

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON


12 July 2000

TO: Marsha L. Landolt, Dean And Vice Provost
The Graduate School

Frederick L. Campbell, Dean
Office of Undergraduate Education

David C. Hodge, Dean
College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Department of Anthropology Program Review Committee

Sandra Silberstein, Professor, English (Chair) 
Peter T. Ellison, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and Harvard
College Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University
Stephen S. Gloyd, Associate Professor and Director, Internal Health Program,
Department of Health Resources
Alma Gottlieb, Professor, Anthropology, University of Illinois Urbana-
Champaign
Robert C. Stacey, Professor and Chair, History
Patty Jo Watson, Edward Malinckrodt Distinguished Professor of Anthropology,
Washington University

RE: DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY TEN-YEAR REVIEW

THE REVIEW PROCESS

Our review, carried out during the Spring Quarter of 2000, began with an examination of the 1999 Anthropology self-study as well as the documents surrounding the 1988 program review. In preparation for the site visit, internal reviewers held preliminary meetings with Anthropology Chair Miriam Kahn, Jackson School Director Jere Bachrach, Geography Chair Victoria Lawson, as well as representatives of the Department's four graduate programs: Archaeology (Angela Close, Don Grayson), Biocultural Anthropology (Gerald Eck, Bettina Shell-Duncan), Environmental Anthropology (Devon Pena, Eric Smith), and Sociocultural Anthropology (Laada Bilaniuk). The external members joined the committee for the site visit on May 30-31 (unfortunately, a family emergency precluded Professor Gloyd's participation on the second day). The site visit included interviews with all available faculty, students, and staff. We held group meetings with the following constituencies: faculty from each of the four subdisciplines, junior faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, the Graduate Advisor and Coordinator, and the undergraduate advisors. We met individually with a staff member, the current and most recent chair, the Department's only contractual lecturer, and another faculty member.

OVERVIEW

In 1988, while still nationally ranked (approximately 20th), Anthropology was deemed a department in decline. Even two years ago it faced substantial challenges: morale was low, three core Sociocultural faculty had left, and the Biocultural division had just sustained a tenure denial. In the spring of 2000 we found a transformed department, on the verge of becoming a national leader far surpassing its previous rankings. Although not directly observable to the committee, surely the previous chair, Steve Harrell, contributed to reversing the previous decline. What is conspicuous at the moment is the leadership of the new chair, Miriam Kahn. She is a first-rate chair, who seems universally liked, praised for her problem-solving approach and for the transparency of her administration. Three of the four areas in the Department are significantly better off than they were several years ago. As a result, morale in those units is high, projecting a sense of energy and renewal. In part this is a credit to the quality of recent additions to the faculty, every one a good hire. The University will find that its investments in junior Anthropology faculty are yielding returns, and we will speak briefly to these dividends here.

The Biocultural group provides a success story following the setback of a tenure denial. With impressive junior hires, they have rapidly recovered through a creative investment of resources that connects them to the Sociocultural and Environmental areas of the Department.

The new interdisciplinary Environmental Program has rapidly achieved national visibility and renown. This innovative unit is exciting at both the faculty and graduate student levels (it does not yet offer an undergraduate curriculum). Because faculty from across the Department work in this unit, it has served to create substantial cross-subdisciplinary links. The creation of this new program as one of the first of its kind in the nation displays the Department's planning vision.

The Sociocultural Program has made five strong hires in recent years, turning the loss of several faculty into an opportunity for program building. The new sociocultural hires represent a broadening of the Program's focus theoretically, regionally, and topically, expanding coverage in anthropological linguistics, medical anthropology, and the environment, among other areas of expertise.

The Archaeology Program is the unit currently in need of help. In the context of recent and anticipated faculty losses as well as the temporary loss of Julie Stein to the Dean's Office, the Program finds itself dramatically understaffed. The faculty who remain are strong, but without new hires, they face an impossible task. The Review Committee is optimistic that immediate action could return this program to its previous stature. We consider, however, that this will require rethinking the traditional structure of the UW Archaeology Program. An appropriate and immediate midlevel hire can catalyze this rethinking and catapult both this subdisciplinary area and the Department as a whole to significant national ranking.

Below we review the four departmental programs in greater depth and detail our Archaeology recommendations. Subsequent sections discuss and make recommendations regarding departmental structure, the undergraduate and graduate programs, and faculty issues. Our final section summarizes our major recommendations. Specific curricular suggestions can be found in the Appendix.

THE SUBDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS

The Biocultural Anthropology program

The Biocultural Anthropology Program has, in ten years, been almost entirely restructured and now certainly ranks among the top tier of programs of its kind in the country. The building of this program, which began after the previous ten-year review, suffered a recent set-back with the tenure denial of a promising junior faculty member. But adherence to the original vision on the part of the Department and flexibility on the part of the Administration have led to excellent junior hires who have continued to bring new energy and direction to the Program, further raising the national profile of the Department.

Ten years ago the Physical Anthropology Program at the University of Washington was languishing. Its emphasis on comparative primate anatomy seemed poorly integrated with the other programs in the Department and moreover was not representative of the most exciting areas of current research in the field. A conscious decision on the part of the faculty resulted in a new orientation for the program, focusing on biocultural responses to environmental challenges and the role that such responses have played in our evolutionary history and continue to play in contemporary societies. This mission resonates much more directly with the missions of the other units-- Sociocultural Anthropology, Environmental Anthropology, and Archaeology--while still allowing coverage of the basic core areas of Biological Anthropology, such as evolutionary theory, genetics, primate behavior and ecology, and hominoid paleontology. The overlap of faculty effort between the Biocultural Program and both the Sociocultural and Environmental Programs is a testimony to the adjacency and interrelationship of these intellectual missions.

A working relationship has also been established with other units in the University, such as the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology and the Center for Quaternary Research. New research foci now highlight the areas of subsistence ecology, disease, reproduction, and aging, with opportunities for the research training of graduate students. The laboratory facilities of the Department have expanded, particularly in the burgeoning area of reproductive ecology and behavioral endocrinology. The Program is also now quite strong in the area of formal and quantitative methods, one of the backbones of a successful graduate training program. Thus with several bold steps the Department has positioned itself in the front ranks of Biological Anthropology departments in the country and should begin to draw increasing international attention as well.

The Program's recent successes augur well for its ability to meet challenges inherent in its recent growth and reorientation. Its decision to adopt a research focus on the biocultural adaptations of modern human populations is a wise one from the standpoints of department integration, funding opportunities, and the potential for training students. But that focus does depart somewhat from some of the main currents of Biological Anthropology, such as the nature and process of human evolution, human origins, and the comparative study of human and primate behavior. We hope that the Department will not lose sight of these equally exciting areas of the discipline. Doctoral students emerging from the Program will need to have a firm foundation of knowledge in these areas sufficient to teach undergraduates and to remain intellectually conversant with the forefront of research. Should opportunities for new faculty hires emerge in coming years the Department would do well to consider strengthening one or more of these areas.

