

Department of Anthropology  
215 Machmer Hall  
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Academic Quality Assessment and Development  
(AQAD)

# **Departmental Self-study**

February 2005

by

Ralph Faulkingham  
Department Chair



## **Purpose**

This self-study represents the starting point for an institutional and disciplinary process for identifying key programmatic strengths and challenges in the Department of Anthropology and for charting how programmatic quality may be improved and then sustained well into the future.

This report was written by Ralph Faulkingham, chair of the department, with the full cooperation and active support of the department's faculty and graduate students. I want to acknowledge the skillful work of graduate students Joannah Whitney and Jamie Edwards in securing data, conducting interviews and focus groups among key stakeholders, and participating thoughtfully in the data analysis. I am most grateful to the extraordinarily talented faculty of the department, whose commitment to achieve broad and holistic programmatic goals has given anthropology at UMass Amherst a distinct and widely respected position both on the UMass Amherst campus and in the discipline of anthropology.

The self-study's parameters are defined in the document "Campus Procedures for Academic Quality Assessment and Development," published by the University's Office of Academic Planning and Assessment in May 1999, and will be followed closely in this study. This assessment builds on three previous assessment and planning reports conducted by the department in 1995, 2000, and 2002.

## Section One

[N.B. : The text on this page is taken from the University's *Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) Procedures*, page 3, and defines the rationale for the narrative that follows in this section.]

### **1. Programs shall ensure that their goals and objectives are linked to the campus mission and strategic priorities, and to their strategy for improving their position within the discipline.**

The Program should evaluate its purpose and planning in light of the campus mission and strategic priorities, and should assess its standing among similar programs nationally. The review should answer the following questions:

What is the Program's mission, and is it clearly aligned with the campus mission and direction?

How does the Program's mission relate to the curriculum; enrollments; faculty teaching, research/professional/creative activity, and outreach? Is it aligned with campus strategic priorities?

The Program should discuss its strategy for promoting diversity.

How does the Program contribute to campus-wide curricular needs through general education and service instruction?

What is the Program's current standing within the discipline, especially with respect to research and graduate education? What goals does the Program have in terms of its national standing?

To a remarkable degree the department's goals, objectives, and practices are congruent with the campus mission and historic strategic priorities in research, teaching, and outreach. Faculty allocate their time appropriately in these three areas, and display a pattern of distinction in each one. Beginning in 2002, Chancellor Lombardi articulated a clear shift in campus priorities, so that faculty research and scholarship would be explicitly fostered and rewarded, as the indispensable step in growing the reputation and resource base of the institution. As I elaborate below, the dean has recently provided an appropriate incentive and modest resource framework, and the faculty have responded energetically and successfully, as hoped for.

1. The **mission of anthropology** at UMass Amherst is to (1) teach students and various external publics about the nature and significance of human diversity in its biological, historical, and cultural forms; (2) conduct and report research in these arenas both to a professional disciplinary audience and to the public at large; and (3) apply what we have learned in our research and in our classrooms to understand and ameliorate social conditions here and elsewhere and to preserve and to interpret cultural resources from the past. This focus demands that we straddle the social sciences and human biology in our theories and methods and the interpretive traditions of the humanities as well. Anthropology regularly challenges conventional views that mystify, categorize, or essentialize human diversity by race, gender, language, nationality, and class.

This departmental mission fits perfectly with the campus mission as a Research 1, public, land-grant institution and is implemented with respect to students, to the profession of anthropology, and to various publics...

1 A. **Undergraduate non-majors**. Our department plays a widely recognized role on this campus in educating students about culture and diversity. Furthermore, teaching to non-major undergraduates dominates departmental attention. Table 4 in Appendix I shows that over the past decade consistently more than *eighty* percent of our undergraduate enrollments are from students who do not major in anthropology. This proportion, already high, is growing. Most of these enrollments come from students aiming to meet either the university's General Education (GenEd) requirement or the College of Social and Behavioral Science's Global Education requirement. In the Fall of 1995, anthropology attracted 4,358 student credit hours (SCH) of enrollments at this level. Over the ensuing nine years this figure gradually climbed to 4,800 SCH per semester. While our courses bear several different GenEd designations, most of our GenEd contributions are directed to the Social and Behavioral Science requirements and the Diversity requirement. I consider that our departmental commitment to teach the General Education program is very strong; we have sustained a culture of leadership by tenure system faculty in teaching these large courses rather than relegating them to graduate teaching assistants or to part-time faculty.

Our normal pattern for each GenEd course is two, 50-minute lectures per week to somewhere between 132 and 264 students. Then for the third hour each week, the class is divided up into discussion sections of 22 students each. Tenure system faculty give the lectures, and supervise the graduate teaching assistants who direct the discussion sections. Over the long term, since

enrollments in the GenEd and Global Education programs are loosely linked to funding for TA positions, there is strong incentive for the department to teach these classes and to sustain high enrollments. In fact, our GenEd courses consistently are full with substantial waiting lists. This demand has accelerated over the past two years. Further, most of those students who do decide to major in anthropology do so as a consequence of taking an anthropology GenEd course. Therefore, given that GenEd teaching is the mother lode for funding TA positions critical to our graduate students, and GenEd is essential for recruiting majors, we have done our best to meet demand while sustaining academic quality. And we have done so at a very low cost.

But while anthropology's contribution in academic quality and cost effectiveness to the University's GenEd mission is unassailable, there are consequences:

1. The faculty devote less attention to teaching and advising undergraduate majors and to maintaining the major curriculum.
2. We also devote less attention to our graduate program.
3. Most problematic is our inability to plan and fund our GenEd contribution. Since the fall of 2002, the University asked the department chair to organize variable teaching resources (TAs and part-time faculty) and tenure system faculty so as to produce 4,600 GenEd student credit hours per semester. Over the past ten years, the department in February receives a firm commitment of TA support for the ensuing fiscal year. This early commitment is essential for course planning for the ensuing two semesters and for recruiting and sustaining graduate students. Yet this commitment represents on average only about 60% of the TA funds we end up with once registrations are complete. Phrased another way, the department receives the 40% balance of TA funding in increments through the ensuing year as actual student demand translates into course registrations. Not only does this stymie rational planning, it also takes an inordinate amount of persistent fine tuning by the department chair to optimize. But the real losers are our graduate students and potential graduate students. We cannot effectively compete nationally with other graduate programs in anthropology because we do not have timely assurance of TA funding, and the lack of predictability in TA funding for the students who are in our program seriously erodes their own ability to plan. With a ten-year history of only modest variation from one year to the next in the number of TA positions the department ends up with, it makes sense for the administration to commit much more than 60% of TA funds early on. Ninety percent would be conservative. This argument has been registered but to date has been unavailing.

