1. **Overall recommendation.**

   The MA program should be continued and the newly developed PhD program shows great promise. The Administration, however, needs to decide if it is going to provide the support necessary for the Applied Anthropology Graduate Program (AAGP) to flourish within the newly reorganize College of Liberal Arts (CLA). Key target areas that need attention are: 1) improved financial (stipend) support for AAGP graduate students; 2) improved student-to-faculty ratio in the AAGP; 3) increased staff support is necessary to keep faculty from being overwhelmed with clerical work; and 4) the perception amongst the faculty and students that the reorganization of CLA has led to a loss of identity, power and control of their program must be remedied.

2. **Introduction.**

   Professor Brenda McComb, Dean of the Graduate School, Oregon State University (OSU), appointed a team to review the Applied Anthropology Graduate Program (AAGP) on Oct. 2, 2012. The Review Team included the following: Barbara Bond (Emeritus Professor; Director, OSU Office of Postdoctoral Programs-Graduate School); Donald B. Jump (Professor, OSU Nutrition Program in the School of Biological and Population Health Sciences-College of Public Health and Human Sciences); Roberta Baer (Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of South Florida); and Bill Roulette (Owner, Applied Archaeological Research, Inc.). Review Team members received a copy of the Self-Study prepared by the Applied Anthropology Graduate Faculty several weeks before the on-site meeting. Dean McComb hosted the Review Team for dinner on the evening of Oct. 1st to provide an opportunity to meet one another,
learn the background associated with review, and share expectations for the evaluation process. The following morning the team first met with Professors Susan Shaw, Director of the School of Language, Culture and Society (SLCS) and Larry Rodgers, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) to share insights about the reorganization of the college and Dean Rodgers’ vision for its continued maturation. Bryan Tilt (Anthropology Graduate Program Director) and Leah Minc (Anthropology Program Coordinator) provided an overview of the AAGP and the faculty. This was followed by a meeting with the faculty (10 in 3 groups: Food-Culture and Social Justice group (5); Bio-cultural group (3), Archeology group (3), a tour of the department offices and laboratory facilities and meeting with graduate students (~17 in attendance). The Review Team and Dean McComb met once again with Professors Shaw, Tilt and Minc for final questions. Once done, the Review Team met in Executive Session to share perspectives on programmatic activities during the past 10 years and the stated perspective of the faculty, students and Dean Rodgers. The Review Team agreed to individually prepare a draft for assigned sections of the final report. The completed draft was shared, revised and accepted by all Review Team members prior to submission to Dean McComb on Oct 25, 2012.

3. DETAILED FINDINGS

A. The fit of the mission of the program and its relationship to the mission of the academic colleges and University mission.

The AAGP seeks to apply anthropological insights to human problems. This is an excellent fit for a major Land Grant university like OSU. Furthermore, the specific focal areas of the program (articulated on p. 14 of the self-study) align very well with OSU’s Strategic Plan. Interestingly, the mission and goals of the program do not align as closely with the theme of the School of Language, Culture and Society, “Social Justice”, which is not presented in the Self Study document but was described during the Site Review. While some of the focal research areas in the AAGP are a very good fit with a “Social Justice” theme (food equity, for example), other areas of strength in research and teaching (archaeology, for example) are more loosely connected. The apparent mis-match may be partly a function of the very recent re-organization of the units, which eliminated a stand-alone Department of Applied Anthropology and put the
AAGP into the structure of a larger school. It is inevitable that a change such as this will result in some level of confusion, and that some of this confusion might clear up over time. On the other hand, the Review Team is concerned that there may be fundamental differences in focus between the School of Language, Culture and Society and the AAGP that could make it especially difficult to achieve a cohesive culture.

**Recommendation 1:** Administrators from the CLA, School of LCS and AAGP should revisit the linkages between the missions of the School and the AAGP.

B. Reorganization, Vision and Culture Issues

The reorganization has led to a perceived loss of identity, power and control among faculty and graduate students in the (now) Anthropology Program. Some subgroups within anthropology feel particularly marginalized. Students particularly note that the program has been placed with a school in which humanities approaches predominate, as opposed to social science approaches. This is a key attack on their identity as applied anthropologists are concerned with mixed methods. The vision of the school is also an issue—it is not clear that everyone has bought into “social justice” as a unifying theme, or that this is appropriate. Moreover, and importantly, justice is a culturally-imbedded concept. The idea of Social Justice may or may not be directly exportable to the international locations where Applied Anthropology faculty and students conduct research and fieldwork. In some settings, “Social Justice” may sound like jingoism.