A second challenge will be to continue the level of extramural funding that the Program has begun to attract. The Program now has an excellent balance of field and laboratory expertise and this should be a significant advantage in attracting and training the best students. However, the maintenance of this capacity will depend on uninterrupted grant support. Support of this nature is still relatively rare in areas of Biological Anthropology that are not of direct clinical relevance. It will require sustained effort on the part of the faculty to attract such funding and establish themselves as credible candidates for competitive continuation grants of longer term. There is every reason to think that they can succeed in this effort and, having done so, will secure a position as a dominant force in the discipline for the next decade or more.

Finally, in order to reap the full benefit of the bold steps that have been taken, the Department and the University Administration will need to meet the challenge of retaining and developing the excellent junior faculty they have recruited in this program. The failure to achieve tenure of another highly promising young scientist would cast a serious shadow on the Program and its future. The investment that has already been made should be supported by a continuing institutional commitment to the professional growth and development of its faculty and their efforts to bring the very best educational and research opportunities to the students of the University. We offer specific recommendations along these lines in the Faculty Issues section below.

The Environmental Anthropology Program

Environmental Anthropology (EA) differs structurally from the Archaeology, Biocultural, and Sociocultural Programs: With the exception of the 200-level "Introduction to Environmental Anthropology," it is solely a graduate program. Like the other three subfields in the Department, EA runs its own graduate admissions program. In apportioning TA resources and other forms of departmental graduate support, however, EA students are treated as if they were Sociocultural students. As an interim arrangement for a new program, this seems to be working. If EA continues to grow, however, as we predict that it will, it may prove necessary to revise the Department's

governing "Policies and Procedures Document" to reflect explicitly the emergence of this new program.

Core faculty in the EA Program are drawn from all three of the existing subfields in the Department. Allied faculty come from across the University. Most EA faculty members are also associated with the UW Program on the Environment (PoE). As a result, the EA faculty is a highly interdisciplinary and wide-ranging group, with intellectual and structural connections to the College of Forest Resources, the School of Marine Affairs, the Law School and the School of Public Health, as well as to American Ethnic Studies, Zoology, Geography, and of course to PoE. No other section of the Anthropology Department has a comparable range of local institutional connections. The Program is also rising rapidly in national visibility, a fact reflected by its growth. It is an outstanding example of the way in which a strategic vision, backed by several imaginative new appointments, can transform a department or program.

The emergence of EA has played an important role in knitting the Department together. EA students take courses drawn from the other three subfields, while EA's own core seminars are helping to create a sense of intellectual community between faculty and students. There is quite a lot of team-teaching and guest-lecturing in EA courses, and universal pride in the Program's accomplishments among both faculty and graduate students. The sense of optimism about its prospects is palpable.

Because the EA Program is so new (it was begun in 1997, although two graduate students were admitted in 1996 who have become EA students), it is too early to measure how quickly its students will move through the Program, or how well they will fare on the job market. The program faculty expect "that most EA graduates will go on (or return) to non-academic careers requiring expertise in social aspects of human-environment interaction" (1999 Self Study, p. 48). This too represents a new commitment within the Anthropology Department, which until now has seen more than half its graduates work in higher education and has generally emphasized this ultimate job outcome in its training.

The biggest obstacle the EA Program faces is the inadequacy of the support it can offer to incoming graduate students. EA faculty have made a point of encouraging students entering the Program to begin applying immediately for NSF, Javits, EPA and other relevant grants, an example of a successful strategy that might be adopted by the other subfields. EA students have proved highly competitive for such outside funding. They have also benefited from support through the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology. But the Program is in danger of losing many of its top graduate applicants to other schools that can offer them multi-year packages of guaranteed support. This is not a problem unique to the Environmental Anthropology Program. It is a constant across all the departmental subfields in Anthropology. It may, however, have a disproportionate effect on EA precisely because the Program is so new.

The Sociocultural Anthropology Program

The program in Sociocultural Anthropology is overall a healthy and intellectually vibrant component of the Department. As the largest unit, it is distinguished by significant diversity in research interests at all levels: theoretically, topically, regionally. We are impressed by the high level of mutual respect within this program. Its faculty meets every month to discuss programmatic issues; this clearly fosters a great deal of cooperation and surely produces a positive tone for the graduate program.

The past decade has seen significant changes in the composition of the Department's Sociocultural faculty. Distressing faculty losses left the Program in a potentially weakened state. Thoughtful reassessment has led to a series of excellent hires, and the Program has rebounded with remarkable speed. Currently the Department includes an unusually large contingent of assistant professors (Bilaniuk, Ferguson, Lowe, Sivaramakrishnan, Taylor). These new faculty join an already strong cohort of ten tenured professors (Anagnost, Harrell, Hunn, Kahn, Keyes, Nason, Peña, Rhodes, Smith, Witherspoon) and one senior lecturer (Green). The gender balance is good overall (although less so by rank), and recent efforts to add ethnic diversity are laudable.

The developing strengths of the graduate program in Sociocultural Anthropology build upon the impressive capacities of this faculty. Through the research interests of both the new and continuing professors, several clusters of issues and themes emerge. These include *colonialism, ethnicity, nation building, migration, and the effects of globalization* (Anagnost, Bilaniuk, Ferguson, Harrell, Kahn, Keyes, Lowe, Peña, Sivaramakrishnan); *cultural aspects of science, technology, and the environment* (Hunn, Kahn, Lowe, Sivaramakrishnan, Smith, Taylor); *ideology, museums, representation, and religion* (Ferguson, Harrell, Kahn, Keyes, Lowe, Nason, Witherspoon); *the cultural construction of the body, including aspects of health and illness* (Anagnost, Green, Rhodes, Taylor); *the social construction of language and thought* (Bilaniuk, Harrell, Hunn, Taylor, Witherspoon); and *gender identity and other gender-related issues* (Anagnost, Bilaniuk, Harrell, Kahn, Peña, Taylor).

Regionally, the faculty now offers expertise in several critical world areas. With Anagnost, Harrell, Kahn, Keyes, Lowe, and Sivaramakrishnan, the Program's expertise in virtually all sectors of *Asia* (East Asia, South Asia, Southeast Asia, and Oceania) is exceptional. This historical strength of the Department has in the past attracted highly ranked graduate students to the Program, and the addition of two new faculty in this area will further solidify an already well-developed regional emphasis. With Peña, Rhodes, and Taylor, life in the *contemporary U.S.*--an increasingly sought-after site of ethnographic research in Sociocultural Anthropology--is now a key offering of the Program. With Nason, Rhodes, and Witherspoon, students can pursue strong research agendas in *native North America*. With Ferguson, the Program restores a previous strength in *Africa* while adding a new emphasis on the *contemporary African diaspora*. And with Bilaniuk, the Program now offers perspectives on the developing region of

Eastern Europe, which is of increasing importance on the world scene and accordingly of increasing interest to students nationwide.

