

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies

FALL 2005-SPRING 2006

Committee Members:

Brian Baker, Ethnic Studies

Alyson Buckman, Humanities and Religious Studies

Thomas Krabacher, Geography (*Chair*)

Individuals Interviewed:

Graduate Students, Department of Anthropology
Jerald Johnson, Professor of Anthropology Emeritus
Christie Hunter, Archeological Curation Technician
Ming-Tung "Mike" Lee, CSUS Assistant Vice President and Dean of Academic Programs
Office Staff, Department of Anthropology
Susan Parman, Program External Review Consultant
Part-Time Faculty Members, Department of Anthropology
Probationary Faculty Members, Department of Anthropology
L. Mark Raab, Program Review External Consultant
Elizabeth Strasser, Department of Anthropology Chair
Otis Scott, Dean of the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
Joseph Sheley, Vice President for Academic Affairs (former Dean, College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies)
Tenured Faculty Members, Department of Anthropology
Undergraduate Students in ANTH 160 (Fall 2005)

Documents Consulted:

1997 Academic Program Review Report
CSUS University Catalog
Department Course Syllabi
Dept. of Anthropology 2004/2005 Self-Study
Department ARTP Policies and Procedures
Faculty Vitae
External Consultants' Reports by L. Mark Raab and Susan Parman

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. The department is to be commended for its shared vision of and strong commitment to a liberal arts Anthropology major and minor.
2. The Department is to be commended for developing and maintaining a clearly defined undergraduate major.
3. Members of the Anthropology faculty are to be commended for the high level of professional expertise and intellectual rigor they bring to the Department's undergraduate and graduate programs.
4. Members of the Anthropology faculty are to be commended on their strong research and publication records in addition to their commitment to teaching and service.
5. The Part-Time faculty in Anthropology are to be commended for both the dedication they bring to their teaching and the more general support they provide both their students and the program.
6. The Department chair, Beth Strasser, is to be commended for her efforts to lead the Department during what proved to be frequently contentious and trying circumstances.
7. The Department, and in particular director Mark Basgall, are to be commended for the high quality of the Archaeological Research Center, and unique opportunities it brings to both the Anthropology Program and the campus.
8. The Department, and in particular museum curator Terri Castaneda and instructional/curation technician Christie Hunter, are to be commended for maintaining both a high quality museum and extensive collections, often under challenging conditions.
9. The Department staff, Doni Santinello and Derek Bevers, are to be commended for the strong support they provide the faculty, students, and academic programs in the Anthropology Department; praise for their contributions came from all quarters.

Recommendations to the Department

1. The Anthropology faculty give top priority to addressing the inter-faculty conflicts that currently exist within the Department.

2. The Anthropology Department review its curriculum with an eye toward (1) determining whether it effectively achieves the goals of the program's mission statement, and (2) identifying ways of increasing the flexibility in its undergraduate curriculum.
3. The Anthropology Department, with the support of the College and the University, seek to hire faculty with the expertise to meet current or anticipated needs in the following areas: socio-cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and the curation of skeletal remains.
4. The Department put in place an acceptable academic assessment plan that meets University guidelines.
5. The Department work with the College and University to address the need for improved storage and maintenance of its artifact and human remains collections.
6. The Department seek to upgrade its archaeological curation technician position to a full-time position; it should consider assigning additional responsibilities to the position if necessary to justify the upgrade.
7. The Anthropology Department work closely with the College and University to find permanent space on campus for the Archaeological Research Center.
8. The Anthropology Department meet with undergraduate majors for the purpose of resolving student concerns over class scheduling.
9. The Anthropology Department clarify and strengthen its undergraduate advising procedures.
10. The Anthropology Department develop a process by which part-time faculty concerns can be heard and addressed.
11. The Anthropology Department consider reorganizing its office space in order to facilitate workflow and staff needs; new furniture and equipment must be considered as part of this.
12. The Anthropology Department work to develop ways of alleviating staff morale problems.