One motivation for the reorganization is that there is a feeling among higher university administration that departments/disciplines are not suited to solved contemporary social problems. An interdisciplinary approach is favored. The irony of this is that anthropology, probably the most applied and interdisciplinary unit of the new school, is the one feeling the most threatened.

In addition, these reorganization efforts have the potential to undermine the overall goals of OSU. Applied anthropology has a long history at OSU, and was well known nationally for the department’s commitment to graduate training in applied anthropology. MA graduates easily found jobs working in public and private agencies devoted to the solving of contemporary
social problems. But without the autonomy necessary to maintain a coherent vision and long
term plan, and the authority over the budget necessary to carry this out, applied anthropology
at OSU may not be able to maintain this nationally recognized position. Faculty feel the need to
preserve the autonomy and identity of anthropology. They are concerned about development
of a vision of where applied anthropology program should go and how it should develop, but
are not clear how they can move towards that without a chair and a budget. And they need the
ability to hire the type of faculty they need. Since new hires pick their tenure home,
anthropology cannot necessarily determine what kind of hire will be made in these cases. This
is a key problem. Anthropology at OSU is one of less than two dozen programs/departments in
the US which train students in applied anthropology. Certain standard curricular offerings are
expected in these programs, and to remain competitive with the other programs, the OSU
AAGP must continue to provide these courses. Additionally, there must be the opportunity for
specialized training in fields such as medical anthropology, archaeology, etc. Competing for
hires against the needs of other programs, or operating in an environment where a hire must
be leveraged to meet the needs of multiple other programs in the school (let’s just get an
archaeologist who works in France on women in prehistory), will not adequately address the
needs of the OSU AAGP. Ultimately, the program will become less competitive nationally.

Higher administration at OSU needs to understand that applied anthropology is in itself
a multidisciplinary endeavor. But it is built from a solid core of values and approaches unique
to anthropology. These include a focus on culture and cultural differences, and a holistic
perspective. Anthropologists are particularly adept at being the ones on a multidisciplinary
team who can identify the larger picture and co-ordinate ways in which diverse perspectives
and all contribute to the problem at hand. This approach is fundamentally different from an
interdisciplinary unit such as women’s studies, where people trained in many different fields
bring their expertise to bear on women’s issues. Applied anthropologists do the reverse—from
a core culture, they move out to interact with scholars and activists coming from other
disciplinary perspectives.

**Recommendation 2.** Applied anthropology needs a more autonomous position within
OSU. The fit in the current school is not good. Discussions should first take place within
the anthropology program about these issues. Then they should be discussed with
higher administration. While OSU wants to move away from departments, perhaps a center/institute for applied anthropology might be appropriate. Additionally, each anthropologist might be given a joint appointment in another appropriate unit—such as public health, geology, nutrition, etc. This might be a way to finesse the identity needs of applied anthropology while recognizing that these faculty members are indeed highly involved and committed to the interdisciplinary goals of the university.

C. Quality of students

Overall, the quality of students is reasonably good. More importantly, student quality—at least as measured by GRE scores, appears to be increasing, although the apparent trend is strongly influenced by the fact that both verbal and quantitative GRE scores were much lower in 2007—the first year presented in the document—than in subsequent years.

The gender and resident vs. non-resident distribution of the student population are reasonable. Of course it would be nice to see a greater proportion of minority students, but their representation is not out of line with other OSU graduate programs.

Recommendation 3: There should be continued effort to improve student quality. This can been achieved through 1) improved funding for students (see below), 2) developing a more active recruitment of high quality students, perhaps through closer coordination with the recruitment efforts in the Graduate School.

D. Admissions selectivity

Overall, the program admits slightly less than 1/3 of the applicants, which represents a reasonably high level of selectivity. On the other hand, for the six years of data provided in the self-study report, only in the most recent year (2012) were the average GRE scores for admitted students greater than for rejected students. It appears that the ‘selection’ process is more likely to favor higher GRE scores now than in the past. Interestingly, the GRE scores of applicants have not changed significantly over the six year time period presented in spite of the
fact that there is a trend to improved scores in the admitted students, so the improvement in student quality noted above (at least in terms of GRE scores) is entirely a function of the selection process rather than recruitment. Obviously, GRE scores are only one of many metrics for evaluating student quality, and probably a poor one at that. But these are the only metrics available to the Review Team.

**Recommendation 4:** Develop a more deliberate process for selecting high quality graduate students. This might include identifying metrics in addition to GRE scores that predict student success and recruitment and selection on the basis of those metrics.

