

**A DEPARTMENT IN RE-BUILDING MODE:
PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON**

Review Committee Members:

William Leonard
Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University

Gail Nomura
Department of American Ethnic Studies, University of Washington

Miriam Stark
Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai'i

Stewart E. Tolnay, Chair
Department of Sociology, University of Washington

Robert Weller
Department of Anthropology, Boston University

Craig ZumBrunnen
Department of Geography, University of Washington

December 2010

BACKGROUND

The Department of Anthropology Review Committee included three local members (Gail Nomura, Department of American Ethnic Studies; Craig ZumBrunnen, Department of Geography; Stewart Tolnay [Chair], Department of Sociology) and three external members (William Leonard, Department of Anthropology, Northwestern University; Miriam Stark, Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai'i; Robert Weller, Department of Anthropology, Boston University). The external committee members represented, generally, the three sub-disciplines that organize most activities within the Department of Anthropology at the University of Washington: Archaeology (Stark), Biocultural Anthropology (Leonard), and Sociocultural Anthropology (Weller).

The Review Committee received its charge on July 12, 2010 in a letter from Gerald J. Baldasty, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School and James Soto Antony, Associate Vice Provost and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. On August 18, 2010 the Review Committee met with representatives from the University administration and the Department of Anthropology for a background discussion and to engage in preliminary planning for the review and site visit. The administrative representatives included the following: Judith Howard (College of Arts and Sciences), Tom Gething, James Antony, and Augustine McCaffrey (Graduate School), Bettina Shell-Duncan (Department of Anthropology). The external reviewers participated via conference call. Subsequently, on October, 18, 2010, the Committee met (external members via phone) with Bettina Shell-Duncan, Chair of the Department of Anthropology. In response to a request from the Review Committee an additional meeting was scheduled for October 29, 2010 with the coordinators of the three primary sub-disciplines within the Anthropology Department. Peter Lape represented Archaeology; Darryl Holman represented Biocultural Anthropology; Lorna Rhodes represented Sociocultural Anthropology.

The departmental site visit occurred on November 1 and November 2, 2010. The Review Committee held a working dinner on the evening of October 31st. On both days of the site visit, the committee began meeting at 9:00 am. and adjourned at about 5:00 pm. The Review Committee met with faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate students. Most of the faculty met, individually, with the Committee. The meetings with staff and students were conducted in groups. An exit interview was held on the second day of the site visit from 2:30 pm. until 4:30 pm. From 2:30 pm. until 3:30 pm. the Review Committee presented an overview of its findings, which were then discussed with representatives of the Department present. From 3:30 pm. to 4:30 pm. the discussion continued without departmental representatives. [The agenda for the two-day site visit is included as an appendix to this report.] The Review Committee's full report was prepared with the input of all Committee members and represents our best collective assessment of the quality of the programs within the Department of Anthropology at the University of Washington.

OVERVIEW

Virtually all activity in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Washington is organized and structured by sub-disciplines. Currently, the Department has three sub-disciplines: Archaeology, Biocultural Anthropology, and Sociocultural Anthropology. The sub-disciplines admit graduate students, prioritize faculty needs and propose hiring plans, hold monthly faculty meetings, and structure the social life of the Department. This type of area-defined organization is not unusual for Anthropology Departments in the United States, and follows from the very diverse subject matter that drives scholarship and teaching in the field. But, it does lead to the creation of social and intellectual “silos” that tend to separate faculty and students. In an effort to facilitate communication across sub-disciplines, the Department recently adopted the “Epistemology Seminar” in which representatives from the sub-disciplines, faculty and graduate students, present their work to the entire department. The Review Committee heard generally positive things about the Epistemology Seminar as a bridge-building strategy, but not all faculty place equal value on building bridges between the silos. For the moment, departmental operations appear to be running relatively smoothly within the three sub-disciplines, with somewhat weak connections among them.

The Department of Anthropology was last reviewed in 2000. The report from that review described a generally upbeat mood and high morale in the Department, partially due to significant rebuilding efforts that followed the prior programmatic review. The 2000 review lauded the creation of the Environmental Anthropology sub-discipline in 1997 and raised concerns about the future of the Archaeology sub-discipline, given actual, or anticipated, faculty losses of various kinds (i.e., to other institutions, to central UW administration, to retirement). Overall, the 2000 review offered an encouraging assessment of the Department and its recommendations were motivated by an interest in continuing the upward trajectory that the Department had established and to strengthen further an already impressive unit.

Between the previous review and this review, the Department benefited significantly from the very capable leadership of Professor Miriam Kahn who served as Chair for eight years. Near the end of Professor Kahn’s term, the Department experienced serious tensions that resulted from a complex combination of destabilizing developments. The Review Committee concluded that these tensions were concentrated primarily within the Sociocultural sub-discipline, and that they were due largely to the demise of the Environmental Anthropology sub-discipline and to intensifying disagreement over the relative emphasis that should be placed on domestic versus international scholarship. The latter, in turn, introduced concerns about diversifying the faculty and graduate student body. The Committee heard conflicting accounts regarding the extent to which hiring decisions made in the College of Arts and Sciences and dynamics internal to the Department were responsible for the discontinuation of the Environmental Anthropology sub-discipline. Similarly, the Committee was presented with varying accounts of the disagreements that emerged over diversity. Regardless of where the truth lies, the perception of different realities posed a significant problem for the Department. What is most important, however, is that the Department lost a sub-discipline that, by all accounts,

was (1) very successful in training graduate students, (2) attracted national and international attention for its scholarship, (3) established relationships with other units on campus, and (4) created connections to the other sub-disciplines within the Department. Further, the atmosphere that was created during this turbulent time led to internal conflict, declining morale, and to an increasing interest among some faculty in moving their lines, or partial lines, to other units on campus.

The healing process began in earnest when Professor Alison Wylie, who served as interim Department Chair for six months, arranged for the services of an external consultant and facilitator. The appointment of Bettina Shell-Duncan as Department Chair in 2008 continued the momentum to reduce tensions in the Department. Policies and procedures instituted under Professor Shell-Duncan's leadership have been designed to introduce a clearer and more coherent governance structure and to increase transparency for the decision-making process within the Department. The very strong consensus in the Department is that Professor Shell-Duncan has done an excellent job during her term as Department Chair. The Review Committee concluded that Professor Shell-Duncan has made substantial progress toward improving the departmental climate during the last two years, and helped to restore the momentum that was noted by the prior Review Committee in 2000. Professor Shell-Duncan is serving a four-year term as Chair. Selection of the next Department Chair will be critical for maintaining the changes that Professor Shell-Duncan has overseen and for continuing a climate of trust, openness, and mutual respect.

Considering the recent and significant problems experienced by the Department, there currently exists an impressive degree of consensus and collegiality. And, there is progress, momentum, and improvement on many different fronts. For example --

- The creation of the undergraduate major track in Medical Anthropology and Global Health (MAGH) has generated excitement among students, faculty, and staff.
- Introduction of the Epistemology Seminar has brought faculty and students from the different sub-disciplines together and helped to communicate the exciting things that are going on within the sub-disciplines.
- The Sociocultural sub-field is engaged in a constructive and forward-looking self-assessment that should prove valuable for planning and implementing changes to the curriculum as well as identifying priorities for future recruitment.
- The Biocultural sub-discipline is thriving.

