

ANTHROPOLOGY DIVISION
COORDINATORS' RESPONSE TO THE
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE REVIEW EXTERNAL REVIEW TEAM REPORT

3/24/18

Drs. Erickson, Patton and Wendt

We very much appreciate the outstanding and helpful report prepared by the Anthropology Division's External Review Team – Dr. Henry Delcore (Professor of Anthropology, California State University, Fresno), Dr. Lynn Gamble (Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara), Dr. Carrie Lane (Professor of American Studies, California State University, Fullerton), and Dr. Sang-Hee Lee (Professor of Anthropology, University of California, Riverside) during their site visit on February 16, 2018. We thank the PPR Team for the time, effort and thoughtfulness they put into their report.

In addition to meeting with the Dean and Associate Dean, these External Reviewers met with Anthropology tenured faculty, untenured faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and staff. At each of these meetings, they not only listened carefully but also offered many excellent suggestions. The External Review Team Report includes ten recommendations. The report has been circulated to the Division Tenure-Track Faculty, and it was positively received. We agree with the majority of the reports comments and recommendations and will rely on the report to guide our future planning and as we implement changes to our program. We address our responses to each individually below:

1) Coming together as a community:

As mentioned in the PPR meetings, we have been able to get along with each other as colleagues much more easily by dividing into programs. We have certain departmental events [e.g. faculty speakers] that, although sponsored by one of the programs, are attended by faculty across the division. Students are our first concern, and we have routinely come together as a faculty to support students at commencement, at commencement receptions, at awards ceremonies, and so forth. We agree with the reviewers that we should continue our efforts in this regard.

2) Selection of Chair in the long term:

There is a diversity of opinion within Division Faculty with regards to reuniting the Department under a single Chair. Most feel that a long-term goal is to reunite the Department, however, there is a general consensus that our current Division structure has served us well. As a group, we are pleased at the progress we have made in such a relatively short time. The three coordinators have been able to work together to collectively manage certain administrative tasks, while overseeing our own budgets, schedules, and DPC. While we recognize that this tripartite structure is not ideal in terms of workload and efficiency, yet it has allowed us to move forward

and serve our students. The majority of the faculty believe that the selection of a chair is a goal in the relatively near future (5-10 years).

3) Balanced growth among Programs:

We will continue to try to build a sense of fairness and equity among the three programs in terms of resources and accommodations. One of the comments of the review committee was that officially creating concentrations might lead to a sense of division among our undergraduate students. Pursuing concentrations is an area of disagreement among faculty. It is very important to us that undergraduate students think of themselves first as Anthropology Majors. We strongly believe that our majors should have the freedom to select courses of interest to them, and we are well aware that the diversity of anthropology is, in fact, one of the things that attract most students to our discipline. In any case, before we proceed with any future proposals for concentrations, we will discuss all of the pros and cons thoroughly with the entire faculty.

4) Hiring plan:

As recommended by the PPR committee, we will discuss a long-term hiring plan. Archaeology has not hired in 10 years and we very much appreciate the review committee's comments on this point. Archaeology, and the Coordinators, will begin discussions on future hiring, which could be in that area of Museum Studies/Collections Management/Cultural Resource Management.

5) Curriculum:

We agree with the PPR reviewers that the Division could benefit by looking at course topics more in terms of collaboration rather than competition. Evolutionary and Cultural are doing well on course enrollments, but Archaeology continues not to make target. This is primarily due to the fact that Archaeology never had many specific "archaeology" courses to begin with, and with the dividing of the curriculum, Archaeology consistently comes up short in terms of FTES. Anthropology's curriculum was never designed to be divided along sub-field lines. The Division structure, and the dividing of the Anthropology curriculum has adversely affected Archaeology. Archaeology plans to develop new courses, and we will work as a Division to be less rigid in "owning" courses, allowing programs to teach each other's courses from time to time. We hope that the eventual reunification of the Department (see above) will make this task moot.

For courses that share topical areas, we plan to continue to communicate across the programs in our scheduling so that we do not offer courses at competing times, or offer similar topical classes in the same semester. The goal is for optimal enrollment for all faculty in every program. One of our faculty commented that we likely have a higher percentage of faculty members leading study abroad, study away, or field classes than any other department on campus (Drs. Patton, Bowser, Grant, Stocker, James, Knell) and this reflects equal opportunity for participation across subfields, without competition.

6) Workload:

We have been actively working to establish a regular teaching load of 3-3 for all faculty. However, this is a barrier for Archaeology since Archaeology has not been able to make target due to the paucity of courses in our offerings (see above).

7) Resources:

We absolutely support the recommendation of the PPR reviewers that the computer lab, MH-422, be reconfigured in horizontal rows to make it more useful as a classroom, in addition to a computer lab. [Currently, the computer stations are in rows facing each other, making it difficult to have a regular class there.] We have talked about this for years, and long ago had staff from the dean's office look at it with us and make suggestions. Given the ongoing need for classroom space, this would be a benefit to all.

We do want to make more regular use of the Museum for exhibits, and hope to go forward with the museum minor/certificate proposal. Faculty agree that it is also positive to create a multi-purpose space within the museum space. For example, we have had several guest presentations there, and last year held our commencement reception there.

8) Advising:

We have discussed the idea of establishing some kind of required advisement for undergraduates, but it is still in the discussion phase. The three coordinators typically divide up the orientations for transfer students and new students that occur in summer and intersession, which has worked out well. For regular advisement, we have long had an unofficial policy that students can seek advisement from any faculty member during their office hours. Some of the junior faculty have not been fully trained in (e.g.) interpreting a Titan Degree Audit. We think that junior faculty should be more involved in advising undergraduates. One idea that we are pursuing is to give 3 WTUs assigned time to one faculty member from each sub-field to be the official advisors for the Division. They would advise our ~120 undergraduates on a yearly basis.

9) Enrollment:

We agree that more sections of ANTH 101 are needed, as a result of its GE category change.

10) Recruitment:

The PPR reviewers have made many good suggestions for outreach to students in order to recruit more majors. They all sound like great ideas. The faculty as a whole is committed to reaching out to students and attracting more majors.