**1 B. Undergraduate majors in anthropology.** The number of majors over the past ten years (see Table 9 in Appendix I) has varied from a high of 188 in 1998 to a low of 135 in Fall 2004. It is especially troubling that over the past 6 years the number of majors has declined steadily by about 5% per year. All the more disturbing, since our GenEd enrollments – our pipeline to attract majors – have increased over this same period. While we have not yet undertaken a systematic study of the causes of this decline, the following factors are likely to be implicated:

1. Over this same period nationally, there has been a shift in majors, away from the liberal arts and toward fields with more immediate instrumental and employment prospects.
2. The department has done little if anything to market the major at a time when other

departments on campus have developed robust efforts both here and in the high schools that send many students to our campus.

3. There are fewer courses for majors to take.

4. The curriculum for the major does not have an easily articulated and understood rationale.

5. The major requirements includes three required courses and nine electives. Such an unstructured major, to work well, requires a high level of engagement by faculty in advising majors and prospective majors. Yet, faculty spend less time in advising majors now than in the past. More on this in section 2.

Only a minority of our majors is likely to go on to graduate school. For most of our students, the major requirements ought to provide them with the means to master a body of knowledge, and in that process the desire and means to keep on learning for the rest of their lives, so that they will be employable, enriched, and engaged citizens. Of course, this liberal arts ideal is also the appropriate foundation to qualify a major for graduate admission in anthropology, but getting our students into graduate school is not the primary point of the major. I consider that faculty attention to the GenEd Program, to graduate education, and to their own scholarship has meant that considerably less attention is given to advising majors and to infusing the major with clear curricular objectives.

At the same time the University's annual survey of graduating seniors finds very high levels of satisfaction with the major (see Table 10 in Appendix 1), with values consistently well above those for other majors in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

**1 C. Graduate students in anthropology.** In our graduate program, with a current headcount of 80, students complete a broadly framed 30-credit master's program before narrowing their research focus at the doctoral level. While the graduate students command considerable attention from faculty, a substantial portion of that lies outside the credit bearing system. Over the past decade, the number of tenure system faculty has remain largely unchanged, as has the graduate student headcount, and the number of graduate student credit hours has averaged an annual 452. This means that on average, graduate students enrolled, whether in seminars or tutorials, for just under 6 credits per *year*.

Both graduate students and faculty are aware of the contrary currents that affect the size of our graduate program. Compared to our peers in anthropology, our program is about average size, using the measure of SCH per tenure system faculty (see Table 11 in Appendix 1). Yet this measure ignores the disparity between headcount and SCH. On a headcount per tenure system faculty member basis, our graduate program is about twice as large as our disciplinary peers. The typical pattern for graduate students is to take two graduate courses per semester for the first five or six semesters in the program. This is followed by a noticeable falling off as students move from the master's program with its 30-credit requirement to the PhD program which has no credit requirements. Faculty are responsive to graduate students, whether or not they are enrolled for credit. In fact, those who are not enrolled in courses, but working on a thesis, a statement of field, or a dissertation likely consume more faculty effort.

The department could well gradually reduce the headcount size of the graduate program over time. This would have the effect of providing more attention to each student, would mean that more of our graduate students would be supported by teaching and research assistantships, and would likely reduce the length of time a student spends in our program. The department could increase the credit requirements for those in the doctoral program, but the faculty have been loathe to do so, since that would impose a direct financial burden on students that is not likely to be offset by tuition waivers. But a reduction in the size of the program, without a commensurate rise in the number of required credits, would reduce the already low enrollments in our graduate seminars to unacceptably low levels.

I had suggested to the department that we could accomplish these objectives of admitting the same size cohort by changing the current pattern from an annual to a bi-annual basis, but while this idea also has the effect of giving space for curricular expansion at the graduate level, it has drawn little support, as most faculty consider that we would immediately be put at a competitive disadvantage in our national recruiting, and we would neglect our obligation as a department in a public university to be open annually to qualified applicants.

While graduate students on the whole are very pleased with the quality of the faculty instruction and mentoring they receive in our program, their most persistent criticism is the lack of TA and RA funding, in amount, in duration, and in predictability. Yet, our graduate students are completing their degree programs faster here than in our peer institutions. In 2003, I analyzed the records of 356 graduate students who had completed degree programs here since the department was founded in 1969. I found no significant change over time. In this study I learned that for those admitted to the MA or MA/PhD program...

1. The elapsed time from date of entry to the MA degree: 2.93 years for 212 students.
2. The elapsed time from completion of the MA to the PhD degree: 6.3 years for 79 students.
3. The elapsed time from date of entry with a BA to the completion of the PhD degree: 8.93 years for 79 students.

And for those with the MA who were admitted straight into the PhD program, the elapsed time from date of entry to the PhD degree was 6.9 years for 63 students. According to a 1996 study by the National Research Council, the average time from BA to Ph.D. in the social sciences is 10.3 years, and the average student is registered for 7.4 years. While that may make our program look good by national comparison, it offers small comfort to our graduate students.

While we do not sustain systematic information to discipline our perceptions, the faculty's personal ties with our alumni lead us to believe that virtually all of our PhD alumni are professionally employed, and over 90 percent of them work in higher education or in research institutes. We aim for a very diverse graduate student population and we excel in teaching across conventional subfield divisions.

In concluding this review of our teaching profiles, I note that anthropology is giving the

University a terrific bargain, but it is achieved at a very high cost. For academic year 2002-2003, the most recent year for which data are available, it cost the University just \$155 to deliver each SCH in all anthropology courses (see Table 11 in Appendix 1), well below the University's average of \$170 and well below the average of \$180 per SCH in anthropology at peer institutions. As Table 2 in Appendix 1 demonstrates, anthropology has experienced an enrollment *growth*, measured in SCH of 17% over the past decade, yet instructional expenditures per SCH in constant dollars have *declined* by 2.6% . In fact, over the past decade, while we have had strong incentives to grow our Gen Ed commitment, it has been accomplished by a neglect of our program for our majors; in fact no matter how noble our efforts, I do not see us making a dent in real program improvements until we solve the resource issue. As Table 1 indicates, if anthropology were funded at either the mean rate per SCH on campus (\$170) or the mean rate for peer anthropology programs (\$180), and still maintain the same high level of SCH, we would have far more resources to produce them.

Table 1  
Hypothetical Change in Total Cost of Instruction as a function of cost per SCH

Framework	Cost per SCH	Academic year Total SCH	Total Cost of Instruction	Difference in cost from current
Current	\$155	11,887	\$1,842,485	0

At mean campus wide rate	\$170	11,887	\$2,020,790	\$178,305
At rate of peer institutions	\$180	11,887	\$2,139,660	\$297,175

These differences in the last column translate to either two or three tenure system faculty. The alternative is to assume stability in instructional resources, redirect our attention to the major, and reduce our commitment to GenEd. This is modeled in Table 2, and shows that we would have to reduce our annual SCH output by between 9 and 14 %. We simply cannot expect to improve the quality of the major without either growth in resources or a pulling back from GenEd.