Nevertheless, challenges remain.

- The Archaeology sub-field remains threatened, as it was in 2000. Actual and anticipated faculty losses could seriously degrade or threaten completely the area's

- ability to offer high quality graduate instruction that covers the required topics and regions of the world and constrain efforts underway to develop new undergraduate Archaeology course offerings as noted below on page 20.
- Despite the presence of the Burke Museum, the Department has no full-time faculty members that specialize in the Anthropology and Archaeology of the Pacific Northwest.
- Increasing numbers of undergraduate majors, and enrollments in general service courses, have strained the advising and teaching capacity of the Department.
- There continue to be reverberations from the Department's recent difficulties and it remains to be seen if there are active fault lines that could jeopardize future departmental planning and progress

In the following sections of this report, we elaborate upon these, and other, achievements and challenges for the Department of Anthropology. And, we propose specific recommendations to assist the Department as it attempts to continue moving forward in a very difficult fiscal environment in the State of Washington and at the University of Washington.

FACULTY RESEARCH AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Because the Department of Anthropology's programs and activities are so tightly structured around the three sub-disciplines, we organize the following section by sub-disciplines. And, given the close correspondence between faculty activity and graduate student training, we combine the two as we discuss the current state and future prospects of each sub-discipline. We conclude this section with a discussion of issues, and recommendations, that concern all three sub-disciplines.

Biocultural Anthropology

Faculty & Research

Faculty members in the Biocultural Anthropology program study human bio-behavioral variation from a comparative and evolutionary perspective. This group is represented by eight faculty members, including seven tenure-line faculty (1 Assistant Professor, 2 Associate Professors, and 4 Professors), and one Research Associate Professor. Overall, this is a very productive group of scholars who have done extremely well in securing external funding and support for their students over the last decade.

The University of Washington's Biocultural program is widely regarded as one of the top in the country. The program provides full coverage of the field of biological anthropology, while emphasizing the study of human biological diversity and health in living populations. The effective balancing of breadth and depth within the field of biological anthropology has been a distinctive signature of the UW Biocultural program.

Unlike the trend in many other Anthropology Departments, UW's Biocultural program provides students with a strong grounding in all areas of biological anthropology, including primate ecology, human paleontology, behavioral ecology, human genetics, demography, and human adaptability.

Central to the Biocultural program's strength has been the links of faculty to other units on campus. The most important of these affiliations is with the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology (CSDE). Six of the Biocultural faculty members are affiliated with CSDE, and several of them run major grants through the Center. The consensus within this group is that the relationship with CSDE has been a positive one for both the involved faculty and for the Department as a whole. For the affiliated faculty, the Center's infrastructure greatly facilitates grant submissions and administration, while the sharing of overhead allows for the Department to benefit from the faculty grants that are run through the Center.

UW's Biocultural program is also well-known for providing outstanding training in both field and laboratory methods. Indeed, the success of the Biocultural graduate program has been built, in part, on the rigorous methods training that their students receive. The Biological Anthropology and Biodemography Laboratory directed by Dr. Kathleen O'Connor is an important resource for the Department in this regard. The Lab's research group has been at the forefront of developing new biomarkers for measuring various dimensions of health and biological function (e.g., fertility, nutritional status, chronic disease risks). In addition, it is now a shared facility with the CSDE Bio-Demography Core, providing support and analytic services for biological and social scientists interested in incorporating biomarkers into their research.

The Department is currently poised to expand its Biocultural faculty, having been authorized to conduct a national search for a tenure-track Assistant Professor in anthropological genetics. This is a bold step that offers to expand and enrich the human population biology and health focus of the Biocultural group while also creating new links to the medical school. The addition of a geneticist to the Department will make the Biocultural program one of the very few in the country where graduate students can get this type of training. In addition, it is expected that this new faculty hire will also add an important new dimension to the undergraduate program in Medical Anthropology and Global Health.

One of the challenges facing the Biocultural group is the pending retirement of two senior faculty members (Eric Smith and Laura Newell). These retirements have enormous implications for the program. Eric Smith has been a central figure in the Biocultural as well as the (now defunct) Environmental Anthropology programs. Over the last decade, he has chaired more Ph.D. committees (9) than any other faculty member in the Department. Additionally, Smith's focus on behavioral ecology has been a distinctive component to the UW Biocultural program that is not widely seen in most other biological anthropology programs across the country. With Newell's departure, the program loses a scholar whose research is focused on primate growth and body composition. Thus, with the retirements of these two faculty members, the program will

need to consider whether it should continue to cover the full breadth of biological anthropology, or focus more specifically on contemporary human biological variation and health.

A second issue that emerged in our discussions with the Biocultural faculty was the importance of and need for laboratory space. This will be a major consideration in recruiting the new anthropological geneticist. While it will be important for the new hire to have links and collaborative ties with the medical school, it will be critical for him/her to have suitable laboratory space within the Department, particularly since this hire will be at the Assistant Professor level. Such an arrangement will be necessary for insuring that this new faculty member and his/her research will be well integrated within the Biocultural program and within the Department more broadly. The potential “fit” of the candidate and their research with the program should also be a major consideration for the search. More broadly, the Department should consider how it will handle the allocation of research space, especially laboratory space, to faculty who need it. For example, the current arrangement whereby Dr. O’Connor rents laboratory space is not ideal and may not be sustainable.

A third issue that came up in discussions with some of the Biocultural faculty was the possibility of regularizing the position of Patricia Kramer in the Department. Dr. Kramer currently has a half-time appointment (non-tenure track) Research Associate Professor position in Anthropology (and half-time research appointment in Orthopaedics and Sports Medicine), and yet she provides critical undergraduate teaching in the large introductory biological anthropology class, and graduate teaching and training in human paleontology. In light of the important contributions that Dr. Kramer has made to both undergraduate and graduate education, it would be beneficial for the Department and administration to discuss regularizing her position into a full-time tenure-track appointment in the Department.

Graduate Program

The UW Biocultural program is competitive relative to other leading biological anthropology programs in attracting and recruiting talented graduate students. Of the three subfields, the Biocultural program typically receives the smallest number of graduate applications each year, a pattern that is typical of most anthropology programs. Compared to other biological anthropology programs that focus on contemporary human variation and health (e.g., Emory, Northwestern) the annual number of graduate applications is similar.

Of the three subfields, average time to degree is lowest in the Biocultural program, being just over 8 years. This is, in part, a reflection of the fact that the program admits relatively few students each year (3 to 4), and that the students in this subfield are often partly funded by research grants. As noted in the departmental self-study, over the last five years some Biocultural students were also recruited and funded by the IGERT Program in Evolutionary Modeling that was co-directed by Eric Smith. Yet, as with the

other subfields, adequate funding for students is seen as an ongoing challenge within the Biocultural program.

Although funding is clearly a challenge, the Biocultural program has done a very good job in competing with other top programs for the best students in the country. The program has an outstanding reputation for providing students with rigorous methods training and good fieldwork opportunities for launching their research. Moreover, the program also provides students with opportunities to pursue the Master of Public Health (MPH) degree in conjunction with their Ph.D. Such joint Ph.D./MPH programs in biocultural and biomedical anthropology are becoming increasingly popular among students who are interested in pursuing careers outside of anthropology in more applied areas of medicine and public health. UW is one of only a handful of anthropology programs in the country where students can pursue this type of dual degree.

