: 82.9%)	3				

Student satisfaction with the graduate program (MA) somewhat less than the college or university averages listed below (Table 3d.2). This of strong concern and is already being addressed in the department. During the past review period at least one faculty member had less success than others working with some students at the graduate level. This includes concerns about research supervision and leading the student to a successful graduation. This is likely to be a primary cause of the reported results for student perception of the program and possibly also the graduation rates.

Table 3d.2 Student satisfaction - Graduate Program.

Student (GR) Satisfaction (e.g., exit survey data on overall program satisfaction). [*] If available, report by year, for the last 3 years			Learner Outcomes (e.g., capstone, licensing/certification exam pass-rates) by year, for the last three years				
Year	N	Result (e.g., 4.5 on scale of 1-5, where 5 highest)	Year	N	Name of Exam	Program Result	National Comparison±
10-11		n/a	1				
11-12		Mean: 4.0, Median: 4.0; (Progr: 71.4; Coll: 77%; Univ: 80%) (n=23)	2				

12-13	Mean: 3.3; Median 4.0; (Progr: 58.3%; Coll:77.5%; Univ: 82.5%) (n=21)	3				
-------	---	---	--	--	--	--

3e. Assessment of general education/KBOR Foresight 2020 initiatives.

The department teaches several courses in general education and plays an important role in service to General Education, other departments and colleges. One of three assessments specifically addresses the department's success in response to the Foresight 2020 objectives of advancing information literacy, writing skills, and critical thinking. One course, Biological Anthropology (Anth 101) represents an introductory Biological Science course in the WSU general education program. The student body regularly comprises largely non-majors (GenEd). The instruments used to assess the KBOR/GenEd initiatives include a library exercise (Information Literacy) where students are required to navigate library facilities in search of professional resources; two writing assignments (Writing Skills) requiring students to read and review professional articles in biological anthropology or related fields, testing the students capacity for relating, in writing, published professional research and discussion of topics discussed in class; a written report about non-human primate behavior, biology/biological capacity, and variation (Critical Thinking) on a required visit to the Sedgwick County Zoo. The zoo report requires the student to develop a research question, a strategy for observing and collecting data related to the project objective, an analysis and discussion of the data. Each student is expected to achieve a score of at least 75% on each of the three assignment to demonstrate mastery of Information Literacy, Writing Skills, and Creative and Critical Thinking.

Learner outcomes: The number of students who met or exceeded the level of mastery of each of the three objectives (students who performed at $\geq 75\%$ or better) is reported below (Table 3e.1). More than 78 percent of students scored in excess of 75% on all assignments in both semesters assessed. This confirms that student master each of skills at the level put forth by the General Education program. It also suggests that Anth 101 addresses successfully the initiatives of the Foresight 2020 program put forth KBOR.

Table 3e.1. Anthropology 101 assessment of GenEd objectives.

Gen Educ Outcomes Anth 101	Informat. Literacy Libr. Assignment ($\geq 75\%$)	Writing & Critic. Thinking Article Review 1 ($\geq 75\%$)	Writing & Critic. Thinking Article Review 2 ($\geq 75\%$)	Creative & Critic. Thinking Zoo Report ($\geq 75\%$)
Fall 2011	86.0% (n=74/86)	84.5% (n=71/84)	85.2% (n=69/81)	94.9% n=74/78)
Fall 2013	84.5% (n=71/84)	78.6% (ne66/84)	79.0% (n=64/81)	88.5% (n=69/78)

Because of budget limitations and to maintain enrollments, the department has examined different ways of delivering some courses while optimizing departmental resources. Two of four ongoing curriculum projects currently being undertaken to assess our introductory sections in anthropology and evaluate the success of both classes in light of KBOR's Foresight 2020 initiatives. Just prior to the past review period, the department initiated an on-line model to deliver two undergraduate introductory courses, making them accessible to a wider audience while also restructuring and optimizing the efficiency of course offerings, delivery, and student enrollment. The following assessments of two classes (Anth 102 and Anth 103) address issues identified with this effort.

Assessment of Anthropology 102

Anthropology 102 was assessed to understand the students' general knowledge of anthropology, as tested by a multiple choice exam of questions designed to reflect knowledge of the key concepts of cultural anthropology, and administered each year as a portion of the final exam. Although some questions change from semester to semester, the content of the exam questions are similar. The assessment seeks to measure students outcomes (3-yr averages) for students taking this course online versus those who take it in a classroom setting (Table 3e.1; below).