Table 2  
Hypothetical changes in enrollments as a function of increasing the cost per SCH

Framework	Cost per SCH	Total cost of instruction	Total annual SCH	Difference in SCH from current
Current	\$155	\$1,842,485	11,887	0
At mean campus wide rate	\$170	\$1,842,485	10,838	1,049
At rate of peer institutions	\$180	\$1,842,485	10,236	1,651

1 D. To the **profession of anthropology**, we aim to sustain an inordinate influence, especially as a consequence of faculty scholarship that cuts across the conventional subfield divisions, of our service on professional association boards and in editorial positions, and of our well-trained, and well-placed PhD alumni. A review of faculty annual reports and CVs (see Appendix II) show how strongly our faculty are contributing to the growth and public salience of the field of anthropology. Our faculty serve leadership roles disproportionately to our size on national and regional anthropological professional associations, and we are very proud that our PhD alumnus, Professor Alan Goodman of Hampshire College, was recently elected as president of the American Anthropological Association, the largest and oldest professional association of anthropologists in the United States. Our faculty and graduate students' participation – by giving papers, serving as discussants, or organizing sessions in the annual meetings of professional associations – is extraordinary. And it continues in spite of the fact that our annual funding formula for supporting travel to meetings has not changed in years: Assistant Professors: \$500; Associate Professors: \$250; and Full Professors: \$0).

1 E. While in a general way, all of the faculty are committed to influence the course of public culture to be more informed and tolerant of human diversity, there are distinct segments of the public that receive specific attention.

1. First, our department houses the University of Massachusetts Archaeological Services (UMAS) which provides archaeological services on a contract basis to public and private entities throughout the northeastern states. This profit-making enterprise was founded by UMass PhD, Mitchell Mulholland in 1984, and for many years was part of the Environmental Institute on campus. In 2003, UMAS became fully a part of the Department of Anthropology, and it provides a critical training ground for students in archaeology while at the same time it extends the department's reach in applied research throughout the Northeast. In FY04, UMAS employed 8 full-time staff, 8 graduate students, 9 undergraduate students, and 17 seasonal employees, and it brings in over \$600,000 per year in gross revenue.

2. All of our archaeological research here in Massachusetts must comply with the rules developed by the state archaeologist. These rules require us to curate and preserve what we excavate, an obligation that imposes special burdens on our already inadequate storage space. A national mandate, represented in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), has demanded that we inform the officials of federally recognized tribes of the skeletal materials and associated grave artifacts that we possess and to curate and/or repatriate them where requested. Our compliance with NAGPRA, organized by the department's Repatriation Committee, has been remarkable in its scope and character, especially over the past five years, as this committee of graduate students and faculty has played a critical role in facilitating unprecedented cooperation among New England's tribes -- both federally recognized and unrecognized – in solving in

conjunction with state and federal officials, a host of thorny problems affecting not only our collections, both also those at Amherst College, Smith College, and at the Springfield Museum of Science, as well as in private collections. In the interests of assuring the University's compliance with federal law, the Provost requires the department to produce an annual NAGPRA report, and we have done so, yet the resources to accomplish compliance have not been forthcoming, and the department has had to use its reserves to do so.

3. In our collaboration with Historic Deerfield, Inc., we conduct a summer field school in archaeology that directly interprets the past to those tourists who visit our research and teaching sites here in Western Massachusetts. The program is operated through the aegis of the Division of Continuing Education. While the program is ostensibly aimed to educate registered students about archaeological theory, method, and practice in the context of broadening their understanding of the past here in Western Massachusetts, the program also affords an important public outreach to the thousands of tourists each summer who visit Deerfield. The Field School is not yet self-sufficient. Tuition and fees, together with the annual subsidy from Historic Deerfield, Inc., cover most direct costs. As we are already one of the most expensive field schools in the country, we cannot now raise tuition to achieve self sufficiency. Our reporting costs to the state archaeologist are borne by the department, and our current accounting methods do not consider the depreciation of equipment or of the department's 11-year old van. We are seeking a greater share of the tuition and fees now collected by the Division of Continuing Education to help close our budget gap.

2. **Diversity.** While the department has a deserved very positive reputation for the quality of its teaching about diversity, and it contributes heavily to teaching about diversity in the GenEd Program, the culture of the department is overwhelmingly white. By that I mean that nearly all our faculty are white (see Table 3), a strong majority of our graduate students are white, and while we do not have distributional data sorted by race concerning our undergraduate majors and GenEd students, most of our undergraduate students are white. And the subjects of informal corridor talk are also white. Professor Enoch Page, who is African American, regularly attracts a far higher proportion of students of color to his classes than do the rest of the faculty. We do only somewhat better in our gender profile, with seven of our 16 tenure system faculty being women, and over 70% of our graduate students being women.

Table 3  
Faculty Distribution by Gender and Ethnicity

Gender	Ethnicity
--------	-----------

	White	Hispanic	African American	Foreign	Totals
Female	6	0	0	1	7
Male	7	1	1	0	9
Totals	13	1	1	1	16

The profession of anthropology nationally is no better. The latest available sample, based on a national survey of all departments of anthropology in 1998 by the American Anthropological Association show a similar pattern (see Table 4).

Table 4  
Faculty of Color in Anthropology <sup>1</sup>

Ethnicity	1988-89	1992-93	1995-96	1997-98
Native American	1%	2%	1%	1% (n = 20)
Asian American	2 %	2 %	3 %	3% (n= 53)

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: *1998 Biennial Survey of Anthropology Departments in the United States*. Arlington, VA: The American Anthropological Association, March 1999, pp. 20 - 21.

African American	2 %	3 %	3 %	3% (n = 45)
Latino/Latina American	2 %	3 %	3 %	4% (n = 62)
White	93 %	90 %	89 %	89% (n = 1554)

We believe that our culture would change and then the racial composition of our student body would change if our faculty were more racially diverse. Yet our last six tenure system appointments (Professors Samuels, Krause, Hemment, Chilton, Sugerman, and Harper, in that order) have been white, and while judging each hire on its own terms, I believe we made the right decision, the cumulative effect runs precisely counter to our expressed desire. Our recent tenure system recruitment has been in areas with very few people of color (the anthropology of Europe and Northeast archaeology) or else has been done without a search (Harper and

Sugerman).<sup>2</sup> The more white the faculty is, of course, the more difficult it is to recruit and retain faculty and students of color.

We are currently searching for a skeletal biologist, another sub field of anthropology where the vast majority of candidates are white. Yet we have taken extraordinary care, far beyond the requirements of our Equal Opportunity and Diversity Office, both in defining the position and in advertising it to attract candidates of color.