**E. Level of financial support of students**

The level of support for students in the AAGP is poor compared with the general graduate student population at OSU. Compared with other OSU graduate students, graduate students in AAGP are more than four times more likely to be dissatisfied with the level of financial support, and an equal proportion is more likely to be dissatisfied with the equity of distribution of support within the program, which is curious in a School that explicitly focuses on social justice. Few graduate students in AAGP have an externally-funded scholarship or fellowship, and only 20% have continuous internally-funded scholarships or fellowships. Most students are funded on Teaching Assistantships at the minimum level (0.2 FTE) that provides tuition. From one perspective, this is a reasonable distribution of limited funds in a way that provides support for the maximum number of students and still covers their tuition. From another perspective, the students in the program are likely to have severe financial challenges that distract them from their academic pursuits, and they will be saddled with significant debt that will persist for many years after they graduate. Improved financial support for students will greatly enhance recruitment of high-quality graduate students (above).

**Recommendation 5:** Develop a multi-faceted plan to increase financial resources to support graduate students. The plan should have explicit goals that include targets for increased faculty support of graduate students as GRAs on grants, increased internal and external scholarships and fellowships, and increasing the average FTE per student (we suggest a target of 0.49 for PhD students). A program that provides assistance to
faculty in grant writing and developing interdisciplinary collaborations for grants, incentives for including graduate student support in grant budgets, and rewards for success in obtaining student funding is most likely to be successful.

F. Curriculum strength

The graduate students in AAGP seem pleased with the quality of the individual faculty in their program and their commitment to teaching and advising. On the other hand, students are not at all pleased with the availability, or in some cases, the quality of some of the courses available to them. In terms of availability, many required courses are taught only every other year or every three years, and students seem mystified about when and whether courses will be offered. Apparently this problem has been most severe in the recent year because many faculty were on sabbatical leave or had other conflicts at the same time, and the Director of the School is aware of the problem and has resolved to make sure it doesn’t happen again. However, the ratio of students to faculty is very high in this program, and the inevitable consequence is that there is very little flexibility in course offerings.

Another consequence of the high student-to-faculty ratio is the necessity of combining a large number of graduate courses with undergraduate courses – which at OSU are known as “slash courses”. Slash courses have been at the top of the “complaint” list for OSU Graduate Students for many decades, and are a particularly serious problem in programs that have a large number of undergraduates in comparison with graduate students and a relatively small faculty. In the AAGP it may be possible to alleviate this problem in part by improving the quality of the slash courses. The Review Team noted that well over half of the course descriptions provided in the Self Study document for “slash courses” did not even articulate graduate-level outcomes, and many of those that did attempt to distinguish between graduate and undergraduate level expectations mentioned course requirements (such as a term paper) rather than learning outcomes. Assistance for faculty in better understanding appropriate learning outcomes for graduate students, as well as assistance in instruction to achieve these outcomes, could be helpful. But there is no denying the fact that this faculty is stretched to its limit in providing high-quality graduate instruction. This is not a condemnation of the quality of the faculty, but rather a consequence of their small number.
Most of the graduate students are unaware of the university-level requirements for graduate students. For example, they do not know about the policy requiring training in Research Ethics, recently adopted by the Graduate Council. The AAGP self-study does not specify how this training is delivered. We suggest this issue be addressed directly.

**Recommendation 6:** Review course outcomes for all graduate courses and revise as necessary to make sure that graduate outcomes are explicit and appropriate. Offer convenient workshops to faculty to help with this and to help them design learning activities to achieve the stated outcomes without over-burdening the faculty. The Center for Teaching and Learning can assist with this.

**Recommendation 7:** Develop a plan to reduce the faculty-to-student ratio. This plan should be proactive rather than reactive – i.e., it should anticipate retirements and future needs and should lay out a commitment by School and College administration to provide sufficient faculty numbers and expertise to sustain the program. The plan might also consider enhancing the teaching capacity of the AAGP by adding adjunct and courtesy faculty.

**Recommendation 8:** Improve communications with graduate students about course offerings and program requirements, including university-level requirements.

**Recommendation 9:** Develop a plan for ethics training of AAGP graduate students consistent with the standards and practices in the field of Applied Anthropology.