Together, the Sociocultural faculty is carefully undertaking a revision of the graduate curriculum. We applaud a new and thoughtful three-quarter sequence of core courses that introduce first-year students to an array of perspectives in the subdiscipline. Faculty are vigorously adding many other new courses and revamping or dropping old ones to bring the current course offerings into line with the influx of current faculty research. The multiple overlaps in their research interests can provide the basis for developing strong sets (and perhaps formal sequences) of courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

A major source of productive activity over the coming five years will be oriented around the journal *Cultural Anthropology*, published by the Society for Cultural Anthropology, a unit of the American Anthropological Association. Next year this journal --one of the two major U.S.-based journals in its subfield--will move to the Department of Anthropology under the editorship of Ann Anagnost. Its presence offers an extraordinary opportunity to catapult the program in Sociocultural Anthropology to a much higher position of national and even international visibility. Graduate students in Sociocultural Anthropology who become involved in the journal will gain invaluable professional experience including training in editing, exposure to the entire editorial process from submission to publication, and access to major national and international professional networks. To capitalize on the extraordinary opportunity that the journal represents to the Department, we recommend the following two measures:

- the Editor should be granted Research Assistantship support adequate to sustain the editorship of a major journal (allocating these R.A. positions will help alleviate the student funding crisis that currently plagues the graduate program);
- the Editor could consider the possibility of instituting a graduate-level, hands-on internship or practicum course oriented around the journal, and/or a more scholarly course focusing on scholarly publishing in Anthropology, perhaps with an historical focus, using *Cultural Anthropology* as an intellectual springboard.

Of mild concern is that we noted a significant discrepancy in the distribution of advisees among the faculty. While a certain amount of disproportionate distribution is probably inevitable, the discrepancy in this program seems unduly large. We were pleased to learn that next year's incoming graduate cohort is more widely distributed than seems to have been the case in the past. If this continues, a more equitable distribution of advisees among the faculty will result.

Together, the 15 full-time faculty stand poised to create top-notch undergraduate and graduate programs in Sociocultural Anthropology. In our meetings we did note some discrepancy between the optimism and enthusiasm of the Sociocultural faculty (who are able to look ahead to the kind of program they are building) and the students (who were

concerned about a lack of structure at the undergraduate level and what they perceive as gaps in the core courses at the graduate level, despite recent attention to this sequence). Because there are so many new faculty in this division, it is inevitable that it will take some time for the full faculty to work together to develop a fully articulated program. Faculty already seem to be exploring the possibility of introducing some optional concentrations with suggested course sequences in areas of particular faculty strengths.

At the graduate level, we recommend faculty/student meetings to solicit ideas for program structure. We believe that there is cause for optimism that significant programmatic innovation on the part of these impressive faculty can be developed without profound or disruptive shifts. In the section below on the Graduate Program, we enumerate our concerns regarding the Department's overall graduate program. We note in particular both a need for more structured mentoring efforts in several arenas, and for far more reliable and long-term sources for graduate student funding. In our opinion, the overly long time that many graduate students take to complete their doctoral degrees can be remedied only through attention to both these areas. Here we note simply that these two challenges to the graduate program, while general to the entire department, disproportionately affect the Sociocultural faculty because of the large number of students they must fund and mentor and the challenges this presents in a context of limited funding.

For its part, the undergraduate program has been the object of some productive attention in recent years. We note that the majority of Anthropology majors specialize in Sociocultural Anthropology--a sign that there is much of note happening in this segment of the Department. At the same time, we believe that more can be done to create an intellectually exciting and effective program, especially for majors and minors. Yet as with the graduate program in Sociocultural Anthropology, there is reason for great optimism here. Given the promising new directions offered by junior faculty as well as exciting new research being undertaken by several senior members of the faculty, it should not be hard to bolster the undergraduate program. In the Undergraduate section of this report and in the Appendix we recommend specific changes to further strengthen the curriculum at the undergraduate level.

The Archaeology Program

The Archaeology Program is currently faced with more challenges and opportunities than any other subsector of the Anthropology Department. Over the past few years, the Archaeology faculty--ranked among the top ten in the country by the Society for American Archaeology--has been severely affected by retirement, tenure denial, offers from other institutions, and acceptance of full-time, extra-departmental administrative responsibilities. Reduced to half its former size and stretched very thin to maintain the undergraduate and graduate course curricula, this group is struggling to define a trajectory that will return the Archaeology Program to its former position of prominence. The remaining Archaeologists are handicapped in this planning process by uncertainties concerning two senior professors, one of whom will retire soon (Wenke) and the other of whom anticipates moving to another institution in the near future

(Grayson). Of the two Archaeologists who are presently full-time in the Department and who will be helping to shape the Archaeology Program for the next several decades, one is not yet tenured (Fitzhugh) and one (Close) represents an academic background very different from that of the University of Washington Anthropology Department.

For these and perhaps other reasons, the Archaeologists seemed unable to articulate, as clearly and persuasively as the Committee had hoped, exactly how they expect to make use of the opportunities afforded them to rebuild a once-powerful program. They have identified a promising candidate to fill a temporary full-time position (Stein's), and are close to a final draft for the job description pertaining to Hagstrum's replacement (tenure-track, entry-level). We strongly suggest, however, that because of the crippling uncertainties alluded to above and to the difficulty those uncertainties engender in defining detailed tactics, they choose two sympathetic, senior advisors from the national archaeological community outside the University to help them crystallize a vision of their new program and to aid them in rapidly implementing a strategy to achieve it. Our Archaeology specialist, Patty Jo Watson, will suggest names of possible advisors to Anthropology Chair Miriam Kahn. Furthermore, we urge the Central Administration to take whatever immediate steps they can to clarify the situations of Grayson and Wenke, so that only the Archaeological faculty who will be living with the consequences of the program restructuring and imminent searches are centrally involved in this work. Finally, we think the Archaeology group together with the Central Administration should give very serious consideration to converting one of the two senior positions anticipated to be opening soon (i.e., Grayson's and Wenke's) into a top priority search to be launched early in Fall 2000. This search would be for an established, midcareer, tenured Archaeologist with a dynamic teaching and research record. The successful candidate should be willing to take on a central role within the University of Washington's Archaeology Program. We were heartened in our meeting with Dean David Hodge at his seeming willingness to endorse this plan and his hope that a successful senior hire would allow the Department to move quickly to a second search. Presumably the new senior hire would take a key role in recruiting the Hagstrum replacement and in shaping subsequent faculty searches.