To its credit, the members of the department have made deliberate and measurable progress in diversifying our graduate student body. Beginning in 1994, faculty and graduate student caucuses voted to set aside one TA position per year to recruit a student of color to our program. That decision has been affirmed each year with a vote in the department meeting. What is particularly heartening is the commitment of members of the graduate student caucus to support this set aside, even though it has the precise effect of taking away TA funding for one of its members for the ensuing year. Working with the Graduate School, successive Graduate Admissions Directors in the department have aggressively pursued fellowships and TA funds to attract students of color, and the annual earnings on the Sylvia Forman endowment have provided a \$10,000 recruitment fellowship for either Native Americans or applicants from 'third world' countries. The results of this ten-year effort are displayed in Table 5.

---

<sup>2</sup> Michael Sugerman is the husband of Elizabeth Chilton. In 2003, rather than see Chilton test the market to find a locale where both she and her husband could develop their careers, I worked closely with the administration and the Five Colleges, Inc. to secure a tenure-track appointment for Sugerman. The department permanently gave up a claim on \$15,000 in annual part-time teaching funds as its share of the Sugerman appointment. This effort enjoyed strong departmental support in a framework of an enlightened spousal hiring policy on the part of the dean and Provost. In 2004, this same spousal hiring policy was used when the dean asked the department's concurrence to appoint Krista Harper to a tenure track appointment in anthropology, as a way to secure the commitment of Harper's husband to a faculty position in Economics. No departmental funds were involved.

Table 5  
Distribution of Graduate Students in Anthropology by Nationality and/or Ethnic Identity

Year	African American	Asian American	Hispanic American	Native American	Total ALANA	Foreign	White American	Total
1994	4	0	0	1	5	8	67	80
2004	6	2	6	3	17	9	54	80

I conclude from this experience that a strategy to diversify our department must be clear on goals, enjoy broad support and an assurance of resources, and be patient and disciplined for the long term in its approach.

**3. Standing in the discipline.** The most recent national ranking of anthropology departments occurred with the 1993 National Research Council survey which was published in 1995. There are no other more recent surveys aimed at establishing a ranking of departments. The 1993 NRC study ranked UMass Amherst Anthropology dead center among 65 PhD-granting programs in the nation. The ranking was based primarily on faculty publications and external research support. Now, more than a decade later, the faculty composition of this department has changed considerably, with a turnover of 56%, and the 11-year old NRC rankings are not valid, given how much this and other departments have changed in the interim.

Table 11 in Appendix 1 shows faculty sponsored research production at \$42,416 per FTE faculty member in 2002-2003) placing us 7<sup>th</sup> out of a sample of 18 research 1 departments of anthropology.

Our standing as a center for graduate education in anthropology is difficult to measure. Table 8 in Appendix I shows that over the past decade we have seen an average of about 80 applications per year, with an acceptance rate of about 20%, and a yield of half of those we admit. It concerns us that the number of applications fell steadily from 1997 (100) to 2003 (72); the number of acceptances held steady during this time, and the yield went up. For Fall 2003, 2004, and 2005, the number of applications has gone up markedly (94, 95, and 100, respectively). We consider our application rate to be directly related to the levels of support we offer incoming graduate students. For as long as we have had a graduate program our mantra has been that we do not provide support for most incoming graduate students for their first year; the vast majority of those we do admit have been appointed to teaching assistantships for the ensuing three years. However, this is small comfort to well prepared graduate applicants, and we have substantial anecdotal evidence of losing our top picks to rival schools that can entice applicants with support right from the outset. I see the increase in applications over the past three years as a consequence of a decision by the faculty, over the objections of current graduate students, to set aside a total of three teaching assistantships for recruitment.

What then is UMass Amherst anthropology doing differently now than it did in 1993 when the last NRC ranking was constructed to move ourselves up in whatever ranking scale might emerge in the years ahead to evaluate the quality of the faculty?

UMass faculty are all active researchers who are publishing books and articles in refereed journals and are deeply engaged and quite visible in their respective professional associations. Over the past four years, there has been a marked up tick in productivity in faculty publications, especially by the junior faculty, portending a more robust profile for the future (see Appendix II). Responding to my inducements of course releases and a small pilot grant program developed by our dean, the number and scale of submissions of proposals for external support has escalated sharply in the past two years, and already we have seen the fruits of this effort, as our external support rose dramatically in FY04 (see Table 3 in Appendix I) , although the lion's share of that can be accounted for by the acquisition of Archaeological Services unit. I have committed more of my personal advocacy efforts to the junior faculty in their pursuit of external funding, and as a consequence I have neglected the more senior faculty.

## Section Two

[N.B. : The text on this page is taken from the University's *Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) Procedures*, pages 3 and 4, and defines the rationale for the narrative that follows in this section.]

### **2. Programs shall ensure that curriculum is relevant, rigorous, current and coherent.**

The need to provide a high quality education for students should be the primary consideration when evaluating the relevancy, currency, and coherence of curricula. Evaluation of the curriculum should reflect an awareness of changing knowledge, trends in the discipline, and the professional context for curriculum. The review should answer the following questions:

How does the Program determine curricular content? How does the curriculum relate to current existing standards, if any, of the discipline?

What internal or external measures of review are employed to ensure that the curriculum is relevant and up-to-date?

Are the curricular offerings structured in a logical, sequential and coherent manner? Is there an appropriate balance between breadth and depth?

If consistent with the Program mission, does the curriculum adequately prepare students for further study or employment?

In what way does the Program contribute to the education of students in terms of general knowledge, critical thinking capacity and other essential cognitive skills?

**1. General Education Curriculum.** The University's GenEd program is monitored by the Faculty Senate's GenEd Council and administered by the Provost's Office. The department of anthropology submitted a limited number of its courses for consideration to meet various GenEd requirements, and virtually all were accepted. In theory the GenEd Council of the Faculty Senate reviews all courses quadrennially to insure that each one has remained true to the compass of its initial proposal, but this has not been borne out in practice. In effect the, the GenEd courses we teach are not part of a departmental program that is monitored locally. Yet, as noted in Section 1, the GenEd course enrollments represent over 80% of our enrollments in any one semester, and we must and do take this commitment seriously. To a large extent, our commitment to GenEd lies at the heart of the tenure system faculty's commitment to teaching, and our most prolific researchers and writers on the faculty do most of the teaching of GenEd courses.

**2. Undergraduate Major Curriculum.** The current major requirements were established in 1972, and have been modified only slightly in the intervening 32 years. Majors must complete a total of 36 credits (or 12 courses) and distribute them in three of the four sub-fields of anthropology. No more than two courses taken at the introductory level may count toward the major, and all majors must complete a research methods course (Anthropology 481), a course on anthropological theory (Anthropology 364), and another course that represents a practical applications experience (e.g. study abroad, an honors thesis research project, an internship, community service). The rest of the major is made up from electives, and we have tried to spice each semester's offerings with a variety of topical and areal courses. When the department established the current major requirements, we expected that faculty advising would be the key to a student's success in the major, as a faculty advisor, sensitive to the student's aspirations, would help design an appropriate sequence of courses that would fulfill her/his expectations. Our current practice is that all faculty are assigned a roughly equal number of majors to advise. The initial assignment is made by the Undergraduate Program Director when the student first declares the major, and an effort is made to match student and advisor interests.