**G. Level and quality of infrastructure**

The program is housed in a large, old building that has been under-occupied for many years. Consequently, there is quite a bit of space available to the program, even though it is spread out over many floors. The faculty offices are simply stunning, and the new faculty lounge is nice – especially for a faculty of this size. Office space for graduate students is uneven, in some cases with eight or more students crammed into a very small office with barely room for their chairs, and in other cases with much more commodious office conditions. Also we are not sure whether there is any common space, such as a lounge, available to graduate
students. (We note that in many departments at OSU, the “lounge” space is open to faculty and students alike). The laboratory space available to the archaeology program appears ample and the computing infrastructure is impressive, although there may be a need for additional storage for archival of artifacts and for field equipment. There are other programs that do not have such ample laboratory space available, but they do not appear to be cramped. In the short time available to the Review Team there were many questions that could not be addressed, but we have some concern that graduate students are not provided adequate support for access and training to computer software. It appears that this support is provided ad hoc by individual advisors or teams and that there is no provision on the program or School level to provide such support to students.

**Recommendation 10:** Make sure all students in the program have access to computer software and computer support.

**H. Quality of organizational support**

Largely because of the recent reorganization, the support structure within and external to the Anthropology Program is still in flux. Students seem very pleased with the clarity and direction that Bryan Tilt is bringing to the graduate program. On the other hand, students and faculty alike appear to feel “leaderless” – which is not to fault the current leadership structure so much as to point out that there are difficulties in the transition. The Review Team was especially concerned that the ideas and perspectives offered by Dean of the College of Liberal Arts did not indicate a strong alliance with the Anthropology Program. Potentially problematic is the limited evidence that the administration is willing or able to provide adequate support to maintain sufficient faculty numbers in this program to sustain a high quality PhD program. It is noteworthy that the Director of SLCS intends to attend all of the Anthropology Program faculty meetings, and this interaction may go a long way to improve support for and communications with the Program.

**Recommendation 11:** The Anthropology program and the AAGP should actively seek to elevate the profile of their program within the School, College and University. One way to do this is to rotate responsibilities among faculty and students to write “press
releases” or other promotional materials. Such a project might be integrated into the “Uses of Anthropology” course, which would provide valuable training for students in making applied anthropological research available to multidisciplinary audiences. These materials might be included in newsletters and other communications on all of these levels, and also be included on the AAGP’s website.

**Recommendation 12:** In addition to attending Anthropology faculty meetings the Director should periodically meet with small groups of anthropology faculty and graduate students to gain a more personal sense of the program.

### I. PRODUCTIVITY

#### 1. Level and Quality of Student Performance.

The graduate students in AAGP are composed primarily of MA candidates (~75%) with some Ph.D. candidates (~25%). From 2007 to 2012, 60 MA candidates entered the program, 4 (6.7%) left without completing the degree requirements, 29 (48%) completed the degree requirements. Most MA students completed their degree requirements within 4 years of entering the program. The remaining students (27 or 45%) are still enrolled in the program. The Ph.D. program began in 2006; from 2007-2012, 19 students entered the program. Three students have completed the Ph.D. (~16%), 1 (~5%) left the program; the remaining 15 (79%) are still enrolled in the program.

The students have received several awards [Alumni Scholarship, Wilbur “Buck” Davis Memorial, Service to undergraduate education, Thomas Hogg Book scholarship, SYLFF fellowship for international research, McNair scholarship, et al]. While MA and doctoral students’ thesis/dissertation titles are listed, there is no evidence of publication of student research in peer reviewed journals. In fact, the Alumni Survey indicated that the majority of students do not publish their research. While there is evidence that graduate students in the AAGP attend national meetings (46 awards to graduate students for travel to conferences are noted in the self-study), it is not clear how many of these students presented their research.

**Recommendation 13:** Characterize causes for lack of completion of the degree and develop strategies to increase completion rate.
**Recommendation 14:** Articulate publication expectations for students.

**Recommendation 15:** Encourage faculty and graduate students to seek graduate fellowships, including OSU Graduate Fellowships.

**Recommendation 16:** Roughly 75% of the students in the program are MA candidates. The Provost has emphasized the training of Ph.D. candidates. If the AAGP wants to increase the # of Ph.D. candidates, the AAGP needs to develop a plan (with metrics) for the growth of # of Ph.D. candidates in the AAGP. In conjunction with this, the AAGP needs to develop funding mechanisms that assures students of adequate GTA/GRA/Fellowship support for the duration of their graduate program.

2. **Level and Quality of Faculty Performance.** The faculty, on average, published 3 refereed or other manuscripts/books per year during the 2007-2012 timeframe. During this same time the faculty received over $5 million (~$1 million/year) in research support from federal, state, industry and foundation sources. This represents highly commendable research productivity as measured by receipt of grants/research support and publication of peer-reviewed manuscripts. The webpages for the faculty, however, do not contain updated lists of publications or research support. The Program Review document also does not contain a list of presentations at professional meetings or invited presentation.