The Committee thinks it imperative that rebuilding begin as soon as possible, and is very optimistic about the likelihood of repeating the success so recently achieved by the other three departmental subgroups.

Beyond the acutely pressing issue of faculty strength, we have a few comments on the matters of graduate student funding and training in Archaeology.

As is the case for all of the Anthropology sections, Archaeology is hurt each year by lack of even one multi-year funding package to recruit the best applicants. It is greatly to the faculty's credit that they have just received funding for an Archaeological graduate fellowship from a private donor. In their portion of the departmental strategic plan (this document is currently in draft, but the Archaeologists kindly gave us a copy), they also refer to an expanded relation with the Burke Museum and to establishing links with public and private sector archaeological firms that could provide job opportunities and training in the cultural resource management (CRM) subbranch of Archaeology. They also list suggestions for raising the profile of nonacademic employment for their graduate students: a seminar; a speaker series; revitalizing of the CRM course already on the books (ARCHY 465/468); reinstatement of a methods seminar to prepare students for CRM

fieldwork; and, eventually, the establishing of a certificate program in CRM that would include internships with regional employers.

These initiatives are excellent. They also speak directly to concerns voiced by the Archaeology representatives at our discussion with graduate students about the Department's MA and Ph.D. programs.

Recommendations

- Core Archaeology faculty (i.e., those who will be long-term participants in the rebuilt program) and the Department Chair should contact two outside senior Archaeologists to act as advisors and catalysts in creating a plan for rebuilding the Archaeology Program.

- Simultaneously, the Department Chair and core Archaeology faculty should confer with the Central Administration concerning a search early in Fall 2000 for a highly qualified midcareer Archaeologist, rather than the entry-level Hagstrum replacement. We suggest further that the external archeological advisors be invited to participate in the search process.

- Assuming the above procedures are successfully implemented, then the newly configured Archaeology faculty (current core members plus the new midcareer hire) should move rapidly to recruit an entry-level Assistant Professor (the Hagstrum replacement) with qualifications appropriate to their new vision of the Archaeology Program in Anthropology at the University of Washington.

We emphasize again our strong opinion that the University of Washington Anthropology Department's Archaeology Program, with a modest investment of resources and a good deal of creative effort, can achieve as remarkable a turn-around as have other segments of the Department within the past few years. Once this program has regained its prominence, the Anthropology Department as a whole will be able to realize its full potential.

DEPARTMENT STRUCTURE

The Department is organized into four programs: Sociocultural Anthropology, Archaeology, Biocultural Anthropology, and Environmental Anthropology. The faculty and missions of these programs overlap to a certain degree, with the Environmental Anthropology Program currently involving faculty members who are simultaneously involved in all three of the other programs. Many, if not all, faculty members are involved in two or more of the programs. Thus, although the programs are distinct in many ways, the areas of intellectual engagement that they represent are more broadly distributed within the Department. The Sociocultural Anthropology, Archaeology, and Biocultural Anthropology Programs represent the historical structure of the Department, with Environmental Anthropology representing a new curricular initiative cross-cutting the original tripartite structure. Faculty appointments are still viewed as belonging in one or the other of the original three programs.

The programs maintain their greatest separation at the level of graduate training. Graduate students are specifically admitted to one or another program, each having its own requirements and timetable to the Ph.D. degree. Curricular issues are handled by the faculty of each program, and the levels and sources of financial support available to graduate students vary as well. Other than the TA training program, there is no common curricular core to the graduate program. This is usual practice among Anthropology departments seeking to sustain excellent graduate programs in several of the subfields of Anthropology and reflects the increasingly divergent specialization of research training in particular.

At the undergraduate level the Department is undifferentiated, with a common curricular structure for all majors. Each program faculty makes curricular decisions beyond the common core on its own to reflect the interests of its members. The Undergraduate Handbook delineates course sequences that allow concentrations in each of the programs; we understand that the web page will eventually contain these along with options in topical areas such as medical anthropology.

At the administrative level the Department is loosely integrated. Each program faculty meets regularly to discuss most student and curricular issues. A Department Curriculum Committee oversees administrative issues such as course titles and descriptions. The Department faculty meets as a body as well. There is a single Graduate Program Coordinator from the faculty, but he sees his role as quite limited, focused mainly on the interpretation of Department and University rules. There has been a Department Executive Committee in the past, but it has not functioned recently.

The semi-disarticulated structure of the Anthropology Department, while perhaps unusual compared to other Arts and Sciences departments, is in fact not unusual among Anthropology departments across the country that aspire to excellence in more than one subdiscipline. The breadth of intellectual activity that characterizes Anthropology is quite breathtaking, ranging from molecular approaches in the life sciences to humanistic applications of critical theory. The diversity of approaches, techniques, and theoretical orientations brought to bear on an understanding of the human condition is the great strength of the discipline. But it also renders the discipline vulnerable to fault lines of misunderstanding and rancor. Successful departments depend on maintaining a crucial balance between the intellectual energy that this tension generates and the centrifugal tendencies that are natural to its constituent elements. One key to success is a structure that minimizes competition among the various subdisciplines for limited resources (FTEs, graduate support funds, etc.) while emphasizing the benefits that each subfield gains from the success of the others. Failure to minimize intradepartmental competition for resources has directly contributed to the splitting of several Anthropology departments around the country (including Stanford, Duke, SUNY-Stony Brook, and Johns Hopkins) or the departure of faculty to other units, such as at UC-Berkeley. A more differentiated internal structure has been a key to the longevity of other major departments with three or four vibrant subfields, including Pennsylvania, Michigan, Yale, and Harvard. The University of Washington Department of Anthropology represents one of the most successful examples of a balance of structural differentiation and intellectual

integration through the overlapping membership of its faculty in the different programs. The Committee sees tremendous potential for further intellectual integration around topics such as human reproduction, medical anthropology, environmental change, and population and development--potential that we believe can be tapped without sacrificing the administrative stability of a differentiated, "federal" structure.

The one segment of the Department that is most differentiated, and therefore benefits least from the intellectual integration that is possible, is the graduate program. We therefore recommend that the Department seek opportunities to introduce the graduate students more fully to the intellectual diversity it encompasses. There are many possible routes to achieving such a goal.