When comparing scores for students who TAKE the exam in Anth 102, it appears that the students taking the class online are succeeding at a higher rate than those who take the course in the classroom. Students who take the test on-line perform noticeably better (71.56%). It is worth noting that many fewer of the internet students complete the final exam. This is consistent with expectations because of differences in ability of students to refer to their texts and notes while taking the exam. Overall, only 72% (156/218) of the students who are enrolled in an on-line section take the final exam. In contrast, 83% (65/78) of those enrolled in a classroom section complete the final exam. It is strongly recommended that the question of why a larger percentage of students who enroll in on-line courses fail to take the final exam to address and improve student success across the board in the on-line class. Further, it is strongly recommended to address how to raise student success to acceptable (>70%) among students taking the final in the class room. Clearly, the high success rate on the final exam in the online course is related to the high drop rate.

Table 3e.1. Enrollment statistics for on-line and FTF Anthropology 102 courses for Review period

Anthropology 102 Delivery	Date	Total Students	Total students taking final exam	Mean Score on Final Exam	Total student scoring $\geq 70\%$ on Final	Total class above $\geq 70\%$ on final
On-line	Fall 2011 Spring 2012 Fall 2012	256	156 (71.5%)	75%	119 (71.56%)	52.33%
Class room	Sum. 2012 Spring 2013 Fall 2013	78	65 (83.3%)	77.7%	36 (46%)	61.33%

Assessment of Anthropology 103

Anthropology 103 is the introductory course for archaeology, which serves as a general education requirement for non-majors and as a requirement for the major. As a major requirement, the course provides the foundation for further study in archaeology by teaching students about the archaeological research process—how we know what we know—and by fostering the development of higher order thinking skills (e.g. critical thinking and evaluation) and writing skills. The course is offered in both online and classroom or face-to-face (FTF) formats each semester. By offering the course online, the anthropology department is able to increase its credit hours and reach students who would otherwise not be able to take our courses.

Class activities, discussions, and assignments have to be designed not according to the ideal educational experience, but keeping in mind the limited amount of time available for grading each week. In the first iteration of the course, only the final project (a group online museum exhibit with two benchmark assignments for feedback) facilitated student-student and student-instructor engagement. After learning outcomes and student evaluations were disappointing, the course was revised to include hands-on or analytical activities that students could complete at home, followed by weekly class discussions on Blackboard. While student-student interaction increased significantly as a result, student-instructor engagement remains limited. This limitation surely hinders student learning in the class, and likely contributes to continued student dissatisfaction, disengagement, and withdrawal rates. A comparison of statistics on final grades and completion rates for the concurrent online and FTF Anthropology 103 courses reveals two strikingly consistent patterns. First, more students withdraw from the online course after the drop deadline—roughly 20% in the online course compared to 0-2% in the FTF one (see Table 2). Significantly more online students tend to drop the course before the drop deadline, though unfortunately, that data is not available. However, students who stay in the course perform roughly equally well; 20-25% of the students earn a grade lower than a C in the course, and comparison of final projects between the two formats revealed no significant differences.

The elevated withdrawal rates are of significant concern, because they run counter to the university's goals of increasing student retention and graduation rates in accordance with Foresight 2020, the 10-year strategic agenda put forward by the Kansas Board of Regents. The withdrawal rates suggest that at present we are not adequately engaging students, motivating them, and getting them invested in the online course early on in the semester, as we are able to do in a traditional classroom course

Table 2. Enrollment statistics for on-line and FTF Anthropology 103 courses for AY 2012-2013

	Online F '12		Online Sp '13		FTF F '12		FTF Sp '13	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Withdraw	12	20%	11	21%	1	2%	0	0%
A-C	34	58%	29	55%	33	73%	8	67%
D	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	2	17%
F	12	20%	13	24%	11	24%	2	17%
Total	59		53		45		12	

Conclusions and Recommendations

Anthropology 103 is a foundational course that provides the skills and knowledge needed to succeed in more advanced archaeology courses. It is designed to move students along William Perry's (1970) scheme of development, from dualism to multiplicity to relativism and finally commitment in relativism, and to engender the higher ordering thinking skills located at the top of Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson et al. 2001). Accordingly, the course asks students to do more than memorize and regurgitate details or facts. Students compare, evaluate, and create sources of archaeological information, all while working on their writing skills. As a major requirement, this scholarly rigor must be maintained. Student evaluations and informal feedback from students, however, demonstrate that many online students do not expect such rigor. Recent education research demonstrates that students in online courses perceived the workload to be greater than equivalent FTF courses, and have lower levels of satisfaction (Maki and Maki 2002, 2003). Maki and Maki (2003) postulate that having regular weekly assignments—a course structure that according to pedagogical literature promotes knowledge retention, and so was implemented in the redesign of Anthropology 103 online—leads to lower satisfaction among students. While it is possible to engage students such that they feel satisfied with a rigorous workload, and even motivated by it—as seen in the very good evaluations for the equally rigorous FTF Anthropology 103 course—this is clearly not the case in the online course as it is currently designed given instructor support limitations.