Over the last five years, however, the faculty received many awards and honors and served on numerous editorial boards for peer-review journals and reviewed books. They have also provided service to the state and national boards, societies/associations and government. As such, the faculty are well-engaged at the local, state, national and international level. The faculty appear to be doing a good job of publishing scholarly work and obtaining extramural support.

**Recommendation 17:** Faculty websites need to be updated for publications, presentations and grants. This could be done by a staff person, were one available.
**Recommendation 18:** Extramural support should include GRA support for graduate students.

3. **Viability of Scholarly Community within Which Students Can Interact.**

While seminars occur in the program, neither students or faculty shared information on these seminars, such as the # of internal and external speakers, or seminars devoted to professional development/preparation. Thus, it is unclear if the students are exposed to views of their discipline outside of OSU. Moreover, it was unclear if the students have the opportunity to present their research in a public forum.

**Recommendation 19:** Engage graduate students in periodic seminars as speakers in and organizers of the seminar series.

**Recommendation 20:** Develop a Graduate Colloquium for which each graduate student is required to present their thesis/dissertation findings. This could be held once a year. Discussants could be drawn from appropriate other disciplines across campus, thus contributing to the interdisciplinary goals of the university as well as publicizing applied anthropology in other areas of the university.

**Recommendation 21:** Maintain a list of seminar speakers. Provide an opportunity for students to meet with outside speakers to discuss research issues.

J. **OUTCOMES**

1. **Professional viability of Graduates.**

The AAGP is dominated by MA candidates. Since 2007, 52 MA and 2 PhD graduated from the program. Of the MA graduates, 30 are employed by various states (Oregon, Washington, California, Florida, Michigan, etc), federal agencies (US military) or enrolled in Ph.D. programs. Of the 3 PhD graduates, one is employed by NOAA in Seattle and the others
are program coordinators at OSU. Of the students for which placement data are available, the majority are employed in fields related to anthropology.

Employers of graduates from programs such as the AAGP at OSU note that the skills they find most important in new hires are ability to write and critical thinking. Such skills are not always identified by those of the opinion that learning should be oriented to fill the needs of the market place; that the primary job of the academy is to prepare students to compete in the market place. However, training for employment in applied anthropology should focus on opening and stimulating the minds of its students. The AAGP should have as it primary goal helping students learn to be curious, to have open minds, to be able to approach a problem from multiple sides, and to think critically. The market will absorb such thinkers and teach them the skills they need to be successful.

**Recommendation 22:** The AAGP should continue to stress writing abilities and the development of critical thinking in students in the program

2. **Satisfaction of Students and Graduates.**

Data for the satisfaction level for graduates of the program was obtained through 3 surveys: 1) a survey of current graduate students; 2) an exit survey of graduating students between 2010-2012; 3) a survey of alumni from the past 10 years. The current students were generally satisfied with their program and would choose the AAGP again. Moreover, they would recommend the program to prospective students. Their reason for coming to OSU-AAGP is the quality of the faculty and the Anthropology program.

Concerns expressed by the current students in both the surveys and in our meeting with the students were: 1) scheduling and availability of graduate level courses for completion of degree requirements, this applied to major and minor courses; 2) teaching graduate level courses at the appropriate level, this likely concerns slash courses; 3) initial advising could be improved. The exit survey by the Graduate School provides a comparison of the AAGP with all OSU graduate programs. Areas where the AAGP deviated negatively from other OSU graduate programs include: 1) fairness in distribution of graduate student financial support in the form of
GTA, fellowships and other sources of funding; 2) need to obtain student loans, financial aid or borrow money for program completion, it is high amongst AAGP students; 3) ~40% of students were not satisfied with the program advising and guidance; 4) ~50% were not satisfied with the explanation of survival strategies in graduate school and 40% were not satisfied with help received to find professional employment. The alumni survey indicated that the top reason for getting a graduate degree at OSU was to get a promotion at a job. Of these respondents (28 former students) most were satisfied-very satisfied with their program at OSU. As stated earlier, most of these students did not publish their research in a scholarly format, other than their thesis/dissertation.

**Recommendation 23:** Provide adequate GTA/GRA support for the graduate students.

**Recommendation 24:** Provide adequate advising for all entering students. Assess mentoring yearly through reviews/surveys/townhall meetings; and make changes in the program accordingly.