Recommendations:

- We encourage the Chair to begin a department-wide conversation among graduate students and faculty to explore strategies to address this issue.
- One suggestion is that the Department consider instituting an "Anthropology Day"--an annual or semiannual, all-day event at which faculty and graduate students representing the various programs make informal presentations of work-in-progress. Department retreats of this kind have been very successful at other institutions in generating a sense of community and mutual respect among students who may not regularly encounter each other in the context of their classes or research. It also affords faculty members an opportunity to hear what their colleagues are doing. Combined with refreshments and discussion periods, the tone can be festive and lively, fostering an appreciation of and engagement with the full range of activities encompassed by the Department .

Other suggestions regarding the organization of the graduate and undergraduate programs will be made in the appropriate sections below.

THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM

The undergraduate curriculum in Anthropology is overseen by a department Curriculum Committee, composed of the coordinators of each of the three major subfields (Archaeology, Biocultural, and Sociocultural) and the Undergraduate Advisor, along with graduate and undergraduate student representatives. The faculty of each subfield is responsible for structuring its courses and for staffing required and optional classes. As a result, each subfield handles such issues somewhat differently. Although the entire department does vote to approve new course proposals, there is no faculty member (aside from the Chair) directly responsible for coordinating the scheduling of courses across the subfields or for overseeing other aspects of the Department's undergraduate curriculum. Given the size of the Department, the complexity of the curriculum, and because course schedule conflicts do arise, we recommend that the Department consider appointing a faculty-level Director of Undergraduate Studies. The Undergraduate Director would oversee the ongoing review of the undergraduate

curriculum, take charge of scheduling courses and ensuring that teaching responsibilities are fairly and evenly distributed, and supervise the mentoring of undergraduates continuing on to graduate study.

The undergraduate curriculum in Anthropology is relatively unstructured, reflecting the Department's sense that it is serving three populations of students: Anthropology majors with a clear area of specialization, Anthropology majors who prefer to gain the broadest exposure to the field, and the large number of nonmajors who elect Anthropology coursework. The curriculum involves a more limited set of distribution requirements than is common in some Arts and Science departments. Aside from the foundational interdisciplinary courses, which have been recently reviewed and in some cases overhauled, there is little sequencing of course content. Although many do, Undergraduate Anthropology majors are not required to specialize in any of the Department's subfields. They are required to complete four courses at the 200 level (BIO A 201, ARCHY 205, plus any two courses from ANTH 200-210), a statistics course, and then to complete a minimum of 30 additional credits in Anthropology, of which at least 20 credits must be at the 300 or 400 level. At least 25 credits in the major must be earned with a grade of 3.0 or better; no credit toward the major is awarded for classes in which students earn a grade below 2.0. Possible undergraduate concentrations are reported to be in preparation, with the medical anthropology concentration's presence on the Department's website intended as a prototype. We note, however, that much of the Department's website remains under construction and recommend the highest priority be given to its completion.

Among the subfields, Archaeology appears to have the most structured undergraduate program. ARCHY 205 is a popular required course in the major (110 students, which the instructor says could go higher if additional TAs were available). It serves as a prerequisite for entry into most 300- and 400-level courses in Archaeology. The Program also offers two more specialized 300-level courses, in New World Archaeology (ARCHY 304) and in Archaeological Analysis (ARCHY 371), which serve as prerequisites for advanced, 400-level work in these two areas. The Biocultural and Sociocultural Programs, by contrast, are much less structured, although both of these subfields offer successful 200-level "foundations" courses (BIO A 201, ANTH 200-210). Beyond these, students are free to choose among a wide range of offerings.

We were pleased with the Department's recent efforts to review the curriculum and make information available to undergraduates. All of the students with whom we spoke praised the efforts of Undergraduate Advisor Diane Guerra, who among other things, tries to steer students towards appropriate faculty and courses when students indicate a disciplinary, geographical, or topical focus. We would remind the Department, however, that a potential result of an absence of curricular structure can be majors who feel that their programs of study lack coherence. We also heard concerns from undergraduates who felt that the lack of prerequisites for some 300- and 400-level courses attracts students with widely divergent knowledge, which can make for difficult learning environments. We recommend that the Department explore possibilities for

sequencing and structure without losing the flexibility to which the faculty is obviously committed.

As is the case in many large departments with substantial "service" loads, teaching by the senior faculty is concentrated at the 300 and 400 levels. This was attributed both to staffing availability and the perceived strengths of the faculty. We recommend that, over the course of several years, the teaching of 200-level courses be distributed across faculty ranks and programs. In recent years, senior faculty have been largely absent from the 100-level general introduction course, Anthropology 100--until the present spring quarter, when Professor Steve Harrell began teaching it in an experimental format. For a number of years, ANTH 100 has been taught solely (with great success) by Senior Lecturer James Green. Green has also played a key role in spearheading the Department's TA training efforts, which began approximately 7 years ago and will be formalized in Fall 2001 in a new 3-credit course in which all Anthropology Teaching Assistants will enroll.

The Committee does not in the least wish to diminish the excellent work of James Green. Indeed, the most common suggestion we heard for improving undergraduate teaching in the Department was to appoint more senior lecturers of Green's caliber. While this may be the case, the Committee also hopes that what we perceive as a renewed commitment to undergraduate teaching in the Department will translate into increased faculty involvement in teaching at all levels, though we can't pretend to know what form that involvement should take.

The Honors Program is another area that will benefit from the renewed attention it is receiving from Director Bettina Shell-Duncan. We were made aware of two challenges facing the Program. First is the Junior Seminar (ANTH 399), designed to teach skills needed to write the senior thesis. The course seems to be in a transition phase with last year's and this year's offerings manifesting complementary problems. We understand that this challenging course is taught as a faculty overload. We hope that the Department can clarify its goals for this course and appropriately credit those faculty who work to build, then teach it. A second challenge faced by the Program is the availability of faculty to supervise honors research. Most students we talked with praised the availability of faculty; nonetheless, we understand that some students each year have difficulty finding faculty to supervise their senior theses (our understanding is that this problem is most likely to arise in the Sociocultural Program). We hope that a mechanism can be found to expedite a solution for these students.

The Committee welcomes new developments that signal attention to undergraduate teaching. We perceive that these are both timely and necessary. The Sociocultural faculty (where the absence of curricular structure is most evident) is now meeting regularly to revise the descriptions (and in some cases, the conception) of its courses. Regular meetings of the Biocultural and the Archaeology faculty have gone on for some time, and we trust will continue. New appointments have also brought new energy to the Department's undergraduate teaching mission. We hope that the result of these changes will be a new level of dedication on the part of the entire department to excellent undergraduate teaching. The quality of the Department's undergraduate teaching depends on these new initiatives: continued attention to the 100- and 200-level

curriculum, overall attention to articulation across the curriculum and, we feel, the creation of an Undergraduate Director position. Moreover, there are a number of additional, practical steps that could be taken to better serve the Department's undergraduate students.