The median course size for our courses dedicated to our majors is 22. This is the kind of intensive experience one would expect to find in the very best liberal arts colleges; yet in anthropology at UMass, we have been able to add primary research experiences, internships, community service learning, and close contact with faculty who are active scholars. There are four distinct features of our major that underscore its value:

A. First, with small class size, the faculty put a strong emphasis on writing, both as a way to promote critical thinking and as a way to promote real fluency with written expression. Every course for our majors involves several writing assignments, and none relies on multiple choice tests. Several of our faculty have taught the junior year theory course and have come out of that experience convinced of the value of fostering writing for critical thinking and learning.

B. In many of our courses for majors, but especially in the community service learning courses, our students work in small teams to conduct research, analyze data, and report results. This collaborative work is followed by oral presentations in courses. We are proud of the fact that the state-wide Honors conference each year always has a strong delegation of our majors giving papers or hosting poster sessions.

C. Our applications or 'doing' requirement demands that students apply their learning in a concrete context. Increasingly over the past three years, our majors have chosen to meet that requirement in a community service learning course.

D. Finally, the total number of majors is modest: now 135. This means that students form personal friendships and practical collaborations out of sharing many of the same small-enrollment courses.

We expect that an anthropology major completing the BA to be fluently expressive in writing and in public speaking, to know how to deal easily with people of diverse backgrounds, to have the intellectual tools and passion to keep on learning after graduation, and to have a solid mastery of the rudiments of anthropology.

While I am proud of these features of our major, I believe we can and must do better by strengthening the requirements for the major. Rather than tinkering around the edges, I believe that we need to rethink our major from the ground up, with much more focus on the desired learning outcomes, and with an adequate resource base. Our faculty discussion on these issues has begun; over the past four years faculty in cultural anthropology have met regularly to discuss curricular reform. In my view transformation of the major needs to attend to the following dimensions:

A. The faculty need to develop a much greater sensitivity to the desired outcome of the major. We are good at designing and teaching courses with explicit goals, but with rare exceptions, we do not actively consider the intellectual sequencing of courses from introductory through intermediate, to advanced, to capstone. This does not mean that we run a smorgasbord, for there is enough corridor talk and personal friendships and conversations to roughly calibrate a sequence of information in courses, but there is no Curriculum Committee and no systematic shared consideration of course content.

B. At the moment, we offer two tiers of courses: introductory and advanced, with very few prerequisites for our advanced courses. We should offer a minimum of three levels, with entry to each higher level dependent on prerequisite courses at the preceding level. Right now, we have sacrificed intensivity for extensivity, and we need a better balance. This step will advance our objective of greater mastery, which cannot be achieved if there are few if any prerequisites at the advanced levels.

C. Further, while we require our majors to take courses in three of the four subfields, most students take an introductory course for two subfields, then most of their major coursework in one subfield. Concentration is fine, but in my view, our students need to take at least one intermediate and one advanced course in each of three of the four subfields.

D. The faculty need to rethink the role of advising. In principle, faculty ought to develop with their advisees intellectual pathways through courses to mastery; this is indeed the expectation of an unstructured major, as ours is. Yet, with occasional exceptions, most advising sessions are focussed on an auditing of requirements fulfilled or yet to be met. Increasingly this auditing function is carried out by the Undergraduate Program Director, and the overall level of faculty advising has declined. It is clear to me that the need for faculty advising would decline dramatically if the major requirements were more structured.

E. The faculty teach between one third and one half their current courses under the rubric of special topics courses. These courses, offered as Anthropology 197, 297, 397, and so on, can be developed and offered repeatedly without any curricular review by peers in the department, college, or university, and the actual titles, and course descriptions do not appear in the university catalog, depriving students interested in the major of reading about what the department actually does offer. The primary problem in my view, with the \*97 courses, is that they evade peer review, so our colleagues do not know what each other is offering in detail. Having served on various university-wide curricular review committees over the past 20 years, I know that this problem is not confined to anthropology.

F. We need to rethink the place and value of our research methods requirement. It is basically a statistics course taught by a part-time faculty member in a department where most faculty do not use statistical methods in their own research. The course needs to be broadened in its objectives to include non-quantitative research methods and application opportunities, it needs to be taught by tenure-system faculty to underscore its place as an important part of our major, and it needs to be a prerequisite to many upper level courses. As it is, most majors take this course during the second semester of their senior year, far too late to have a meaningful role in the curriculum.

G. Finally we need to focus more faculty teaching power on the major, either by growing our faculty by two or three positions or by shifting current teaching resources away from the GenEd program.

3. **Graduate Education** Like most research 1 institutions, anthropology is both holistic in terms of general theoretical frameworks, but divided into subfields for teaching and research.

The subfield with the largest faculty investment – more than 50%– is cultural anthropology, where the dominant areal focus has been and continues to be Europe. Regretably, the department no longer has anyone whose sole contemporary research focus is on Asia or Latin America. Early on we abandoned the notion that we could cover the world in our ethnographic

teaching and research. Instead, we committed to strengthen our European program, which is a major reason for our national and international reputation. Archaeology claims four faculty members, and nearly half of all the graduate students in the program. Two faculty have research and teaching interests here in New England, and the other two focus on the Old World. In biological anthropology, we are down to three faculty, and are currently searching for a fourth. Finally linguistic anthropology claims but one faculty member. I consider the most urgent area of growth in our faculty to be in archaeology, where faculty synergies, funding and career opportunities at all levels abound. Next, I would invest in biological anthropology, another area where there are significant external funding opportunities, and where there are currently some curricular gaps. And third, I think linguistic anthropology needs to grow, especially as enrollments in that sub-field have risen dramatically, and where productive teaching and research collaborations with colleagues in Linguistics and Communication are within close reach.

Anthropology at UMass Amherst is one of the smaller programs nationally, and without new faculty lines, we simply cannot cover the conventional four divisions equally well. As a consequence, we have, especially over the last ten years with our planning efforts, identified and nurtured a second dimension: several nodes of excellence that cross-cut the disciplinary subfield divisions, and these programs have given us international visibility, renown, and provide a strong draw for new graduate students and new faculty. Our modest size and the particular personal circumstances of the history of faculty recruiting have placed a premium on hiring faculty not only with expertise in one domain, but also with a readiness to collaborate in research and teaching across conventional subdisciplinary lines. This character is now reflected in the training that takes place in our graduate program. These nodes have included:

A. Our European program (our principal claim to national and international recognition in anthropology). Central to that is the European Field Training Program, where graduate students spend a semester under faculty supervision conducting preliminary field research in Europe. Their subsequent success in securing dissertation grants and then professional positions continues to reflect well on our department and the university. There is no better research center on the anthropology of Europe than here at UMass. With three recent hires in this area (Krista Harper, Julie Hemment and Betsy Krause), and Professors Pi-Sunyer, Urla, and Wobst, I expect a sharp increase in sponsored research over the coming five years.