Overall, the assessment of the anthropology program as described above is positive and strong. The program is aligned with the university mission, the objectives of the major and graduate program, addresses and exceeds objectives of general education and non-major objectives across the university, among and within colleges and into the community. Learner outcomes demonstrate the success of the program in most areas and speak to the relevance of the instruments used to assess the objectives.

Part 4. Student and Employer Demand for the Anthropology Program

The following addresses the continued demand for the anthropology program by students, employers, and communities in and outside of Kansas. Employment and placement, along with diversity and enrollment statistics summarized below. Among our recent graduates (2010-2013), three students are currently teaching at Community Colleges outside Kansas,

Three students are employed by private or government archaeological entities in and outside Kansas, one student is in law school (KS), One student is enrolled in a Physical Therapy program in Canada, five students have matriculated in a PhD programs (outside KS), one student is engaged in museum work in Kansas, three students are or are seeking employment with law enforcement in Wichita and Derby, two students work for a nonprofit organization in Wichita, and two students returned to school for a second degree (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Student and Employer Demand – Majors.

Majors						Employment of Majors*							No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS**				
Last 3 FYs= Su, Fl, and Sp	No. new applicants or declared majors	No. who enter or are admitted in the major	No. enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Total no. of grads	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment % related to the field	Employment % outside the field								
Year 1→	30	28			16								Current year only					
Year 2→	26	26			27													
Year 3→	31	30			18													
Race/Ethnicity by Major***										Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK	NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	UNK
Year 1→	3	4	4	0	2	0	86	2	4									
Year 2→	0	6	4	0	3	0	85	1	4									
Year 3→	0	6	1	1	4	0	77	0	5									

* May not be collected every year

** Go to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Website: <http://www.bls.gov/oco/> and view job outlook data and salary information (if the Program has information available from professional associations or alumni surveys, enter that data)

*** NRA=Non-resident alien; H=Hispanic; AI/AN=American Indian/ Alaskan Native; A=Asian; B=Black; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; C=Caucasian; MR=Multi-race; UNK=Unknown

KBOR data minima for UG programs: Majors=25; Graduates=10; Faculty=3; KBOR data minima for master programs: Majors=20; Graduates=5; Faculty=3 additional; KBOR data minima for doctoral programs: Majors=5; Graduates=2; Faculty=2 additional.

The M.A. program continues to satisfy a need for well-prepared employees within the field and in related disciplines. Approximately 1/3 to 50% of our graduates finds employment within the state. Between 33-66% of our MA graduates find employment (seasonal or full-time) within the discipline whereas 11% take positions outside the field. Approximate 1/3 of our MA graduates matriculate in PhD programs outside the State of Kansas.

The composition of the graduate student body continues to reflect a diverse background. Recent admissions not included here continue to confirm this trend. The "decision" to choose anthropology as a profession is still limited by concerns about financial success, social acceptance and individual maturity. Even though the average age of our students have dropped (historically), the decision to choose anthropology remains decision made later in a student's career. We continue to admit Kansas applicants to our program, but admittedly, a larger part of our graduate student body is made up of out-of-state students. This reflects our growing reputation nationwide.

In addition to traditional jobs in academia (professor, lecturers, community college instructors), graduates of the MA program can continue to expect to find employment opportunities in archaeological field work (government agencies, private consulting firms), as compliance officers, park rangers or interpreters (government agencies), crime scene investigation, law enforcement, morgues and forensic facilities, museum workers, teachers, non-profit consultants, case-workers, advocates, and many more. Indeed, anthropology remains a foundational discipline to many related and unrelated disciplines placing graduating majors and MA students in demand. The degrees also aids student who seek to matriculate in advanced Anthropology, Education, Criminal Justice and Psychology programs, Law and Medical schools (Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Student and Employer Demand for Program – MA Graduates.