Recommendations:

- Faculty in all the subfields should go carefully through their course descriptions to make sure these are accurate and reflect current developments in the field. (Specific suggestions with respect to course offerings appear in the Appendix.)

- The Department's "Undergraduate Handbook" needs to be revised, to eliminate references to retired or departed faculty, to correct inaccuracies in faculty ranks, and to direct students toward the department website, where more detailed information should be posted. Completing and improving this website should be a high priority for the Department.

- Basic handbooks (such as the American Anthropological Association's *Guide to Programs; A Directory of Members* and the Archaeological Institute of America's *Archaeological Fieldwork Opportunities Bulletin*) need to be made easily available to undergraduate majors, many of whom at present seem unaware of their existence. Undergraduates need more help from faculty than they are presently getting in finding internship and research opportunities, and they need more guidance in preparing and applying to graduate programs than the very able staff person assigned to the Department's undergraduate advising office can provide.

- Anthropology majors might also benefit from some kind of peer advising system, modeled perhaps on those functioning already in the UW Geography Department and Comparative History of Ideas Program.

- The Department might also consider ways in which it could bring greater emphasis and honor to undergraduate education. A departmental prize for outstanding undergraduate teaching, awarded annually to one faculty member and one Teaching Assistant, would be an excellent beginning, and might pave the way for some deserving Anthropology faculty member eventually to win a University Distinguished Teaching Award.

- Prizes for outstanding undergraduate achievement (to the top graduating Anthropology major; the best senior essay; etc.) could also be established, and might prove attractive to donors wishing to establish endowments within the Department to fund such prizes on a permanent basis.

- The Department might also consider whether it could provide modest sums to assist undergraduate majors to attend regional or national scholarly conferences. (We suggest in the Graduate Program section below how Anthropology students might be supported to attend conferences.)

• Departmental encouragement might also lead to establishing a UW chapter of Lambda Alpha, the national undergraduate honors society in Anthropology.

Finally, we review here suggestions made earlier in this section:

- We recommend that the Department create a faculty Director of Undergraduate Studies.
- We recommend that the Department explore possibilities for additional course sequencing and undergraduate program structure.
- We recommend that the Department explore possibilities for faculty involvement at all levels of the curriculum.
- We recommend attention to those areas of the Honors Program outlined above.

GRADUATE PROGRAM

We congratulate the Anthropology Department on maintaining a successful set of graduate curricula in spite of the turbulence that has characterized some aspects of its recent history. We also compliment the faculty on the Department's 10-year graduate student placement record (p. 27 of the Self-Study), while agreeing with their further observation that it is increasingly important to balance nonacademic with academic employment goals in all departmental curricula. We applaud the introduction of a new course presenting a range of nonacademic career options.

We also agree with the Department consensus that the issue of graduate student recruitment and support is most pressing, along with the closely related matter of transit time to degree. We address these matters below in the context of our discussions with graduate students and faculty, our understanding of graduate curricula in the four departmental subfields, and our comparative knowledge of graduate programs in Anthropology elsewhere in the United States.

Interview with Graduate Students

The students with whom we spoke were very articulate and well-prepared for the interview, having put together short summaries of major concerns for graduate students in each of the four departmental sections, plus a fifth list of general concerns. In our discussions with them (we spoke with 9 students, who represented all the departmental sections: 2 from Biocultural Anthropology, 2 from Environmental Anthropology, 2 from Sociocultural Anthropology, and 3 from Archaeology), we found that by and large morale is high and that the students are very appreciative of the breadth and diversity of the Anthropology graduate curriculum, as well as the accessibility of faculty, and the interdisciplinary, campus-wide network of courses and other resources made available to

them. Their major shared concerns were about (1) funding (except for the students representing the Biocultural Program, where funding was said not to be such a problem because the group is small and there are several RA- as well as TA-ships); (2) systematic faculty mentoring (this issue seemed most acute in the Sociocultural Program); and (3) lack of a well-developed sense of community across the Anthropology Department as a whole. (We note in the Sociocultural section their additional worry that the core courses leave them with gaps in their training.)

(1) **Funding** for graduate students is, of course, a central concern not only in Anthropology but across the entire campus. So far, the Archaeology Program is the only one to have secured a privately-funded graduate fellowship, and it appears that only the Environmental Anthropology faculty systematically encourages entering students to apply for NSF and Javits graduate fellowships.

(2) The **mentoring** issue was presented largely as a matter of insufficient systematic attention by the faculty to individual students, whose needs may vary regarding issues of career development, including resume-building, networking, presenting papers at meetings, publishing in good journals, dissertation and grant writing, preparing for careers outside the academy, etc. As with funding uncertainties, this concern seemed to be felt most acutely in the Sociocultural subfield, which has the most students.

(3) As regards **community**, apparently a sense of integration and *esprit de corps* is enjoyed within each of the four subfields, but is largely missing at the department-wide level. One graduate student remarked that cross-program integration was lacking even when one's faculty advisor was herself or himself actively participating in two or more of the departmental subfields. A suggestion of an "Anthropology Day" (outlined above in the section on Department Structure) met with considerable interest and approval by the graduate students with whom we spoke.

Transit time to degree was not seen by the students as a separate issue, but rather as a consequence of the funding and mentoring problems.

Graduate Curricula in the Four Departmental Subfields

As is the norm in Anthropology departments, trajectories toward advanced degrees are variable from subfield to subfield. There are common themes of required core courses or course sequences; statistics, language, and methods classes; comprehensive exams at the end of the MA stage (comprehensives are not mentioned in the Self-Study graduate program descriptions for Environmental Anthropology or Sociocultural Anthropology, but are listed for the other two subfields); teaching instruction and experience; a dissertation colloquium. In all four subfields there is strong emphasis on dissertation fieldwork, or some combination of field and laboratory work. Although we did not hear anything about this (on the contrary, the Biocultural students who spoke with us seemed quite satisfied with their work plans), it appears that the Biocultural graduate program (p. 43 of the Self-Study) has too many hurdles: Comprehensive Exam, General Exam, dissertation colloquium, dissertation seminar, and Final Exam. Requirements for the other programs are not as clearly delineated

in the Self-Study document, but where similar, we suggest that fewer in-house exams and more emphasis on student presentations at off-campus professional meetings might be a more productive alternative.

The Archaeology Program is facing a severe transit-time problem, which the faculty has begun to address by eliminating the MA thesis. Although this move is definitely called for, they might also want to consider substituting a smaller-scope, second-year research paper (of sufficient quality to be delivered at a regional or national professional meeting, and/or to be publishable) for the Comprehensive Exam. Ideally, this research project would be preliminary to a dissertation project. Thus it would help ameliorate some of the difficulties inherent in completely eliminating the Master's project experience, then expecting students to go from a classroom MA to designing, funding, carrying out, and writing up a major independent research project worthy of a Ph.D.