B. Our medical anthropology program, closely linked to the Five College interdisciplinary program in Culture, Health, and Science, and strongly committed to outreach applications crosses the line between biological and cultural anthropology. Krista Harper, Lynnette Sievert, Alan Swedlund of our own faculty, and adjunct faculty Alan Goodman and Debra Martin at Hampshire College, and Lynn Morgan at Mount Holyoke have assembled a group of graduate students examining class, culture, and race issues in access to health care and in human growth and development in differing cultural contexts (Europe, the American Southwest, Latin America, India, and Massachusetts).

C. Our program in Northeast archaeology and Native American Indian studies is now carried principally by Elizabeth Chilton, lecturer Jean Foward, Robert Paynter, and Martin Wobst, although Art Keene had been a part of this program until he pursued his interests in community service learning. Chilton, Keene, Paynter, and Wobst have trained an entire generation of archeologists who dominate the study of the European-Native American relations in Northeast North America. Over the past six years, Paynter has developed strong ties with Historic Deerfield, in Deerfield, Massachusetts, where many of our graduate students have completed their dissertation research. The students and faculty in this program have taken the lead in redressing the longstanding social and intellectual schism and distrust between archaeologists and contemporary Native Americans in the Northeast. Elizabeth Chilton replaced Dena Dincauze who retired in December 1999, and Chilton has moved quickly to apply for major grants from NEH for the archaeology labs.

D. Finally, most of our faculty share research interests in social power and inequalities, especially with respect to such manifestations as race, class, gender, globalization, and modernity itself. Harper, Hemment, Krause, Keene, Page, Paynter, Samuels, Urla, and Wobst play key roles here.

The graduate program's requirements are clear, published in print and on the department's web site, and readily understood by faculty and students. Actual credit requirements are at the Graduate School minimum (30 credits for the MA and 10 dissertation credits for the PhD), but students and the individual advisory committees that the Graduate Program Director appoints for each student tailor specific course or writing requirements depending on the student's background and professional aspirations. At the doctoral level, there are no specific course requirements, although following the Berkeley model, students must write three comprehensive statements of field that they in consultation with their committees define, including the dissertation proposal, and they must master the appropriate research tools (e.g. foreign language capabilities) necessary to complete the dissertation research. All our doctoral students take graduate courses in anthropology and in other departments to supply the background and orientation to develop these statements.

While we have good reason to take pride in the program we have built, there remain some important challenges to address:

A. First, while our program offers students considerable flexibility, the price is a very heavy advising load for faculty, whose mentoring and tutorials are not reflected in student credit hours. We have 80 graduate students and a faculty of 16, by far the highest ratio in our college, and nearly double the national average among graduate programs in anthropology. Further the actual advising loads are very unevenly distributed across the faculty. That we are able to sustain high quality is attributable to extraordinary dedication on the part of our faculty and having highly motivated, and self-starting students. Nonetheless, such faculty commitment has an opportunity cost in research, outreach, and scholarship.

B. Our recruitment efforts are directed to highly qualified, self-directed students with strong records of accomplishment. Our median age of graduate students at admission is 26; most of our students have substantial professional or real life experience after the B.A. before coming to UMass. Our ideal is that such students would quickly establish faculty advisory committees and set about defining and then implementing their individually tailored graduate programs, and for many students, this ideal is realized. But for others, it is not, and for them the department needs to insure that they define programs of study early on and that their progress toward reaching program goals is monitored. To date, we have not developed systematic ways of monitoring and then facilitating graduate student compliance with our expectations.

C. We need to establish predictable patterns of graduate course offerings, and as with our undergraduate program, many of our graduate seminars are “Special Topics” courses offered for one or two times, then not offered again. Our enrollments in graduate seminars are variable, but frequently very low.

D. Our European program offers graduate students stipends and tuition waivers to participate, yet enrollments in the program are chronically low. I believe that the University needs to increase the stipend (now set at \$3,500), and index it to the one-semester stipend that TAs receive, and we also need to make a concerted effort to recruit graduate students and funding from other departments with European research interests across campus. This is precisely what European Program Director Urla has done and I expect this effort to increase in the future.

### Section Three

[N.B. : The text on this page is taken from the University's *Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) Procedures*, page 4, and defines the rationale for the narrative that follows in this section.]

#### 3. **Programs shall ensure faculty quality and productivity.**

Programs shall ensure that faculty possess the expertise to assure effective curriculum development, instructional design and delivery, and evaluation of outcomes. Faculty should exhibit awareness of trends in the discipline and the professional field as appropriate. Collectively, faculty should be involved in teaching, research/professional/creative activity, and public service/academic outreach as appropriate to the mission and regional context of the campus. The review should answer the following questions:

Do faculty possess the appropriate background, experience and credentials?

Are faculty current in relation to the knowledge base and content of the discipline and curricular offerings?

Are the program expectations for faculty involvement in teaching, research/professional/creative activity, and public service/academic outreach activities appropriate; and how are these expectations met? Are these expectations consistent with program policies regarding teaching assignments, merit allocations, and other aspects of faculty roles and rewards?

In what ways does the Program foster professional development and growth of faculty?

In what ways does the Program faculty lend its professional expertise — as expressed through teaching and research, scholarly and creative activity — to off-campus constituencies?

By any measure, all our faculty are successful classroom teachers and mentors. In large part, a culture has been developed and sustained that success in classroom teaching is as important as the scholarship profile. When we hire new faculty we inquire closely about an individual's teaching record, and success in classroom teaching is rewarded equally with scholarship in the assigning of merit pay dollars. Four of our faculty have been fellows in the Lilly program (Professors Urla, Page, Krause, and Hemment) and seven other faculty have participated in various programs offered by the Center for Teaching. Anthropology faculty have won a disproportionate number of distinguished teaching awards at the college and university levels.

We are all especially proud of the pioneering leadership of Professor Art Keene for developing and sustaining an array of community service learning programs on the campus. These programs are explicitly not charity outreach opportunities but theoretically grounded opportunities for students to grow their capacity to read the text of their own experience in understanding and ameliorating conditions of inequality here and elsewhere. On February 20, we expect the University trustees to formally name Keene to an endowed professorship to honor his commitment to creating curricula that give students the tools to be effective citizens in a democratic society. Two years ago, Keene was successful in mobilizing seven of our faculty to secure a grant to develop community service modules in their courses and then to sustain a year-long faculty seminar to discuss their experiments.

The CVs of faculty bear witness to a stunning array of outreach activities, whether serving on or leading committees in the department, in the university, in the Five College Consortium, in public service and in service to a broad array of professional societies. As with teaching, we have assiduously cultivated and sustained a culture of expectations that has recognized and rewarded these activities. Outreach activities are rewarded with merit dollars at exactly the same rate as scholarship and teaching.