MA -- Program						Employment of MA Grads								No. pursuing graduate or professional education	Projected growth from BLS ^{***}							
Last 3 FYs -- Su, Fi, and Sp	No. new applicants (MA prog)	No. who enter or are admitted in the GR progr.	No. enrolled one year later	1 Year Attrition %	Total no. of grads	Average Salary	Employment % In state	Employment % in the field	Employment: % related to the field	Employment: % outside the field												
Year 1→	22	19			9		33	33	22	11	33	Current year only										
Year 2→	28	22			6		33	66	16.6	0	16.6											
Year 3→	22	20			6		50	33	33	0	33											
Race/Ethnicity by Major***														Race/Ethnicity by Graduate***								
		NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	MR	UNK			NRA	H	AI/AN	A	B	NH/PI	C	M	R	UNK
Year 1→											2	2	1	1	0	0	26	1	0			
Year 2→											1	4	1	0	0	0	31	1	0			
Year 3→											1	6	1	0	0	0	28	2	1			

The program, albeit small in faculty size, is an effective university unit and experiences national and international recognition. Its place in liberal arts education remains strong and the program continues to fill niches and develop new capacities to fill changing roles across the college, the university while it continues to develop as a major and graduate program with growing state-wide and national prominence.

Although the program is not accredited (nationwide, there is no accreditation system in anthropology), the department maintains its professional listing with the American Anthropological Association. The listing represents a membership in the largest anthropological society and serves as a recognition of the department's professional legitimacy and strength. Several of the individual faculty are highly credentialed in the discipline and in their sub-disciplines representing a broad spectrum of anthropology and museum science, all of which attract students, who are often also recommended to come to WSU by their undergraduate instructors, from across the state of Kansas, the United States, from Canada, and abroad.

The anthropology student body is moderately diverse, and diversity continues to grow within the program. Though diversity is difficult to define and measure, the program is addressing how to attract a more diverse student body by addressing the issue of anthropology NOT being a primary consideration as a major for many students who seek more financially rewarding careers. The program lacks absolute data on retention, but according to a simple head count, the retention of graduate students is approximately 90% or greater.

Part 5. Program Service and Cost Analysis

The program serves a steady body of non-majors, majors and graduate students in anthropology. The teaching emphasis on undergraduate education exceeds teaching at the graduate level, but this is consistent with the proportional composition of our student bodies in the two programs (Table 5.1). All faculty members teach a 3-course teaching load per semester. Some faculty teaches during pre- and summer sessions. A significantly larger part of the program teaching effort reaches out to general education, service courses (e.g. Interdisciplinary courses) taught in service to other departments within and outside the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Anthropology regularly and successfully teaches World Cultures and Intercultural relations to large

Table 5.1. Distribution of teaching efforts.

Percentage of SCH Taken By (last 3 years)			
Fall Semester	Year 1 – 2011	Year 2 – 2011	Year 3 – 2012

UG Majors	16.2%	19.5%	13.0%
Gr Majors	9.5%	12.3%	11.8%
Non-Majors	74.3%	68.2%	75.1%

All faculty members teach a 3-course teaching load per semester. Some faculty teach during pre- and summer sessions. A large part of the teaching effort reaches out to general education, and courses (e.g. Interdisciplinary courses) taught in service to other departments within and outside the college of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Anthropology regularly and successfully teaches World Cultures and Intercultural Relations to large bodies of students from the College of Education. We also teach Anthropological Linguistics to help student satisfy program requirements in Education. Anthropology teaches multiple (cross-listed) sections for the department of Women's Studies and for the Criminal Justice Program and a service course for Forensic Science. With new initiatives including a curriculum in GIS and Museum Science, we expect additional service in teaching by anthropology will involve other departments.

Although enrollment changes according to the economic woes of the state, the nation, and certainly of the local community, the program has managed to maintain and, at times, grow enrollments. It has done so at little cost. Indeed, the program may have improved the university budget during the past review period as higher paid senior faculty has been replaced by lesser paid junior faculty while maintaining the same teaching responsibilities. The program has also optimized instructor effort relative to enrollment by offering large class sections. A shift towards on-line teaching has permitted the department to maintain enrollment while teaching fewer core sections and creating opportunities for teaching a more diverse program curriculum. However, based on several assessments tools (above) addressing the efficacy of such shift in course delivery may be at the expense of course content and student learning. It is suggested that a resolution to this issue may be additional funding for instructional support. Meanwhile, the department has also developed a number of class room sections with growing enrollments (Anth 200, 300, 555, 557, and 600). The efforts required of the instructors of these courses continue to increase without corresponding compensation or instructional support necessary to maintain this growth.