It seems that for neither Sociocultural Anthropology, Environmental Anthropology (really too new to judge), nor Biocultural Anthropology is transit time perceived to be unduly problematic, but rather a consequence of inadequate funding in general. Many graduate students would also add another reason: lack of close attention to mentoring and appropriate, overt steering of students by their advisors along preprofessional and early professional tracks.

Comparison with Graduate Programs Elsewhere

In our combined experience, we find the graduate curricula in Anthropology at the University of Washington to be vigorous, as well as comparable in general outline and philosophy to those elsewhere. We do urge the Department Chair and the heads of the subfields, however, to think about greater inter-subfield integration and also about widening the scope of the faculty Graduate Coordinator's responsibilities. In most places, this job entails integration among interdisciplinary graduate student activities, assistance to graduate students in general strategy and tactics of professionalization, guidance in application for nationally competitive predoctoral fellowships, and similar oversight of the academic and professional life of the graduate student community. Within the University of Washington Anthropology Department, this job seems largely to involve oversight of department and university rules and regulations.

Our greatest concern, one thoroughly familiar to Central Administration, Anthropology faculty and staff, and graduate students is that the Department cannot remain competitive in the present academic arena without a stronger, more predictable graduate student funding system. This issue is absolutely crucial and requires immediate attention. Everyone is aware of it, and everyone is thinking about it and working on it, but time is of the essence here because the problem is substantially worsened with each graduate student recruiting season, as the best students nationally go to the programs with the best package-funding plans. For some subprograms (Archaeology and Sociocultural), judicious trimming in the size of the graduate student bodies may be desirable, although for obvious reasons this is not a move to be lightly undertaken. Most strong and respected programs have long since gone to a quality over quantity approach, however. In particular, all the

University of Washington Anthropology subprograms (and they may already be doing so) should give serious thought to not going too far down their prioritized admissions lists. In any given year, if the very top and near-top candidates are not available, it is probably better to cut losses and begin immediately to plot a stronger campaign for the subsequent year. To take less well qualified students will place greater demands on faculty and department resources without as much likelihood of productive short-term and long-term results. We hasten to add, however, that we were much impressed by the graduate students with whom we met.

In conclusion, we reiterate that the University of Washington Anthropology programs are generally healthy and robust, but that predictable funding for recruiting and maintenance of students is absolutely critical.

Recommendations

- We strongly recommend that the Department as a whole systematically and vigorously recruit the best students in each year's pool (say, the top 10%). If those candidates cannot be secured, we recommend not accepting candidates from farther down the list, but rather organizing better recruitment campaigns for the following year.
- We congratulate the Department on its success a few years ago in obtaining NSF funding for predissertation fieldwork trips and urge it to try to replicate that achievement with similar grants.
- Every entering student with appropriate qualifications--regardless of subfield--should routinely be encouraged and mentored in applying for competitive graduate fellowships offered by outside sources (e.g., NSF, Javits, Wenner-Gren, NIH). The Graduate Coordinator could regularly monitor new funding sources and pass along information to all graduate students.
- The Department and the Central Administration will need to work together to address the funding of graduate students. As often as possible, faculty grant proposals to outside agencies should contain provisions for graduate student RA-ships. We applaud the current Department Chair's efforts to obtain privately endowed graduate fellowships through a new development committee. We also urge the College of Arts and Sciences and/or the Graduate School to offer a set of general fellowships (Regents' Fellowships, President's Fellowships, etc.) for which departments compete yearly by nominating their best applicants. These serve as excellent recruiting devices and excellent publicity generators for the universities that offer them. We urge the Department and the Administration to work together to create multi-year packages for the strongest students in each entering cohort. Without such recruitment packages, the Department will be incapable of attracting the best students nationally, who are now routinely offered such funding packages elsewhere.
- We also urge the University to inaugurate a competition each year for dissertation writing fellowships, as are now offered at peer institutions. A year-long

dissertation write-up fellowship should significantly reduce the transit time to completion of doctorates, not only for those students who are awarded the fellowships, but also for those who organize their writing efforts sufficiently to submit a credible proposal.

- We recommend that either a series of non-credit workshops or a credit-bearing course be introduced each year to prepare advanced graduate students for the transition to a professional career (both within and outside the academy), including working up a series of topics for future conference presentations and journal articles, advising on the mechanics of submission of journal and book manuscripts, and guidance in preparing such manuscripts.

- We recommend that a non-credit workshop or credit-bearing course in dissertation writing be introduced into the Department. With a demanding and structured yet nurturing atmosphere led by a capable faculty member, advanced graduate students who enroll in such a course should reduce considerably the time they would otherwise take to complete their dissertations.

- We recommend that the Department institute a Placement Committee consisting of faculty who oversee and actively manage the process of job seeking (both within and outside academia), including guiding advanced graduate students in writing job letters, preparing a CV, and conducting interviews at conferences, on campuses, and in agency offices.

- We recommend clarification of the Department policy on providing travel funds for graduate students to present papers at conferences. We urge that funds sufficient to allow travel to at least one conference per year be made available to all graduate students who will be presenting papers. For Anthropology meetings on the West Coast and nearby regions, we urge the Department Chair to provide one or more vans to transport groups of students (both graduate students and undergraduate majors) and to fund two conference hotel rooms for students.

FACULTY ISSUES

We recognize that the Anthropology Department has an excellent faculty at all levels. The foregoing discussions have underscored the special importance of the junior faculty for the future of the Department. The Department and the University need to do everything possible to retain this strong cohort. In this spirit, we make the following recommendations, all but one of which refer to the new faculty.

Recommendations:

- While most junior faculty feel relatively well mentored, we urge increased efforts in this arena. One area that needs to be clarified is whether there are differential tenure performance expectations that respond to subdisciplinary differences in research and publishing trajectories; for example, do all subdisciplines require book-length publication? Are joint-authored papers more highly valued in the natural science-

oriented subdisciplines? What is the value for tenure of book chapters in edited collections, and does this vary by subdiscipline?

- We recommend that the Department revisit the issue of instructional assignments so that junior faculty are not disproportionately responsible for larger, lower level courses.

- The fieldwork required for research in Anthropology makes special demands on faculty time. To bring junior faculty leave practices into line with those of competitive research institutions elsewhere, we recommend that the Chair utilize the IRP option whenever possible, to assure that junior faculty have time both to carry out their fieldwork and to prepare findings for publication.

- To provide junior faculty the means to forge critical professional networks, we recommend that adequate travel funds be made available to them. Nationally, junior Anthropology faculty are typically guaranteed funding to attend two domestic conferences annually.

- For those junior faculty not covered by new university initiatives, we recommend that they receive comparable support.