Part of our success in sustaining these qualities of teaching excellence and public and professional service is that there is vibrant corridor talk, solid friendships, and constant discussions among faculty who are "in" a lot more than at home. With no coercion on my part or on the part of the members of the Personnel Committee, the past two cases for tenure and promotion enjoyed detailed letters of support from every member of the faculty.

As department chair, I have made it an explicit part of my own responsibility to talk at length individually with every probationary faculty member once a year, to talk about the entire range of professional growth challenges and opportunities, and to evaluate options with them. Other senior faculty also play more informal mentoring roles. I think the success of this can be seen in the extraordinary stability of our faculty.

## Section 4

[N.B. : The text on this page is taken from the University's *Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) Procedures*, pages 4 and 5, and defines the rationale for the narrative that follows each question in this section.]

### **4. Programs shall ensure teaching/learning environments that facilitate student success.**

Programs shall provide learning environments that promote student success. Students are expected to learn both content and skills appropriate to the discipline. The program should indicate clear expectations for student learning outcomes. The teaching/learning environment should be accessible to all students, should include a variety of instructional methodologies, and should provide timely feedback to students. The review should answer the following questions:

Question 4.1 What is the program looking for in its students? What kind of students is the program well suited to serve? How does the program define “quality” in terms of admission to the program (when relevant)?

As noted in sections 1 and 2, the anthropology major is an open major; we have no admissions thresholds; we accept everyone who applies. The graduate program is competitive and highly selective. Admission decisions are made by all graduate faculty after reviewing a personal essay, transcripts, and three letters of reference. The department looks for individuals with an intellectually rich, diverse, and challenging undergraduate experience and record, considerable personal maturity and demonstrated experience in charting their own way and in being able to write extremely well.

Question 4.2. To what extent does the program have articulated learning outcomes (content and skills) for students? (Outcomes should be articulated at both the undergraduate and graduate level and by sub-fields, when relevant.) By what means are these outcomes measured? Are they achieved by most students? For programs with graduate research or teaching assistantships: To what extent does the program have articulated learning outcomes for the TA/RA experience? By what means are these outcomes and the quality of the experience assessed?

At the undergraduate level, outcomes are defined by the successful completion of the 36 credits in required and elective courses, chosen –theoretically at least– in consultation with a faculty advisor. The rationale for the major requirements is spelled out in a major's guide which is given to each new major. It is also available on the department's website: [<http://www.umass.edu/anthro/Images/handbooks/UGhandbook.pdf>].

At the graduate level, MA candidates have an end-of-first year review – not really an examination– which dictates subsequent course selection, then a formal oral evaluation of the core course experience, and then there is an oral master's general examination, often substituted with a master's thesis defense. At the PhD level, candidates prepare three

statements of field and a dissertation prospectus; the prospectus is presented to an audience of faculty and fellow graduate students. Subsequently, when all statements of field are completed, the PhD comprehensive oral examination is conducted by the doctoral committee and it covers the material of the prospectus and statements of field. Then, of course, there is a formal oral defense of the dissertation once it has been completed. These requirements are spelled out in exhaustive detail on the Graduate Handbook, which is distributed to each new graduate student and is available on the department's website:

[\[http://www.umass.edu/anthro/Images/handbooks/GRhandbook.pdf\]](http://www.umass.edu/anthro/Images/handbooks/GRhandbook.pdf)

While the department expects every graduate student to assume a teaching assistantship at some point in her/his residency, there is no single department-wide policy on monitoring the experience. This is decentralized as TAs are supervised directly by the faculty who have overall responsibility for the course. As a departmental tradition, graduate students do not teach their own stand-alone courses until they have had substantial mentored and evaluated experience as teachers first.

Question 4.3. How are program expectations communicated to students? Are students kept informed of their progress in meeting intended program outcomes?

Students learn about expectations explicitly when they first enter our programs, through an orientation interview or seminar, and they are reminded frequently thereafter to be knowledgeable about program expectations and requirements by consulting the pertinent guide or handbook.

Question 4.4. How is assessment of student learning outcomes used in reviewing and modifying program curriculum, advising, and other program elements, and in evaluating faculty?

Pursuant to trustee policy, all courses are evaluated by students at the end of each semester. These evaluations are used by the personnel committee and by the department chair as part of the annual review of faculty performance and also as part of any personnel action, such as re-appointment, tenure, and promotion. There are no other systematic or recurrent efforts employed to evaluate course or program quality.

Question 4.5 In what ways does the program evaluate student success following graduation and the program's contribution to that success?

The department undertakes no systematic efforts to sustain contact with students after graduation for program evaluation purposes.

Question 4.6. What is the role of the core faculty in teaching lower division, upper division and graduate courses? What is the rationale for these assignments?

All tenure system faculty are expected to teach across the curriculum, from big GenEd courses to small graduate seminars, and the department chair in consultation with the various sub-field faculty caucuses comes up with a schedule of course assignments each semester that artfully balances issues of equity. The department has sustained a vibrant democratic and egalitarian ethos that does not differentiate faculty teaching assignments by rank.

## Section 5

[N.B. : The text on this page is taken from the University's *Academic Quality Assessment and Development (AQAD) Procedures*, page 5, and defines the rationale for the narrative that follows.

### **5. Programs shall ensure that resources are used wisely.**

Programs shall ensure that the resources available are used to meet Program goals and objectives, and as appropriate, engage in use of innovation to enhance resources; should engage in both intra- and inter-campus collaboration; and should demonstrate a commitment to effective and efficient use of resources. The review should answer the following questions:

Question 5.1 What process does the Program use to allocate resources?

The department chair has full authority to allocate resources under guidelines and frameworks established by the administration, and by the Commonwealth. In effect, there is no departmental budget committee. It sounds like a good deal for the department chair, and it would be; however the resources are hopelessly inadequate, and too much of my time is spent managing very small sums of money and seeking ways to leverage meager funds to accomplish a few good things. In terms of resources to sustain its programs, over and above the funds used to pay staff, faculty, and TA salaries and stipends, the department relies on the following:

A. The General Operating Fund (GOF), provided by annual state appropriations, is designed in theory to pay for most non-personnel costs for the day-to-day operations of our program. For FY02 and FY03, that figure was \$65,634. For FY04 and FY 05, our GOF budget was reduced 10% to \$59,071. This is the workhorse fund that pays telephone, postage, network access charges, faculty travel, photocopying, leases, paper, supplies, work-study employees, lab expenses, and office equipment. Of this amount, \$20,000 is earmarked for the European Program, and another \$3,000 for the Certificate Program in Native American Indian Studies. Balances are allowed to roll over to the ensuing fiscal year, but the department rarely carries forward balances that are not earmarked for specific purposes, such as faculty start-up packages.