Recommendations to the Dean

1. The Dean work with Anthropology Department and the University to provide the resources (including space and staffing) to (1) adequately house and curate the department's artifact and human skeleton collections with the goal of making them

NAGPRA compliant and (2) permanently accommodate the Archaeological Research Center in an on-campus location.

2. Dean promote the reduction of faculty conflict through the allocation of discretionary resources (faculty positions, support for mediation, or other resources).
3. The Dean should support the Department's request to hire faculty with expertise in the areas of Socio-cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, and the management of its collection of human remains.
4. The Dean work with the Anthropology Department to increase its staff half-time ASA position to a full-time position.

Recommendations to the University

1. The University should work with the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies and the Department to provide the resources (including space and staffing) to (1) adequately house and curate the department's artifact and human skeleton collections with the goal of making them NAGPRA compliant and (2) permanently accommodate the Archaeological Research Center in an on-campus location.
2. The Anthropology Department is expected to have a fully-implemented assessment plan in place by the time of the next program review. If the Department does not have such a plan in place by then, it is recommended to the Program Review Oversight Committee that it receive no more than a conditional approval at that time.

Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

1. It is recommended that the bachelors degree program (B.A.) in Anthropology and the undergraduate minor in Anthropology be approved for six years or until the next program review.
2. It is recommended that the masters degree program (M.A.) in Anthropology be approved for six years or until the next program review.

OVERVIEW

The Department of Anthropology is one of sixteen departments and programs in the College of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies. The Department views its primary missions to be 1) advancing the knowledge of anthropology through its academic programs, 2) supporting scholarship on issues of anthropological interest, and 3) disseminating anthropological knowledge to the broader Sacramento community. To that end, the Department offers at the undergraduate level both the major (B.A.) and minor in anthropology. In addition, it offers the Master of Arts degree (M.A.) at the graduate level.

Academic Programs

The undergraduate curriculum is organized around the four traditional subfields in Anthropology: social/cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeology, and linguistics. In the B.A. program, parity is maintained among the first three subfields, while linguistics is represented by only a single required course in the core. A total of 49-50 units are required by the major and are distributed as follows:

- Lower division core: 13 units
- Method & theory: 12 units
- Breadth Requirements 9 units
- Field/Research 3 units
- Distributed electives 9-10 units
(3 subfields)
- Undistributed elect. 3 units

Thus, the major requirements are very rigid, allowing the student only three free elective units. (Only with these elective units does the student have the opportunity to add a second linguistics course to the major.) At the time of the review there were officially 117 students in the major.

The Department also offers an 18-unit undergraduate minor. There are no specific course requirements other than that 12 of the 18 units must be in upper division.

The graduate degree (M.A.) has a 30-unit requirement consisting of 9 required units (three 3-unit seminars, one in each of the three major subfields), 18 elective units, and 3 units toward the master's thesis. Over the five years preceding the program review, graduate student enrollment fluctuated between 30 and 40. Currently, the largest block of graduate students elect to specialize in archaeology, primarily because that is where employment opportunities are the greatest.

In addition to supporting the Department's undergraduate and graduate degrees, Anthropology course offerings also serve the University's General Education (GE) program. This currently involves 19 Anthropology courses offered across 13 GE categories.

Facilities

The Anthropology Department office and most faculty offices are located on the fourth floor of Mendocino Hall. The floor also contains a computer lab, the physical anthropology classroom and teaching laboratory, and a smaller laboratory for faculty and graduate student use. Fourth floor space is tight. The Department office (MND 4010) is cramped and in recent years another room, MND 4012, was subdivided to make way two additional faculty offices.

In addition to the above, the Anthropology Department is also home to three additional facilities: the Archaeological Research Center (ARC), the Anthropology Museum, and an extensive collection of cultural artifacts and human skeletal remains.