In light of the strong mentoring and rigorous methods training, it is not surprising that the program has an outstanding record of placing their students in post-docs and tenure-track faculty positions. Despite a grim academic job market over the last 3 years, recent Biocultural graduates have landed some of the top tenure-track jobs in the field (e.g., Brook Scelza, Assistant Professor, UCLA; Masako Fujita, Assistant Professor, Michigan State; Amy Snipes, Assistant Professor, Penn State).

The Biocultural graduate students that the Committee met with were quite positive about the training and mentoring they were receiving in the program. They were particularly pleased with their opportunities to work directly with faculty in laboratory settings. There appears to be a good *esprit de corps* among the students in this group.

Summary recommendations:

The Biocultural Faculty & Research

- The Biocultural faculty is encouraged to develop a strategic plan of program development and hiring over the next five years. In light of pending retirements, the program should seriously discuss whether to continue with a broad program in biocultural anthropology, or to focus explicitly around core strengths in human population biology, demography, and global health.
- The Biocultural faculty is encouraged to think creatively about themes that could provide additional links with the other subfields. The success of the MAGH program at the undergraduate level shows the potential utility of integrating biological and sociocultural perspectives in medical anthropology. Similar kinds of initiatives could help to foster creative interdisciplinary graduate training and faculty research.
- The Department should discuss with the administration the possibility of creating a full-time, permanent, appointment for Dr. Kramer in Anthropology.

- The Department should work with the administration to insure that the laboratory space effectively fits the research and training needs of the Biocultural faculty. This will be a particularly important consideration in the ongoing faculty recruitment in anthropological genetics.

The Biocultural Graduate Program

- The Biocultural faculty should discuss/consider the development of coursework to help bridge the divide among students in the different subfields

Sociocultural Anthropology

Faculty & Research

With about a dozen tenure-track faculty members, the Sociocultural sub-discipline is moderate in size. Its overall quality remains quite high, in spite of the recent retirements or departures of some well-known individuals. As a whole the group is very productive, with none of the dead wood that burdens similar programs at other universities.

Until recently the Sociocultural group was well known for certain areas of great strength. One example was Southeast Asian studies, where an eminent group of faculty added to resources outside the department to attract top graduate students from around the world. Another example was the Environmental Anthropology program which, until recently, functioned as a kind of fourth wing of the Department, overlapping in membership with the others, but independent in some ways. This group also meshed well with UW resources beyond the Department and was at the forefront of this rapidly growing field. Like the Southeast Asia program, it had great success in attracting both funding and graduate students.

Retirements and departures, however, have not led to replacements in those fields. As a result, the Department's previous strength in certain areas of the world is no longer so clear. For Environmental Anthropology, while some core faculty members remain, a key retirement and another key departure have also not been replaced. In addition, that program bore the brunt of some of the departmental tensions of a few years ago, suffering in particular from its partially anomalous structural position, and has now been dissolved as a formal sub-discipline.

While it is disheartening to see these areas lose the exceptional strength that led to their national and international prominence, the Sociocultural sub-field continues to be respected and to attract strong students. Most of the graduate students we interviewed told us that they came to the UW because of the reputation of some individual faculty member. That is, some kind of "branding" of the Sociocultural faculty is not necessarily crucial. Still, except for the very largest departments (some of which are twice the size of this one), there are advantages to having a clear identity that will attract the top students in that particular area and for which the department will be known. This may simply evolve through natural synergies over time, but the Department might also want to

consider longer term strategies. There are, for example, incipient groups specializing in medicine and global health (and crossing over into the Biocultural group) and in issues of colonialism and warfare. The global health group now has a very strong presence in the undergraduate curriculum, but much less so at the graduate level and beyond the university.

One problem in such an exercise is a general feeling that resources are so scarce that long-term plans are pointless. One way to ease this would be some kind of commitment from higher levels at least to allow replacements for crucial losses. The Committee realizes how short resources are, but given the very high teaching burden this department carries, and given the rapid expansion of the major, we feel it may be justified in this case. In addition, we hope the Department will be more proactive in making such cases. The current search for an anthropological geneticist is an example of how a compelling case for an appointment can be made even under the present circumstances.

The Sociocultural program experienced some serious problems a few years ago, perhaps even more than the rest of the department. As we address elsewhere in this report, efforts to create a civil and safe climate for discussion of these issues have made an enormous difference. Some faculty members feel that many of the initial problems have been resolved. This view is by no means shared by everyone, however, and the Committee hopes that continuing attention will be paid to these issues. Nevertheless we were impressed at how greatly the atmosphere had improved in a relatively short period.

Graduate Program

The Department's self-study lists 52 graduate students in Sociocultural Anthropology, plus an additional 9 grandfathered in the Environmental Anthropology program. This is an extremely high average of roughly 5 graduate students per tenure-track faculty member. Comparable national averages do not exist, but drawing rough data from the American Anthropological Association's *Guide to Departments* shows an average of 2.0 graduate students per full-time faculty at Michigan, 2.5 at UNC, and 1.6 at UCLA, compared to 3.6 at UW. These figures are for whole departments, but they show that UW has approximately 50% more graduate students per faculty member than comparable institutions. If we compare this to the figure for the Sociocultural faculty alone, there appears to be almost double the number of graduate students per capita.

Together, these issues help to explain why the sub-discipline has a relatively slow time to degree completion (9 years), as does the Department as a whole (over 10 years). In addition, they help explain why the Department often loses its top admitted students to other schools, even though it receives applications from some of the best students in the nation and internationally. Given the unlikelihood of the University investing more funds at this level in the immediate future, it seems worth considering the possibility of admitting significantly fewer students into the program, cutting far back on the number of unfunded students, and perhaps consolidating funding offers to attract the best applicants. This might improve overall quality in the program without adding additional costs. Such

a change would also respond appropriately to the very weak current job market for anthropology Ph.Ds.

In recognition of many of these issues, the Sociocultural program decided last year not to admit new graduate students, and so there are none in the current entering class. This decision was also a way of creating some space to think about how best to approach the burdens of graduate teaching: it is difficult to balance the need to minimize piggybacking of graduate students into mostly undergraduate courses while also minimizing faculty time spent teaching very small courses to graduate students alone. This was a thoughtful step, although it has not yet been accompanied by the formulation of a new approach. The Sociocultural faculty was planning its first meeting to discuss these issues the week after the site visit, so the situation remains in flux.

In spite of these issues, the Sociocultural graduate program seems to work well. Faculty expressed a strong degree of satisfaction with their students and the general training is solid. Students have a good record in the job market and in obtaining research grants. When we asked students what they liked and disliked about their program, many praised the quality of their mentors. One problem (for both undergraduates and graduates) is that some faculty members advise enormous numbers of students and thus have limited time availability. Students at both levels also complained about insufficient course offerings. These issues are not easily dealt with, however, except by shrinking the size of the graduate program.