**Recommendation 25:** Encourage students to publish their research in peer-reviewed journals.

3. **Rankings/ratings.**

The Program Review document provided no information on rankings or ratings.

**Recommendation 26:** The program needs to identify methods to establish rankings and/or ratings for the MA and Ph.D. program. This information is useful to measure how the program compares to other programs nationally. Such information can be used for faculty and student recruitment.

4. **CONCLUSIONS**

A. Strengths of the Program
1. The staff, faculty, and facilities are impressive, in particular the archaeology labs.
2. Bryan Tilt is doing an excellent job as Graduate Director.
3. The faculty are open to the graduate students; the students really seem to like the faculty.
4. There is a good sense of camaraderie among the faculty

B. Needs Internal to the Anthropology Program

1. Slash courses continue to be an issue, though efforts have been made and continue to be made to address this issue.
2. There should be a departmental list-serve for grad students and faculty though which jobs (and other important information) can be widely and quickly shared.
3. Availability of courses for graduate students, slash courses, and funding are all concerns for grad students.
4. More graduate students are needed for the stand-alone graduate courses—consider development of an anthropology certificate.
5. Archaeology labs need more space, particularly for curated materials.
6. The balance of MA/PhD students needs to be considered in terms of faculty workloads. Support for Ph.D students should be sought from grants.

C. Reorganization, Vision and Culture Issues

1. The reorganization has led to a perceived loss of identity, power and control among faculty and graduate students in the (now) Anthropology Program. Some subgroups within anthropology feel particularly marginalized.
2. Students particularly note that the program has been placed with a school in which a humanities approach predominates, as opposed to social science approaches. This is a key attack on their identity as applied anthropologists concerned with mixed methods.
3. The vision of the school is an issue—it is not clear that everyone has bought into “social justice” as a unifying theme, or that this is appropriate.
4. The department needs to explain to Susan, Larry, and others the differences between the culture of anthropology vs. interdisciplinary culture. The identity needs of the anthropology need to be finessed.
5. There is a feeling among higher university administration that departments/disciplines are not suited to solve contemporary social problems. An interdisciplinary approach is favored. This runs counter to the culture of anthropology.

6. Susan does not agree that the reorganization has created identity problems as well as problems for long term program development.

7. New hires are a problem. While they pick their tenure home, anthropology may not be able to determine what kind of hire will be made.

8. Faculty feel the need to preserve the autonomy and identity of anthropology.

9. Faculty are concerned about development of a vision of where applied anthropology program should go and how it should develop, but are not clear how they can move toward that without a chair and a budget. And the ability to hire the type of faculty they need.

D. Graduate Student Issues

1. Some of the required courses are not felt to be relevant for the archaeologists. Either requirements need to be changed or the relevance of these courses (ethnographic methods) needs to be clarified.

2. Most grad students are appointed at the same FTE, but workloads vary.

3. Scheduling of the methods course and other required courses may not be optimal for student requirements. Regular meetings between faculty and students should be instituted. Having graduate representation at faculty meetings and/or town hall meetings held biannually would help bring student concerns to the faculty.

E. Support Staff

1. Staff support is woefully inadequate.

2. About a quarter time position needs to be solely devoted to the graduate program.

3. Faculty need staff support for grant writing. This should not be in terms of required workshops, and /or web based instructions for faculty, but rather actual support staff who can do some of the hands on work required for larger grants (e.g., NIH).

F. New Faculty Lines Needed

1. The student/faculty ratio is much too high.
2. Medical anthropology is carrying too heavy a load of advisees (one person is on 20 committees, 10 as advisor). Another medical anthropologist is needed.

3. More archaeologists are needed. Currently 2.5 faculty are serving 22 students.

G. Relationships between the Anthropology Program and Other units in the University

1. There is a need for funding transparency. Faculty need to know where the money comes from and where it goes. This is true within the school and between the college and the school.

2. The faculty are fearful that their voices won’t be heard about the future of anthropology within the school.

3. The Anthropology program coordinator must have authority to make decisions that are in the best interest of the AAGP, such as graduate student stipend levels, recruitment of students, scheduling classes, assigning teaching, scheduling faculty meetings, etc.

4. The dean gave frequent examples drawn from women’s studies. Susan must advocate for anthropology to the dean.

5. Anthropology needs more self-promotion within the University. Faculty and students are involved in a wide range of interdisciplinary projects. They must make sure that these activities are recognized by a university increasingly giving attention and resources to interdisciplinary approaches.