The ARC was established in 1995 to support faculty research, seek sources of outside funding, and provide students with hands-on field and research experience in archaeology, particularly of California and the western Great Basin. The Center also provides support for both public and private agencies in the northern California region. The Center operations are supervised by a director (Mark Basgall) and two additional faculty members; nine full-time support staff are also employed. Until recently, the Center was housed in Foley Hall, but has since been relocated due to construction. The Center oversees on average between \$700,000-\$800,000 in contract/grant work per year.

The Anthropology Museum occupies four rooms on the ground floor of Mendocino Hall and includes an exhibition space, workspace, and a collections repository. The Museum is run by a faculty member on a ½ time basis, funded by the Department. Museum funding has been erratic; throughout much of 1990s it was supported by lottery money, but currently lacks a reliable funding stream.

The artifact and skeleton collections represent an important resource, but also a major area of concern for the Department. The lack of adequate storage facilities for the collections has long been a problem. The collection consists of approximately 2000 boxes and trays and by one count has been relocated 26 times over the past 30 years. Since 1991, the bulk of the collection has been stored on the ground floor of Mendocino Hall, with additional space in Capistrano Hall (for which there is no security) and, until recently, Foley Hall. The Mendocino Hall facilities employ a mezzanine arrangement in which scaffolding has been installed to create a loft-like storage space above the laboratory/work area. One of the external consultants labeled this arrangement as clearly substandard: space is limited and lighting and access are poor. In his opinion it was unclear whether the facilities would meet the standards required under the 1990 federal Native American Graves Protection and Restoration Act (NAGPRA).

In addition to a lack of physical space, the present curatorial staff, which consisted at the time of the review of one half-time technician, is also insufficient to meet the demands placed on it. Collections remain un-inventoried and incompletely catalogued. The location of collections is not always easily known, as was the case with a set of skeleton

remains sought by the U.S. Forest Service for repatriation purposes in 2005. University resources are sorely needed to maintain the collection.

Student Profile

Undergraduate majors displayed a steady increase in numbers (11%) over the five years since the previous program review, closely paralleling trends in the College and University. The gender ratio favors females over males by a ratio of approximately 3:1, a pattern that has been consistent over time and not unusual for the discipline as a whole. Ethnic diversity for undergraduate majors (percent non-white) is 41%, almost identical to that for the university as a whole (42%). Among graduate students the gender ratio is approximately even. Ethnic diversity for Anthropology graduate students (32%), however, is noticeably below that of both the College (47%) and University (50%).

A significantly higher proportion of Anthropology students attended the university part-time (approximately 33%) compared to the University as a whole. Retention and graduation rates, on the other hand, show some annual fluctuation but correspond closely to those for the University overall.

Faculty Profile

At the time of the program review the Anthropology program had 16 tenured/tenure-track faculty, with a gender and ethnic composition comparable to that for the College and University (approximately 40% women and 22% non-white). The Anthropology faculty experienced significant turnover in the time between the previous program review (2000) and the current one, with six new faculty hired during that period.

The distribution of faculty by subfield is as follows:

Archaeology:	4
Social/Cultural:	9
Physical:	3

All of the major subfields are represented (the one linguistics specialist is included here under social/cultural), although the number of physical anthropologists is uncomfortably low, given the number of class sections offered in that area. All full-time faculty hold the Ph.D. degree in their field and an examination of their curriculum vitae reveals a high degree of engagement in scholarly activity in its various forms. The Department also maintains a strong pool of well-trained part-time instructors.

Faculty Divisiveness

Unfortunately, the Anthropology program is currently plagued by a high degree of divisiveness among the faculty that has impeded cooperation and progress in a variety of important areas. More than any other topic, this inter-faculty conflict dominated the discussion between the review team and all segments of the faculty.