We also note that issues of diversity and mutual understanding—including both varying social backgrounds and epistemological diversities—were expressed more vocally among the graduate students than among most of the faculty. And, these concerns seemed particularly salient for Sociocultural graduate students. The efforts among faculty to create a civil space for discussion have been generally successful in spite of some continuing underlying issues; the department might consider whether there are mechanisms to promote this more among graduate students as well.

With respect to the more general teaching mission of the department, we note that the Sociocultural side teaches a disproportionate number of undergraduates (roughly 60%, while they constitute about 42% of department faculty). This inequality, however, may not be unusual in many similarly structured departments. Overall, however, it seems clear that the teaching load is quite heavy compared to many comparable departments. The UW department is larger than most such groups at private universities, but smaller than some other faculties at state universities more comparable to UW in size. Anthropology at the University of Michigan Ann Arbor, for instance, is almost twice as large, but with fewer majors and roughly the same number of graduate students. The University of North Carolina at Chapel department is about the same size, with only about one-third as many majors and two-thirds as many graduate students. UCLA, like Michigan, is much larger, and has proportionally more undergraduate majors, but fewer graduate students. By any of these measures, the UW faculty is doing a lot of teaching. This is especially true for the graduate program.

Summary recommendations:

The Sociocultural Faculty & Research

- The Sociocultural faculty should consider a gradual process of building areas of strength to achieve a balance between the ability to train students across the breadth of the field while having several areas of outstanding achievement that will attract funding and top graduate students. This is not an urgent goal, but might benefit the Department in the long term.
- The Sociocultural faculty should try to establish hiring plans, at least for replacement of key losses to retirement or other jobs, that make a truly compelling case for both the needs of the Department and needs across the College and University.

The Sociocultural Graduate Programs

- As the Sociocultural program considers its future after the current admissions hiatus, it should give serious consideration to decreasing the size of the graduate class.

Archaeology

Faculty & Research

The UW Archaeology program has six full-time, tenured or tenure-track members, with an additional 0.25 FTE for Alison Wylie and one Research Associate Professor (James Feathers) in the Burke Museum. UW archaeologists represent approximately one-fifth of the Anthropology program. In general, the archaeologists are quite productive, with a skew toward greater productivity among the senior tenured faculty. The UW archaeologists engage in a wide and varied range of research, and – while no recent subfield-specific ranking is available by which to gauge archaeologists at UW – they are well-respected and active in their fields.

The UW Archaeology program has maintained a consistently good reputation for providing strong training that blends archeological method and theory. The UW Anthropology self-study describes its Archaeology faculty as “marked not by a particular theoretical approach or geographical or temporal interest, but by an interest in rigorous interdisciplinary approaches to understanding past human interactions with the natural environment as well as with social and symbolic landscapes.” That said, the UW Archaeology program from the 1980s through the mid-1990s was nationally recognized for its “evolutionary archaeology” approach during Robert Dunnell’s tenure. Shortly after Dunnell’s retirement, the Archaeology program gained recognition for its participation in the Environmental Anthropology specialization until that program’s closure. Most recently, the UW Archaeology program is one of only three Ph.D. programs in the United States that currently employs two Southeast Asian archaeologists.

The UW sought and received a Luce Foundation institutional grant through its “East and Southeast Asian Archaeology and Early History Initiative.” The disappearance of Southeast Asia from the UW’s Sociocultural and Biocultural sub-disciplines (with the retirement of Charles Keyes and Celia Lowe’s half-time migration to the Jackson School) weakens the program’s ability to train graduate students in Southeast Asian studies, including Archaeology graduate students.

Interviews with UW Archaeology faculty identified current weaknesses in the program that require attention to maintain the Archaeology graduate program’s formerly high caliber. The first is that UW at present has a relatively small number of Archaeology faculty members relative to the size of the overall program. This decrease in Archaeology faculty was noted in the 2000 review as a halving of the program. UW Archaeologists told the Committee that the six full-time faculty members (some of whom offer classes year-round because they direct summer archaeological field schools) are restricted in the range of classes they can offer at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. At a departmental level, relatively few undergraduate classes are offered in Archaeology (although several are very high-enrollment classes).

If the pending retirement of their two most senior faculty (Don Grayson, Angela Close) is not counterbalanced by new hires in Archaeology, the UW Archaeology graduate program will be severely compromised. The following table includes total full-time and/or tenured faculty members in a range of the country’s highly ranked 3- or 4-subfield Ph.D. Anthropology programs; some programs whose profiles parallel that of UW are also included. Currently, the representation of UW Archaeologists in their Anthropology program (row highlighted in blue) is fairly average. Should the UW administration opt not to replace the two upcoming retirements, the Archaeology program (row highlighted in pink) may lose its viability as a nationally-recognized program.

	Cult/ling	Phys/Bio	Archaeology	Total	% of total
U Washington (w/ 2 retirements)	13	7	4.25	24.25	17%
Washington U	16	10	6	32	18.75%
U Wisconsin	12	4	4	20	20%
U Michigan	30	5	9	44	20.50%
U Chicago	17	1	5	23	21.70%
Northwestern U	11	3	4	18	22.20%
U Washington	13	7	6.25	26.25	24%
U Pennsylvania	12	3	6	21	28.60%
U Hawaii	8	2	5	15	30%
UC-Berkeley	17	2	9	28	32.10%

The Review Committee asked UW Archaeologists about plans to rebuild their program. Some UW Archaeology faculty members expressed an interest in continuing certain methodological strengths after Drs. Grayson and Close retire (e.g., lithics, faunal

analysis); others mentioned the need to hire a scholar of Pacific Northwest archaeology who specializes in Public Archaeology. That the archaeologists have not yet developed a hiring plan largely reflects a general malaise caused by the scarcity of resources at the UW, in general, and the dim prospects for improvement. The Committee acknowledges the acuity of budget problems throughout the University, but hopes that the administration will consider strategic hires to fill deep gaps in the program as they arise.

Archaeologists have access to good laboratory and analytical facilities with excellent equipment. At least one-half of the UW archaeologists maintain active research programs that incorporate students and offer valuable mentoring. The archaeologists also seem to get along quite well, and work collectively. That this *esprit de corps* was evident in the midst of the current economic crisis bodes well for the UW Archaeology program, and the committee is confident that they can move forward with support from the Department and the UW administration.

We were pleased to see the social cohesiveness that characterizes the UW Archaeology faculty, and to learn more about their interdisciplinary collaborations with colleagues in other units on campus and also with Washington State University. We recognize their active research profiles and believe that the UW Archaeology program remains lively and strong. But we have grave concerns for their future post-retirements, and hope the faculty can develop and implement a strategic hiring plan to maintain and build their program after the departure of Drs. Grayson and Close.

Graduate Program

The UW Archaeology sub-discipline draws talented applicants to the graduate program based on the high productivity of the faculty. Less than 20% of the applicants are admitted, annually, to the Archaeology program and Archaeology is one of the more selective subfields in the UW Anthropology program. The majority of UW Archaeology graduates find employment in their field. Surveys by the Society for American Archaeology (the flagship organization for American archaeologists) suggest that most archaeologists working in the United States today are employed outside of academia, and UW graduates are typical in this regard. The Archaeology faculty recognizes that its graduates hold the longest average time to degree in the program, and exceed the national average as well. To that end, they have revised the examination procedures.