Individual faculty members provide extensive professional service, more some than others, but the sum of the effort is considerable. The money saved by local municipalities and even at the state level is significant. The service-in-kind contribution to Forensic Investigation and Human Identification to the Region of South-Central Kansas alone exceed \$50,000.00 during the past review period, not including the educational services provided. The City-Archaeologist, a student position funded by the college (formally funded by City mill-levy but unfunded by a former interim vice-provost without consultation) saves the City of Wichita/Sedgwick County as much as \$50,000.00-\$100,000.00. The department museum has established a strong profile within the department with its continually changing exhibits and intriguing collections. The museum employs students, who also design and build all exhibits. Because the museum is housed within the department, the exhibits represent a major attraction to locals and visiting students.

The University and the Community also gains from the efforts of individual faculty to work with individual students, aiding them in developing student or faculty student authored publications and presentations, on campus and locally but also regionally and nationally. The public relations earned by the university are significant and represents an important factor in student awareness of the university. The program also offers opportunities for field work in all the sub-disciplines of anthropology. Students have traveled to South Africa, Turkey, Poland, Samoa, Mexico, and numerous places across the North America. This raises the university profile beyond the State of Kansas.

The faculty are also active in grant writing or contract proposal submission. At least three faculty have written grants for approximate \$100,000.00 during the past review period. Some faculty members have also successfully raised new funding sources (endowments or financial donations to the department). These funds will aid in the support of students, research, and ongoing faculty development. Further, the department was recently afforded a four million dollar endowment. This award speaks strongly to the recognition of the department, the program, its faculty, and its students. The fund enables the program to award student scholarships at the undergraduate level (5-6 annually) and 9 graduate student research assistant awards. The opportunities afforded here attract students and has had a

dramatic effect on the identity of the department. Individual faculty members have attracted smaller endowments, of varying amounts all of which support research in archaeology and biological anthropology.

Part 6 and 7. Summary and Recommendations.

Department strengths include award-winning teaching and a national reputation for our biological anthropology program. We currently have 37 graduate students and 76 undergraduate majors. Our graduation rate for the MA program has averaged 7 per year over the last 10 years. We are also strong in service and community engagement (including an on-line presence). Strengths in terms of facilities include the Skeleton Acres research facility, one of only eight in the country, osteological collections, the L.D. Holmes Museum of Anthropology that has one of the world's best collections of Asmat art, a cutting-edge ethnographic field-collecting program, and extensive archaeological collections from the Great Plains. The department also boasts three archaeological research lab and a good supply of basic field research equipment. We also benefit from the Jackman endowment which is dedicated to the maintenance and development of the Skeleton Acres research facility, student support and research and other experiences that directly involve students. It cannot be used for faculty salaries.

Overall our assessments for the past review period demonstrate the appropriateness of our current objectives and the appropriateness of our measuring instruments. Weaknesses include under-staffing, especially in the Museum, which has a part-time director, and in the classroom, where the demand in biological anthropology outstrips our ability to offer courses and other training, both in terms of faculty and appropriate teaching space. In terms of attracting new students, a stronger archaeology program of the past used several federal programs to underwrite annual field schools. Those funding opportunities have ended, and enrollments have suffered as a result. The socio-cultural program needs to strengthen external funding and has three relatively young faculty members who can grow the program. But it does not yet have the ability to attract students from across the country or the globe. The department should also increase its publication rate, especially on-line publications, and enrollments of undergraduate majors and graduate students in cultural and archaeological anthropology. The program is in dire need of upgraded teaching facilities including a dedicated classroom, teaching lab facility for teaching human osteology, forensic anthropology, and lithic analysis. Further, we have a general lack of good laboratory equipment, outdated total stations, and no remote sensing equipment for cemetery and archaeology use.

The results of the efforts of the past few years to replenish and replace departing faculty, the department find itself with far more junior faculty than senior faculty, a total reversal of the former department environment. Overall, this change has had a strong impact on program identity, program structure, curriculum development, teaching and instructional delivery. The program remains a strong contributor to the general education program and curriculum and it has found new ways to interact with and provide service to departments and colleges across the university. The department's recent strategic vision report outlines in greater detail a number of new and revitalized initiatives that line up with the KBOR Foresight 202 objectives, President Bardo's vision for WSU, and aims at bringing the program forward. The department remains strongly committed to the university mission, but the ongoing changes have opened up new opportunities for growth and the development of new strengths. These strengths lay not only in research focus, curriculum, but also in professional development and opportunities for refurbishing of infrastructure. On the positive side, the department's endowment fund, using the criteria defined for the guidelines has enabled the department to provide significant funding for specific types of student support at both the undergraduate and graduate level. On the negative side, the department clearly needs additional instructional support (GTA), and an additional faculty position in biological anthropology to further facilitate optimizing curriculum development, alternate course delivery and continuing growing class room sections.