In one sense the conflict seems to be primarily (but not entirely) generational: senior faculty for the most part on one side, many of the more recently appointed junior faculty on the other. Based on the review team's conversation with various segments of the faculty, the causes of the conflict seem to breakdown along a number of lines:

Generational: Many senior faculty feel the younger faculty have little respect for them and for the Anthropology program in its current form; younger faculty feel the older faculty are obstructionist and unwilling to let them have a role in department decision-making.

Demographic: The hiring of a large number of new faculty over a short period of time (5 during a one-year period) made it difficult to assimilate new faculty into the existing department culture.

Philosophical: Disagreements over the approaches to anthropology that should be taken in the Department.

Curricular: The inflexible structure of the existing undergraduate curriculum with little room for electives makes it difficult for newer faculty to develop and teach courses in their areas of interest.

Personalities: In some cases individual personalities appear to have exacerbated the situation.

The divisiveness is most felt among the Department's social/cultural anthropologists, where ideological differences are most apparent. This is perhaps most clearly reflected in the fact that the Department could not agree on a single essay describing the Social/Cultural subfield for inclusion in the Self Study. Two separate descriptions (or "Perceptions") were included, instead. Similarly, the Department requested two, rather than the usual one, external consultants for the program review. As one of the consultants observed, however, this conflict is simply a reflection of the much broader conflict that currently characterizes the discipline as a whole.

Unfortunately, the consequences of this go beyond a simple loss of collegiality. An attempt at curricular revision in the year prior to the program review apparently ground to a halt due to the ill-feeling present. In another instance, the department chair felt compelled to resign as a consequence.

The bottom line is that there is a lot of anger, frustration, and unhappiness throughout the faculty. Fortunately, so far this does not appear to have affected the academic programs. From what the review team was able to tell, there is no sign that knowledge of the conflict has filtered down to the students; the Anthropology majors seem generally unaware that it is going on. Nonetheless, dealing with this issue is the greatest challenge the Anthropology faculty will face between now and their next program review.

RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS FROM LAST PROGRAM REVIEW

The 2000 Anthropology Program Review contained a total of 19 recommendations on a wide range of topics. In addition, the review team suggested the Department revisit six recommendations from the previous (1993) review, for a total of 25 altogether. Topics addressed by the recommendations included: departmental academic planning, academic advising, career advising, undergraduate and graduate class scheduling, graduate program admission criteria, departmental staffing, and internal resource allocation.

The 2005 Anthropology Self Study (Appendix 11) indicates that the Department responded satisfactorily to the above recommendations, in most cases accepting and acting upon the suggestions made. In those cases where the Department did not adopt a particular recommendation, the Department offered a well-supported explanation as to why it did not do so.

In four cases, however, the Department's response to the recommendations was either incomplete or, for some reason, the department failed to fully address the circumstances prompting the original recommendation. These are:

1. Assessment: Recommendation 16 from the 2000 Program Review recommended that *the Department implement existing plans and continue consideration of future plans for assessing student learning*. Since that time the Department has taken significant steps in that direction, although the process is not yet complete. This is addressed in the current Recommendation #4 to the Department below.
2. Status of Part-Time Faculty: The previous review contained two recommendations, #7 and #19, aimed at integrating part-time faculty more fully into the life of the Anthropology Department. The Department addressed the issues raised in the recommendation in its response to the 2000 Program Review Report, but it did not address them in the 2005 Self Study. While the Department's 2000 response to Recommendation #7 indicated that the issues raised were being addressed in a number of ways, the question of morale among part-time faculty still remains. The present Review addresses this subject, along with a number of other part-time related issues, in its Recommendation #10 to the Department.
3. Advising: Recommendation #13 from the 1993 program review (and revisited in 2000) urged the Anthropology Department to augment its advising practices. Undergraduate advising remains an issue for the present program review and is addressed in Recommendation #9 in the current program review.
4. Curriculum: The 2000 Review urged a revision of the Anthropology curriculum, which took place that same year. A number of curricular issues, old as well as new, persist today and the current program review team strongly recommends the