To learn more about financial support available to the UW graduate students, the quality and success of mentoring, and their perceptions of departmental strengths and weaknesses, the Committee met with a cross-section of graduate students that included at least 5 Archaeology students. The Archaeology graduate students were relatively quiet during our interview session, in part because they constituted a small proportion of the group and in part because they had few complaints with the program. The most significant problem facing Archaeology Ph.D. programs in the country's public universities is limited graduate student funding and its likely linkage to protracted time to degree. Limited funding pushes archaeology students into the contract archaeology world before they finish their degrees. On average, UW Archaeology graduate students

complete their MA degrees in 2-2.5 years, which is typical for the country's graduate programs. The fact that nearly one-third of the Archaeology Ph.D.s (8/25) between 2000 and 2010 took 14 years or longer to finish their degrees, however, remains a matter of some concern. Notable improvements in the average time to Ph.D. for Archaeology students finishing since 2005 – down to 10 years (excluding an outlier who took 20.75 years to finish) – are occurring. Also, steps to streamline the MA degree like revising the comprehensive examination structure may help further reduce the time to Ph.D.

Aside from concerns with lack of funding, UW Archaeology graduate students feel well-mentored and expressed satisfaction with the program. UW Archaeology faculty members include their students in both the fieldwork and laboratory-based research that they undertake; at present, students can work in several parts of the world through UW-based projects. UW archaeologists advise a large number of graduate students relative to their small numbers; the self-study lists 27 active graduate students, with an average of 4.5 students per tenure-track faculty member. Disparities exist in advising load and two Archaeology faculty members advise most of the graduate students. We encourage the UW Archaeology program to continue its restrictive admissions policy for several years and – as we recommend for the Sociocultural program – to consolidate funding offers for the strongest applicants.

Summary recommendations:

The Archaeology Faculty & Research

- The Archaeology faculty is encouraged to develop a well-articulated multi-year hiring plan to achieve a balance between disciplinary breadth and several thematic (not methodological) foci. Building on core specializations can only strengthen the Archaeology program and may attract even stronger applicants to the graduate program (some of whom bring their own funding).
- The Archaeology faculty is encouraged to develop a broader curriculum to meet the needs of UW Archaeology Ph.D.s who enter the non-academic workplace. Some of these courses were taught previously or are offered on an intermittent basis (field techniques, field research design) but the program could be bolstered significantly to include more Pacific Northwest-focused courses that would prepare students to become cultural resource management (CRM) practitioners in the greater Pacific Northwest.

The Archaeology Graduate Programs

- As the Archaeology graduate program moves forward, it should continue its very strict admissions policy and give serious consideration to decreasing the size of the graduate class.

- The Department should consider ways of offering 4-year packages to top applicants, perhaps through consolidation or by combining grant and teaching opportunities.

General Observations and Recommendations

As noted above, the three sub-disciplinary groups have significant independence. They systematically rotate resources like graduate fellowships and available lines, and their pedagogical programs are largely separate from each other. This situation is not at all unusual and falls well within the range typical for American departments of Anthropology. That range runs from almost total autonomy of sub-disciplines (e.g., the three "wings" at Harvard) to a more unified approach based on a partially shared core (e.g., Northwestern or Boston University). While the Department has certainly had some serious problems over the last decade, conflict among the sub-disciplines does not appear to have been at their heart, unlike a number of other programs elsewhere in the country.

As separate as the sub-disciplines are within the Department, they also share some common challenges and concerns. Some of these are the result of external forces that limit the flow of resources to the Department. For example, limited resources, and a general policy by the College of Arts and Sciences to centralize all vacant faculty lines, has introduced great uncertainty over replacing lost (to retirement, resignation, unsuccessful tenure cases) faculty members. In addition, all three subfields struggle to fund adequately their graduate students. The department lacks reliable (i.e., non-grant) funding to offer really competitive aid packages to students. Faculty members report that they can rarely offer more than two- or three-year packages. Most of their competitors are offering four to five years. Finally, we heard several complaints about salary compression, especially for younger and recently tenured faculty members. Again, we understand that current resources do not allow much flexibility, but want to express concern about talented younger faculty members entering the job market as the only way of increasing their income.

Others concerns and challenges are endogenous to the Department. The recent tensions in the Department resulted primarily from internal dynamics – driven by competition over the internal distribution of resources, compounded by conflicting conceptual and ideological orientations to the discipline.

In contrast to what appeared to be good morale and cohesion among graduate students within each subfield, the Committee's discussion with the graduate students also highlighted how little interaction and discussion there appears to be among students across the three subfields. There are ongoing attempts, such as the Department's Epistemology Seminar, to bridge the divide among the subfields; however, opinions seem divided on how effective those attempts have been. It appears that the largely autonomous nature of the three subfield programs is much more evident in the divisions among graduate students than among the faculty. In light of these issues, it might be helpful for the Department to think about additional ways to promote more substantial engagement among students across the subfield divides. One possibility that has been

used in other programs is to institute a required “bridging seminar” for first year students. Such seminars are typically courses that are jointly taught by two faculty members from different subfields which address issues that can highlight the importance of integrative cross-field dialogue and analysis (e.g., racial/ethnic disparities, the anthropology of food/nutrition, perspectives on materiality, medical anthropology, technology and culture, and anthropology of states).

In reaction to these issues that transcend the three sub-disciplines, we offer the following general recommendations:

Summary recommendations:

General Faculty & Research

- The Department should continue to contribute to and support the new forums for discussion across the sub-disciplines, like jointly taught courses and the Epistemologies Seminar.
- The Department should continue working with the Dean and others to resolve problems of salary compression to the extent possible.
- The Department should continue to address the issues of diversity that contributed to the problems of a few years ago.

General Graduate Program

- The Department should consider ways of offering 4-year packages to top applicants, perhaps through consolidation or by combining grant and teaching opportunities.
- The Department should explore new graduate funding options (e.g., NSF-IGERT, NIH training grants) that could be developed by creating new research/training linkages across the subfields.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

General Information

Currently the Department of Anthropology offers both a B.A. major and minor. Majors are required to enroll in core courses from each of the three programs in Anthropology – Sociocultural, Biocultural, and Archaeology, as part of their 55 Anthropology credits, along with at least one statistics class. Majors are now required to maintain at least a 2.5 GPA in at least 25 of the credits and 20 of the 55 credits must be at the 300 or 400 level. The minor requires a 2.0 GPA or higher and 30 Anthropology credits. Faculty within each of the three sub-disciplines collaborated to arrive at explicit overall learning

objectives at each level in the undergraduate curriculum. The 100- and 200-level courses are designed to be both gateway courses for majors and general lower division courses for non-majors, whereas the 300- and 400-level courses are designed to be of greater intellectual service to majors. Advanced undergraduates may also take 500-level courses, and given the large number of Anthropology honors students, this seems wise.

An important question facing the Department is how they can best meet the needs of their undergraduate majors, which in the last two years have grown dramatically from below 300 to the current total of over 600 majors. Under "normal" times this scale of growth would have been nearly a totally positive development. However, during the current UW budget crisis, this growth has presented both problems and benefits. Unlike in some other social science departments in the College (e.g., Economics), the growth in majors in Anthropology seems to be the result of very deliberate and conscious actions by the Department – especially the introduction of the very popular track in Medical Anthropology and Global Health.