The Reserved Trust Fund receives the department's share (10%) of overhead on faculty research grants. In FY04, the department received \$6,600 into this account. By a prior agreement that will last through FY06, the department plows all of the overhead earnings of our archaeological services unit back into that entity, so as to allow it to invest in capacities that will increase its long term profitability. My general principle is to use the overhead earnings to grow the capacity of faculty to generate more research. We carried

forward a balance to FY 05 of \$14,000, but all but about \$5,000 was earmarked for specific purposes.

Our gift account receives gifts from friends and alumni and in FY04, earned a total of about \$4,500.

The Continuing Education Services Account receives funds for our courses and programs operated through the Division of Continuing Education, the largest of which is our summer field school in archaeology. All earnings into this account are plowed back into the field school.

In addition the department has three endowments: (1) The Sylvia Forman Graduate Scholarship Fund, generates about \$10,000 annually to underwrite graduate student recruitment scholarships for Native Americans or for applicants from third world countries; (2) the George J. Armelagos medical anthropology scholarship which pays for small research projects in medical anthropology undertaken by graduate students; and (3) the Richard B. Woodbury fund which provides about \$1,200 per year to pay for the travel expenses of graduate students giving their first paper at a professional meeting.

Question 5.2 In what ways does the Program maximize the use of its human resources?

The department has three permanent staff:

A. A professional office manager with a business administration degree who reports to the department chair. The office manager supervises the other two staff members, manages the department's accounts, provides oversight for all faculty services such as assisting in research grant budgets, faculty searches, and all appointments for faculty and graduate students, personnel actions, and searches. The office manager also shares supervision responsibilities for the business manager of the Archaeological Services unit.

B. The departmental receptionist and graduate and undergraduate secretary, who doubles as our web site developer and maintainer.

C. The departmental bookkeeper.

In my judgment the department is well served by this staff and this configuration.

Question 5.3 In what ways does the Program maximize the use of material resources such as space, equipment, operating funds, etc.?

The department makes maximum of space in a building that was designed only for faculty offices and classrooms in many different ways, but our physical anthropology teaching and research space is inadequate to the point of actively discouraging both teaching and research. Faculty and students have been heroic in dealing with very challenging circumstances. In

spite of promises from the dean to address some of the more serious problems, no funds have been transferred. In archaeology, Professor Chilton has applied for funding from NEH to catalog all our artifacts and then once that project is complete, to renovate our storage facilities. We jointly secured \$100,000 in a private gift to be matched by \$50,000 from the Commonwealth to renovate one of our labs to honor MA alumna, archaeologist Betty Alden Little. Thanks to the successful lobbying efforts of Professor Jacqueline Urla, the Office of Information Technologies equipped a computer lab that we now use for visual and linguistic anthropology research and teaching.

Apart from buying or leasing photocopiers, the department does not have a strategy to depreciate and replace equipment, such as the van used for the field school in archaeology

Question 5.4 What strategies does the Program employ to develop alternate sources of revenue (private giving, grants and contracts, etc.), and to share costs with other public and private entities?

The department has already developed three strategies to grow its resource base:

1. To aggressively support faculty in applying for external funds to support their research, I have been generous in providing course releases and the dean has provided small grants. We have seen a substantial increase in sponsored activity with grant proposals submitted this fiscal year by Professors Chilton, Godfrey, Harper, Hemment, Krause, Sievert, Sugerman, and Urla.
2. Grow the University of Massachusetts Archaeological Services by giving it three years where the dean and department claim no overhead so that this unit can invest in capacity building so as to be more competitive for larger projects over the long term.
3. Increase private donations with targeted campaigns. In FY05, we saw our first large gifts, with a \$5,000 gift by PhD alumnus Ken Jacobson to fund Laurie Godfrey's research, another \$10,000 from emeritus professor R. Brooke Thomas to underwrite distinguished alumni visits, and \$100,000 from John Little to renovate an archaeology lab to honor his wife, Betty Little. This last gift qualified for a state match of \$50,000. The department has been extraordinarily well supported in these efforts by the dean and her talented and imaginative development staff.

# Appendix I

## Tables

[N.B. Tables 1 through 10 are also available on the web at the following address:

[http://www.umass.edu/oapa/publications/department\\_profiles/menu/](http://www.umass.edu/oapa/publications/department_profiles/menu/)

In Step One, select the table you want to read and then in Step Two select anthropology from within the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences window]

- Table 1 Degrees Awarded by Degree Program Level, Anthropology, Academic Years 1994-95 through 2003-04
- Table 2 Educational Expenditures per FTE Instructed Student (FTEIS) and Student Credit Hour (SCH), Anthropology, Fiscal years 1992 through 2002
- Table 3 Expenditures for Sponsored Activity (in thousands) per Tenure System Faculty, Anthropology, Fiscal years 1995 through 2004
- Table 4 Instruction to Majors and Non-Majors, Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Instructed Students and Student Credit Hours (SCH), Anthropology, Fall Semester, 1995 - 2004
- Table 5 Lecture Sections Taught/FTE faculty, Anthropology, Academic Years 1995-96 through 2003-04
- Table 6 Student Faculty Ratios, FTE Instructed Students/FTE Faculty, Anthropology, Academic Years 1995-96 through 2003-04
- Table 7 Student Faculty Ratios, Student Credit Hours/FTE Faculty, Anthropology, Academic Years 1995-96 through 2003-04
- Table 8 Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions, Anthropology, Applications, Acceptances, and Enrollments, Fall Semesters, 1994-2003
- Table 9 Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollment, Headcount Student majors, Anthropology, Fall Semesters, 1995-2004
- Table 10 University of Massachusetts Amherst Graduating Senior Survey 2001-2003, Departmental Results, Anthropology

[N.B. Tables 11 through 15 are also available on the web at the following address:  
<http://www.umass.edu/anthro/aqad.html>]

- Table 11 Instructional Cost Ratios, Research and Public Service Expenditures, *FY 2002-2003*, UMass Amherst and Research 1 institutions with data available at the 4 digit CIP level, Anthropology
- Table 12 Student Credit Hours, Organized Class Sections, and FTE Students Taught *per FTE Instructional Faculty* for Other Faculty (Fall 2002), UMass Amherst and Research 1 institutions with data available at the 4 digit CIP level, Anthropology
- Table 13 Student Credit Hours, Organized Class sections, and FTE Students Taught *per FTE Instructional Faculty* for Tenure System Faculty (Fall 2002), UMass Amherst and Research 1 institutions with data available at the 4 digit CIP level, Anthropology
- Table 14 Student Credit Hours, Organized Class Sections, and FTE Students Taught *per FTE Instructional Faculty* for Supplemental Faculty (Fall 2002), UMass Amherst and Research 1 institutions with data available at the 4 digit CIP level, Anthropology
- Table 15 Student Credit Hours, Organized Class Sections, and FTE Students Taught *per FTE Instructional Faculty* for Teaching Assistants (Credit-Bearing Sections Only) (Fall 2002), UMass Amherst and Research 1 institutions with data available at the 4 digit CIP level, Anthropology

## Appendix II

# Tenure System Faculty CVs