- Finally we recognize that when junior faculty initiatives end, newly promoted Associate Professors can find it difficult to do their work in preparation for their next promotion cycle. It is at this stage that the University once again becomes vulnerable to raiding by its "peers." The junior Anthropology cohort highlights a problem found across the University. We hope that the types of support outlined above can become available to those at the Associate level.

We would also note that retention of first-rate faculty depends on recruitment of first-rate graduate students. We underscore here our recommendations above for graduate student support.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

Below we summarize our major recommendations by category. This abridged outline does not substitute for the detailed lists and rationales interleaved throughout the report.

Hiring:

- We recommend an immediate search for a highly qualified midcareer Archaeologist. In preparation for this, we recommend that two outside senior Archaeologists work with the core UW group to create a plan for rebuilding that Program. Assuming these procedures are successfully implemented, the newly configured Archaeology faculty (current core members plus the new midcareer hire) should move rapidly to recruit an entry-level Assistant Professor with qualifications appropriate to their new vision of the Archaeology Program.

Undergraduate Education:

- We recommend the creation of a faculty-level Undergraduate Director
- The Department might benefit from a peer advising system.
- In the Undergraduate section above we recommend a series of prizes for students and faculty to bring greater emphasis and esteem to undergraduate education.
- At the undergraduate level, we recommend that the Department explore possibilities for additional course sequencing and program structure and that the undergraduate curriculum be examined with an eye toward updating content, titles, and prerequisites.
- In the Undergraduate section above, we make suggestions concerning the Honors Program.

Graduate Education:

- At the graduate level, we recommend that the Department vigorously recruit only the best students each year.
- To address the time-to-degree issue, and to guarantee that the Department can recruit its strongest applicants, the Department and the University must find ways to offer multi-year recruitment packages.
- The Department needs to find ways to create a sense of community across programmatic lines for graduate students and to introduce them more fully to the intellectual diversity of the Department at large

- In the Graduate section above, we recommend arenas in which the faculty can more actively mentor graduate students.

Faculty:

- We recommend that the Department revisit the issue of instructional assignments so that junior faculty are not disproportionately responsible for larger, lower level courses.

- We recommend that the Chair utilize the IRP option whenever possible, to assure that junior faculty have time both to carry out their fieldwork and to prepare findings for publication.

cc: Debra Friedman, Associate Provost for Academic Planning, Office of the Provost
Susan Jeffords, Divisional Dean, Social Sciences, College of Arts and Sciences
Augustine McCaffery, Assistant to the Dean, Academic Programs, The Graduate
School
John T. Slattery, Associate Dean, Academic Programs, The Graduate School

APPENDIX

Curricular Suggestions (Compiled by Professor Alma Gottlieb)

We are aware that the faculty is currently engaged in much updating and streamlining of course offerings. Below are suggestions and observations based on our necessarily partial understanding of the current curriculum and the updating that has already taken place. These are offered as talking points for future discussions as the faculty engages in the good work of keeping course offerings current.

To make these more attractive to potential students, the following courses might be retitled and/or course descriptions updated to add a more current feel:

ANTH 202

ANTH 310

[The instructor for this course might consider adding discussion of contemporary issues affecting Native peoples, and/or building in a component to do outreach work, museum research, and/or fieldwork in nearby Native communities. Or perhaps a separate course on these topics might be added as a follow-up to ANTH 310]

ANTH 316

ANTH 359

ANTH 371

ANTH 375

ANTH 402

ANTH 415

ANTH 420

ANTH 427

[Does this course contain a local fieldwork component? If so, should this be added to the course description? If not, might the instructor pair it formally with ANTH 456 as a logical follow-up course?]

ANTH 429

ANTH 431

[Perhaps the description of this course might be better distinguished from ANTH 429?]

ANTH 442

ANTH 459

[Might retitle for greater appeal: "Critical Studies in Environmental Politics"]

ANTH 467

[Might retitle for greater precision and appeal: "Inequality and Asymmetry in American Education"]

ANTH 489

[Might clarify whether internships are already available or need to be created by each student. The former possibility seems preferable--if this is not currently the case, perhaps a list of available internships can be provided.]

ANTH 510

[Possible retitling: "Seminar on Native Peoples of North America," with the course description amended accordingly]

ANTH 522

[Possible retitling: "Seminar on Native Peoples of South America," with the course description amended accordingly]

ANTH 550

[Should clarify whether students actually conduct local field research.]

ANTH 551

[Is the goal of this course for each student to produce a fundable research proposal? If so, should this be indicated? If not, the instructor might consider revising the course to meet this goal, which would likely be welcomed by graduate students.]

ANTH 552

[Does this course include local field research and/or require prior field research? Should this be indicated?]

The following course seems exceptionally useful, indeed critical for the understanding of Sociocultural Anthropology; the faculty might consider either strongly recommending or even requiring it of all Anthropology majors:

ANTH 208 The Culture Concept (5) I & S

History of the culture concept and its use in the field of cultural anthropology. History of its emergence in European colonial expansion and contemporary debates about its place as the central concept defining the field of anthropology.

To maximize appeal of these strong courses across campus, faculty can consider cross-listing the following courses, as specified:

ANTH 371 Political Anthropology

[Cross-list with Political Science?]

ANTH 372 Anthropology of Law

[Cross-list with the Law School?]

ANTH 434 Comparative Morals and Value Systems

[Cross-list with Philosophy?]

ANTH 435 Economic Anthropology

[Cross-list with Economics?]

ANTH 436 Comparative Family Organization

[Cross-list with Human Development and Family Organization?]

ANTH 439 Law in Changing Societies
[Cross-list with the Law School?]

ANTH 440 Child Rearing, Culture, and Health
[Cross-list with Human Development and Family Economics, and/or Psychology?]

ANTH 441 Psychological Anthropology
[Cross-list with Psychology?]

ANTH 442 Anthropological Aspects of Communication
[Cross-list with Communications?]

ANTH 447 Religion in China
[Cross-list with Religious Studies?]

ANTH 465 Critical Anthropology of Mass Culture
[Cross-list with Sociology?]

ANTH 467 Anthropology of Education
[Cross-list with Education?]

ANTH 471 Colonialism and Culture
[Cross-list with Political Science and/or History?]

ANTH 483 Women in Evolutionary Perspective
[Cross-list with Women's Studies?]

ANTH 485 Cultural Property: Legal and Ethical Issues
[Cross-list with Philosophy?]

ANTH 488 Agroecology
[Cross-list with Agricultural Economics?]

Finally, we note that current faculty strengths would allow developing a few 200-level courses on topics of broad appeal such as the following:

The Anthropology of Gender and Sexuality
The Anthropology of the Nation-State
The Anthropology of the City/The Anthropology of Seattle