Review of Major Undergraduate Curriculum Initiatives

Several faculty and students made positive references to the concerted departmental efforts over the past five years to restructure and prioritize the department's undergraduate curriculum. Two temporary committees were constituted to engage this task, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee and the Foundations Course Committee. The former committee assessed select aspects of instruction while the latter had a narrower task of assessing the foundations courses (100-level courses). Both faculty and students were engaged in this curriculum re-envisioning process, which reportedly involved extensive and serious review of introductory anthropology classes at other peer institutions. In the process, new courses were added and the Anthropology Department had funding support from the UW's Tools for Transformation Initiative, a program that no longer exists at the UW. The Department's Teaching Effectiveness Committee used several assessment tools to evaluate these new courses during 2007-2008. Also during this time period the Department initiated a process to develop specialized tracks. The Department has articulated and publicized how its undergraduate tracks represent real and valuable pathways to a number of more applied careers such as cultural resource management, conservation biology, community development, social services, international relations, foreign policy, medicine and public health.

The shining star of success in this initiative is the new Medical Anthropology and Global Health (MAGH) undergraduate track. Launched in 2008, the MAGH track essentially has gone hand-in-hand with the UW's significant initiative on Global Health. As a result, the new MAGH track has drawn together courses in both Biocultural and Sociocultural anthropology to provide students with an integrative perspective on the causes and consequences of global disparities in health status. As of June 2010, the MAGH track had enrolled 215 new Anthropology majors, many of whom are very talented students interested in pursuing careers in public health and medicine. This new track appears to be responsible for fully two-thirds of the recent growth in the number of Anthropology majors. The tremendous success of the MAGH program is attributable, in part, to the

visionary leadership provided by Bettina Shell-Duncan as Chair, and the impressive breadth of rigorous coursework being provided by faculty in both the Biocultural and Sociocultural groups. It also underscores the broad contributions that anthropology programs can make to training students who will go on to careers in such fields as the health sciences and international development.

The Department appears to be further capitalizing on the impressive success of the MAGH track by launching a new track focusing on the anthropology of globalization and transnationalism. This new track appears to differ from somewhat similar tracks in the UW Geography program by focusing on the "...deep history of global flows..." of "...people, ideas, technologies, genes, disease, and material resources...", whereas Geography's track is more focused on recent time periods. It also appears that courses for this track will be taught by faculty from all three sub-disciplines. A third new track is under development in archaeological science. The motivation for this is to train undergraduate students for jobs in public and private sector archaeology-related jobs as well as for graduate school, but this need is threatened by near-term faculty retirements.

In 2008 the Anthropology Department initiated a process making use of student exit surveys upon graduation with the goal of assessing student satisfaction with the major as well as soliciting suggestions to improve the undergraduate educational experience in Anthropology. The Department reports that graduating seniors give the Department high marks for their overall satisfaction with their Anthropology major. The quality of faculty expertise, quality of instruction, and faculty interest in undergraduate learning ranked highest among the different evaluative dimensions. Students give the lowest ratings for service learning, internship opportunities, and preparation to enter a career. In response to the latter student concern, the Department reports that they have begun working in collaboration with the UW's Carlson Leadership and Public Service Center to provide students with community-based internship and service-learning opportunities. The third proposed track, focusing on archaeological science, represents another positive response to graduating seniors' concerns about career preparation, but is jeopardized by uncertainty over the future of the Archaeology sub-field. The Department continues to be very active in offering undergraduate students several "beyond the classroom" academic experiences. In this regard the department and faculty are involved in the UW's "Exploration Seminars" and "International Programs and Exchanges."

The committee believes that all of these initiatives have had very positive impacts on faculty collegiality and morale.

Anthropology Honors Program and Honors Students

One of the most engaging experiences of the two-day site visit was the Committee's meeting with roughly twenty of the Department's undergraduate students. Nearly all of the students in attendance were either in the Anthropology Honors Program, the College's Honors programs, or an *ad hoc* Honors program. It is clear that the Department of Anthropology attracts some of the UW's very best and brightest undergraduates. There is no doubt that some of these UW undergraduate honors students will be recruited by the

very best anthropology graduate programs in the country. It was noted that some of the recent history of internal faculty conflicts, mainly within the Sociocultural sub-discipline, have spilled over to the undergraduate students, but, not surprisingly, less so than it has amongst the graduate students.

Some students mentioned structural impediments that prevented them from participating in the Anthropology Honors Program. For example, transfer students found it difficult to enter the program due to a conflict between the timing of their transfer to the UW and the timing of certain programmatic requirements for the Anthropology Honors Program. Another student was unable to enroll in a course that is required by the Honors Program, but is pursuing an informal, parallel, course of study of the same high caliber.

The Pangs, Pains, and Problems of Growth in a Time of Diminishing Budgets

Despite the largely successful recent developments, and positive momentum in the Department's undergraduate programs, important challenges lay ahead. These challenges, enumerated below, have as much to do with the University's budget situation as with programmatic decisions by the Department. By stating this we also acknowledge that some of the problems with the Department resource allocations, mentioned elsewhere in our report, have been caused or exacerbated by recent growth in the undergraduate program. The following list highlights some of the most significant challenges facing the Department as it strives to meet its undergraduate instructional mission:

- 1) Rapid growth in the number of undergraduate majors, and undergraduate enrollments more generally, without the personnel and financial resources to adequately accommodate the growth,
- 2) Limitations on the quality and diversity of instruction (e.g., term papers or writing courses) because of large class sizes and increasing scarcity of TAs,
- 3) Uncertainty in course offerings due to limited staff, faculty, and graduate student TA support,
- 4) Overworked and minimal advising staff,
- 5) Imbalance in the distribution of work load across faculty for student contact hours and Honors Thesis advising,
- 6) Some concern that the undergraduate student body's diversity is not adequately reflected in the faculty's diversity.
- 7) Continuation of recent departmental efforts to integrate across the three departmental sub-disciplines that appear to be underway as part of the new tracks with the major.

Summary Recommendations

- The Department should address the uneven distribution of teaching responsibility (in-class and advising) across faculty and, where possible, devise strategies for addressing it.

- The Department should table consideration of the undergraduate archaeological track until the future of the Archaeology sub-discipline is resolved.
- The Department should revise the design of its Honors Program to better accommodate transfer students.

DEPARTMENTAL CULTURE AND CLIMATE

The Recent “Troubles”

The Department of Anthropology at the University of Washington is emerging from a period of debilitating tension which threatened the heretofore relatively collegial and respectful departmental culture and climate. Some spoke of a culture of incivility that emerged at that critical period. Though in reality much more complex and multifaceted, the perceived source of this tension appears to be centered on the process of ending the Environmental Anthropology program and issues of diversity in the Department. Efforts to address the root causes of the conflicts over these two issues have restored a relative calm and civility in the department and a renewed confidence and optimism felt by many that the Department is moving forward in a positive way. Many said that the Department had run to the brink of a precipice but had chosen to step back and did not wish to go there again. However, there remains the belief by some that the fault lines revealed by these conflicts have only been “papered over” and that below the surface there remain fissures of still unresolved issues.

The flash point for this tension was hiring priorities and graduate support partly centering on questions involving the Environmental Anthropology program and diversity issues. Many of the faculty believed that the conflicts and tension were the problem of the Sociocultural program. But the issues were far larger than one single sub-discipline and involved in part the competition for resources, decision-making process, structure of the Department, and conflicting understandings of diversity. Through the effective leadership of the interim-chairs and the current chair the Department began the process of healing.

To address these issues of conflict and incivility the department hired an external consultant to conduct a workplace assessment, devise specific interventions, and advise on long-term strategic planning. As a result, the Department replaced a more informal and collegially based governance style with more formal structures and rules for communication so that, in particular, decisions were more predictable, transparent, and communicated clearly, eliminating any perception of capriciousness. The Department has also liberally used the external consultant to facilitate department-wide and group meetings and to mediate points of local and department-wide conflict as well as train the faculty to effectively facilitate meetings. Training workshops have been conducted such as the “Un-Doing Racism” workshop that provided training on “identifying and confronting institutionalized racism.” There seems to be much progress in building an open and civil climate of communication but some in the Department are still reluctant to meet, as a single group, to discuss major departmental issues or to engage in strategic

planning. More work is needed to rebuild the confidence of the Department so that they can productively discuss difficult departmental issues.

The Department's Diversity Committee had its origins in 2005 when the Department of Anthropology developed a highly commendable "Diversity Mission Statement." In 2006 the Diversity Committee was formally established to advance departmental efforts to achieve the objectives of the mission statement. The Diversity Committee developed a policy for "Excellence in Faculty Hiring Guidelines" which was adopted by a vote of the entire department in the Fall of 2006. A key guideline was "to have a Diversity Committee member on each job search committee." Other guidelines included having the Diversity Committee provide input on the search committee's plan for addressing diversity issues as well as having the search committee read the UW booklet on faculty diversity. But some faculty question whether the guidelines were ever implemented, and worry that they will be abandoned altogether.

While the Department, in theory, adopted the goal of diversity, exactly how to achieve this goal was problematic. The Diversity Committee, itself, appears to have become a lightning rod for unsettled issues in the Department. Some felt that the work of the Diversity Committee had created divisiveness. It was explained to the Review Committee that "non-diversity" faculty felt threatened by new ways of working together and accepting change and new styles of authority. In an effort to address perceptions by some in the Department that the Diversity Committee was a "rogue" committee inserting itself into policymaking, the Department used the external consultant to facilitate a chartering of the Diversity Committee to define its purpose, organization, and responsibilities. It was reported to the Review Committee that the facilitator worked with newly appointed members of the Diversity Committee to avoid an "us versus them mentality" and to view their charge as less one of leadership on diversity issues within the Department and more to share information on diversity with search committees. Some faculty members are concerned that this style of chartering process may lead to the elimination of a meaningful role for the Diversity Committee in the search process. Moreover, some faculty are concerned that a complete change of membership of the Diversity Committee, with no continuity with the members who developed the "Anthropology Diversity Statement" and the "Excellence in Hiring Rubric," may represent a set-back for those concerned about diversity-related issues.

Some faculty and graduate students expressed alienation based on their epistemological approaches. As mentioned above, the Department initiated a series of Epistemologies Seminars to address this and other concerns. In its third year, these seminars have drawn participation cross sub-disciplines and started conversations between and among the three sub-disciplines. The Epistemologies Seminars have proven useful in building bridges across sub-disciplines and have opened communication within the department. Although some believe that no real change has been made, many others believe that the seminars have nurtured a culture in which people are becoming more comfortable to talk and share their different perspectives. But people must attend for this to happen.

It is striking that the self-study's discussion of the engagement of departmental connectivity within the university (pages 7-8) makes no mention of the Department of American Ethnic Studies (AES), nor does AES appear in the extensive visual representation of this departmental connectivity within the university shown in Figure 1 of the self-study. This may reflect the Department's emphasis on international research rather than domestic North American and local communities. There certainly have been connections and collaborative work with AES, and one Anthropology faculty member has a joint appointment (50% effort) in AES, but this is not recognized in the self-study. In seeking to address issues of diversity, the Department should consider further cultivating their relationship with the Department of American Ethnic Studies. This connectivity could enhance the Department of Anthropology's ability to effectively engage with issues of diversity involving U.S. historically underrepresented minorities and effectively develop research and outreach to diverse local communities that it serves.

Morale Among Faculty, Staff, and Students

Diminished resources have negatively affected department morale. Although there is a sense of new possibilities in the Department, with tremendous growth in the major and successful development of new directions in departmental governance, there is also a sense of fatigue and frustration due to the state of the economy and budget cuts. Some say they feel "existentially threatened" with their programs in danger because of cuts, faculty not being replaced, and further cuts on the horizon. They are concerned that the Department will not be able to successfully fulfill its undergraduate and graduate educational missions while facing depleted resources. Graduate funding is of particular concern. Furthermore, some feel that no one is saying they are doing a good job when times are tough.

As described above, the Department has made good progress in restoring a more collegial and productive environment for faculty, but the reverberations from the period of conflict continue to affect morale in the Department. Some have expressed that morale is still down and that some problems are still simmering. Exhaustion from battles has led many to retreat to their separate "islands." Some have disengaged to do their own work and seem not interested in becoming involved with issues affecting the whole department. People remarked about empty hallways and not much engagement with other faculty. Most significantly, some reported feeling "unwelcome" or made to feel like outliers. Some faculty members have taken extended leaves, plan to retire, leave, or move their lines to other units creating critical gaps within sub-disciplines.

As some senior faculty were on leave, in some cases for up to two years, and with other senior faculty stepping back and disengaging from the everyday life of the Department, the junior faculty have faced a lack of mentorship. Some junior faculty expressed a need for mentorship and clearer expectations for tenure and promotion. Though they have an open line of communication with the Chair, they desired more mentorship. Some expressed reservations regarding service commitments. The Review Committee noted, too, that two junior faculty members serve on the Diversity Committee, which may not be

good for them since that committee was near the center of conflict in the “bumpy period,” and because some tensions over diversity issues remain.

Graduate students expressed a desire to know each other more and to meet outside sub-discipline contexts, which would promote more talk across disciplines. They would like a forum for all graduate students, similar to the faculty Epistemologies Seminars. Some graduate students made reference to a perceived culture of incivility for those engaged in non-traditional pedagogical practices or those committed to racial/epistemological issues. Some noted that internationally focused research was encouraged more than local research and that other ways of learning and worldviews were not supported and were denigrated. This affects the morale of some graduate students.

Summary Recommendations

General Faculty & Research

- The Department should continue building a consensus around seriously addressing issues of diversity, including building a better climate for U.S. historically underrepresented minorities in the Department.
- The Department should encourage faculty to fully re-engage and re-invest in the Department’s research and pedagogical missions and not avoid discussing a shared vision and mission of the department as a whole and broader goals, direction, and priorities of the Department across the sub-disciplines.
- The Department should continue supporting the new forums for discussions across the sub-disciplines, like jointly taught courses and the Epistemologies Seminar.
- The Department should continue working to create a climate that is conducive to problem solving and strategic planning by the entire department, not solely within sub-disciplines.

SUPPORT STAFF

The Department is served by a very capable support staff. At present, the departmental staff includes the following positions: department administrator (100% effort), fiscal specialist (100% effort), director of student services (100% effort), graduate program assistant (100% effort), and computer services manager (50% effort). Budget reductions required that a 50% undergraduate advising position (Academic Counselor-Intern) be eliminated in the budget for the 2009-2011 biennium. With the exception of undergraduate advising (discussed below), faculty and students seemed quite pleased with the support they receive from the Department. And, the support staff appeared to be relatively happy with the current configuration of positions and with the relationships among the current individuals in those positions.

Faculty submitting grant applications and principal investigators holding research grants reported satisfaction with the pre-award and post-award support that they receive from the Department. Some faculty members in the Anthropology Department are affiliates of the Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology (CSDE) and, as a result, run their grants through that unit. Professor O'Connor and Professor Holman, who were recruited as part of a CSDE building initiative, are required to do so. The administrator and fiscal specialist seemed pleased with the cooperation they receive from CSDE in their effort to secure and manage extramural research grants. The Department has no policy for returning to principal investigators a portion of indirect costs (F & A) generated by external grants. That is an option that the Department's leadership may want to consider as a small incentive for faculty to seek extramural funding. In addition, new funding opportunities could be created by new and creative links across and within sub-disciplines. Finally, the Department's self-study reported that some Sociocultural faculty believe that they cannot compete for external research grants. The Review Committee believes that is an inaccurate description of the extramural funding environment for Anthropologists engaged in Sociocultural scholarship.

The most significant challenge facing the departmental support team is the loss of the half-time position that was dedicated to undergraduate advising. That reduction in staff occurred at the same time that the number of Anthropology majors, and the total number of undergraduates served by the Department, grew substantially. The Committee heard complaints from faculty, staff, and students about the consequences of the decision to cut the advising position. To be sure, in making that decision, the Department was responding to an extremely difficult budgetary situation. And, to its credit, the Department did allocate a half-time graduate assistant to support the work of the advising office. It is clear to the Review Committee, however, that the current arrangement is not working very well, and that it is not sustainable without serious degradation to the Department's mission of undergraduate education.

Summary Recommendations

- The Department should seek ways to restore reliable funding for professional undergraduate advising in the Advising Office.
- The Department should explore the possibility of returning some proportion of RCR funds to principal investigators.

ROLE WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY

We now operate in an environment in which interdisciplinarity and broad University impact are increasingly valued qualities that play important roles in decisions regarding hiring, promotion, and retention. The evaluation of academic units, therefore, routinely includes an assessment of the connections their faculty members have established with other units on campus. On this criterion, the Department of Anthropology has been very successful. The majority of its faculty is actively involved with other departments or

centers on the UW campus. This includes joint appointments, adjunct appointments, and affiliate status in the following units, among others:

- The Jackson School of International Studies
- The College of the Environment
- The Center for Studies in Demography & Ecology
- The Center for Statistics and the Social Sciences
- The Burke Museum
- The Women Studies Department
- The Quaternary Research Center
- The School of Public Health
- The Medical School

Some Anthropology faculty members play leadership roles in these units, having served on executive committees or planning committees, or as core or program directors. As noted above, the possibility of strengthening the currently weak intellectual connection between the Anthropology Department and the Department of American Ethnic Studies should be explored.

Beyond the University of Washington, the Anthropology faculty is involved in a wide variety of research, public service, policy-related, government organizations. Some have advised the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health in making decisions about grant funding. Professor Rhodes has served as a consultant with the Washington State Department of Corrections. Professor Kramer advised the Seattle Science Center on the “Lucy’s Legacy” exhibit. Professor Shell-Duncan advises the World Health Organization on matters related to female genital cutting. Many more examples could be listed. However, these examples suffice to demonstrate that the Department of Anthropology is engaged in a wide variety of activities that support the broader University of Washington and the local, national, and international communities.

CONCLUDING RECOMMENDATIONS

- The Review Committee recommends that the BA, MA, and Ph.D. programs in the Department of Anthropology be continued.
- The Review Committee recommends that the Department of Anthropology be reviewed, again, in ten years.

APPENDIX: SITE VISIT AGENDA

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School
Department of Anthropology Review Site Visit
November 1-2, 2010

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 31	
6:30 p.m.	Ivar's Salmon House 401 NE Northlake Way - [207-732-0767]
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1	LOCATION: DENNY 402
9:00 a.m.	Bettina Shell-Duncan, Professor and Chair
9:30	Ben Fitzhugh, Associate Professor and Associate Chair
10:00	Staff: Michael Caputi, Administrator; John Cady, Fiscal Specialist; Diane Guerra, Director, Student Services; Rick Aguilar, Program Assistant
10:20	<i>BREAK</i>
10:40	James Feathers, Research Associate Professor
11:00	Peter Lape, Associate Professor, Danny Hoffman, Assistant Professor
11:20	Celia Lowe, Associate Professor
11:40	Rachel Chapman, Assistant Professor
12:00 p.m.	<i>LUNCH</i> – Review Committee (catered to conference room)
1:20	Steven Harrell, Professor & Graduate Program Coordinator Catherine Ziegler, Graduate Program Assistant
1:40	Janelle Taylor, Associate Professor
2:00	Kathleen O'Connor, Associate Professor
2:20	Steven Goodreau, Associate Professor
2:40	Ann Anagnost, Professor
3:00	<i>BREAK</i>
3:20	Don Grayson, Professor
3:40	Sasha Welland, Assistant Professor
	LOCATION: DENNY 401
4:00	Graduate Students
4:30	Undergraduate Students

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
The Graduate School
Department of Anthropology Review Site Visit
November 1-2, 2010

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 2		LOCATION: DENNY 402
9:00 a.m.	Bettina Shell-Duncan, Chair	
9:20	Patricia Kramer, Research Associate Professor	
9:40	Donna Leonetti, Professor	
10:00	Devon Peña, Professor	
10:20	<i>BREAK</i>	
10:40	Marcos Llobera, Assistant Professor	
11:00	Darryl Holman, Associate Professor	
11:20	Lorna Rhodes, Professor & Miriam Kahn, Professor	
11:40	Eric Smith, Professor	
12:00 p.m.	<i>LUNCH</i> – Review Committee (catered to conference room)	
1:00	Review Committee executive session	
	LOCATION: DENNY 401	
2:30	Exit Discussion with: Bettina Shell-Duncan, Chair, Ben Fitzhugh, Associate Professor, and Janelle Taylor, Associate Professor Judith Howard, Divisional Dean, College of Arts and Sciences Janice DeCosmo, Associate Dean, Undergraduate Academic Affairs James Antony, Associate Vice Provost and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Planning, The Graduate School Douglas Wadden, Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Planning, Office of the Provost Graduate School Council Representatives: Paula Nurius, Professor, School of Social Work Sharon Sutton, Professor, Department of Urban Design and Planning & Department of Architecture Augustine McCaffery, Senior Academic Program Specialist, The Graduate School	
3:30	Exit Discussion (continued): Without department representatives	
4:30	Review Committee Debriefing	