15 June 2018

TO: Sissel Schroeder, Professor and Chair, Anthropology
FROM: John Karl Scholz, Dean
RE: Completion of Academic Program Review:
   - Anthropology, B.A., B.S., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.
   - Certificate in Archaeology (undergraduate)

CC: Cal Bergman, Associate Dean for Student Academic Affairs, L&S
    Greg Downey, Associate Dean for Social Science, L&S
    Elaine Klein, Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S
    Sarah Kuba, Academic Planner, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    Lisa Martin, Associate Dean, Graduate School
    Jocelyn Milner, Vice Provost and Director, Academic Planning and Institutional Research
    James Montgomery, Associate Dean for Fiscal Initiatives, L&S
    Jennifer Noyes, Associate Dean for Operations and Staff
    Parmesh Ramanathan, Associate Dean, Graduate School

On May 1, 2018, the L&S Academic Planning Council considered materials submitted with respect to the review of academic programs enumerated above. In the course of the council’s deliberations, members were provided with a self-study submitted by the Department of Anthropology, a report submitted prepared by a committee of faculty who used that self-study as the foundation for its discussions with faculty, staff and students, and the Department’s comments on the report. Discussion was led by Associate Dean Greg Downey, who began with an overview of the department, noting that it is unusual in the breadth of study covered by biological and cultural anthropology and archeology and conveys this breadth in valuable ways to its undergraduate majors, in important service courses, and to graduate students. Council members agreed with the review committee’s assessment of the quality and depth of the self-study prepared for this review, which will likely prove useful in years to come as the department continues to plan for the future.
The self-study documents the decline in enrollments in the undergraduate major, which mirrors — but which is not so precipitous as — the national trend. Undergraduate time to degree is longer than average in the college, and the number of exceptions granted to students who complete the major is relatively high. Certificate awards have also declined considerably over the past four years. These observations, when coupled with insights obtained from a 2015 exit survey and analysis of students’ post graduation plans, make it clear that the department has gathered the raw materials for having a robust discussion about curricular revision, though specific planning is unclear at this time. Council members supported this approach, but also strongly recommended that, in addition to the analysis of descriptive data available about the program, the department should incorporate a better understanding of program wide learning outcomes via direct assessment of student learning. This, too, may help reduce time-to-degree and guide decision-making about program requirements.

The review committee report agreed with and strongly endorsed the self-study’s conclusion about the need to improve the advising model in the department, and that this may also improve student persistence in the major and certificate program. Associate Dean Bergman reported that L&S Academic Advising Services and Anthropology have developed a plan to provide more support for advising in Anthropology for a time, with the goal of evaluating the impact of improved advising and determining the path forward.

The Anthropology graduate program is relatively small, and members noted that both the self-study and committee report cited graduate student funding as one of the department’s primary challenges. The review committee suggested a variety of improvements that might be made with respect to sharing information with graduate students. APC members noted that, in the context of a static budget, stipend changes could be achieved by re-balancing the size of the graduate program. This approach would likely involve investing greater effort in securing students who are most likely to complete the program, and mentoring students to successful completion.

The L&S APC approved a motion to consider the L&S portion of this program review complete. The council requested that Anthropology submit a follow-up report by February 1, 2019, concerning PhD completion, exploring reasons for the relatively low completion rates, and proposing solutions (such as adjusting the size of the graduate program to allocate more resources to fewer students, which may affect student completion). In view of the possibility that the Graduate Faculty Executive Committee may require the Department to provide additional information or impose a different deadline for your report, the APC will defer its request, and review the materials provided in response to the GFEC request.
Dear Elaine and Greg,

Thank you for sharing the Program Review Committee's final report with me. Attached, please find a copy of the report with comments, clarifications, and corrections.

We really appreciate the work of the Review Committee and are most grateful for their constructive suggestions and positive perspective on the department. We learned a lot from putting together our self study and appreciate that the committee gave a lot of attention to the details in the study.

Please let me know if there is anything else that I can do in support of this process.

Best wishes,
Sissel

________________________________________________________________________________

From: Sissel Schroeder
Sent: Sunday, April 8, 2018 9:58:53 PM
To: ELAINE M KLEIN
Subject: Re: Anthropology Program Review report - request for corrections

Dear Elaine,

Thank you so much for sharing the Program Review Committee's final report with me. I will share the report with my colleagues and respond with corrections of fact. I very much hope to be able to do that by April 24!

Best wishes,
Sissel

________________________________________________________________________________

From: ELAINE M KLEIN
Sent: Monday, April 2, 2018 5:08:05 PM
To: Sissel Schroeder
Cc: Greg Downey; Lisa Tew
Subject: Anthropology Program Review report - request for corrections

Dear Sissel,

Greg and I have received the report of the committee convened to review the programs in the Anthropology Department, and per our usual L&S process, are sharing that report with you with a request that you and your colleagues review it to correct any errors of fact (vs. interpretation) prior to APC discussion. Please feel free to annotate the document or to quote from it to correct the information – the council is pretty comfortable with either approach.

________________________________________________________________________________
Our APC agendas are getting crowded – assuming that we receive your response by April 24, and that something really urgent doesn’t come up, it could be discussed May 1 or 15.

Thanks,
Elaine

Elaine M. Klein  
Associate Dean for Academic Planning, L&S  
elaine.klein@wisc.edu | 608-265-8484

Please note that there are two “Elaine Kleins” on campus; are you sending your messages to the right one?
Anthropology Department Review

1. The committee composition and the charge:

The committee was convened on December 8, 2017 by Dean John Karl Scholz. Its members are: Ian Baird (Associate Professor, Geography), Ivan Ermakoff (Professor, Sociology), Earlise Ward (Associate Professor, School of Nursing), Zhongdang Pan (Professor, Communication Arts). Pan was appointed to chair the committee.

In his letter that convened the Review Committee, Dean Scholz instructed us to (1) examine materials prepared by the faculty and (2) interview people who work with the program and its students in order to (3) “validate the self-study, evaluate program quality, and offer useful advice about where the programs need attention or improvement.” We were instructed, in particular, to pay attention to student learning assessments and improvement.

2. The procedure and activities:

The Committee members held an initial meeting with the Department Chair, Professor Sissel Schroeder on Monday, January 8th. The meeting included a wide-ranging discussion that lasted for nearly two hours. It was a valuable opportunity for the Committee members to get an initial impression of the department. As a result of the meeting, a procedure was set up for the Committee to conduct its review activities:

1) We each read the Self-Study document carefully and generated a list of questions or issues for clarification or exploration. Pan pooled these together and sent to Sissel as among the topics to be discussed in upcoming meetings.

2) Sissel helped us to set up four meetings:
   ● 1:45 pm – 3 pm on Friday, Feb 9, a meeting with Sissel (Department Chair), Claire Wendland (Associate Chair and Faculty Undergraduate Advisor), and Travis Pickering (Director of Graduate Program).
   ● 2:30 – 4 pm, Tuesday, Feb. 13, a meeting with graduate students. Twelve graduate students, representing all three sections of the department, attended the meeting.
   ● 1:45 – 3 pm, Friday, Feb. 16, a meeting with undergraduate students. The turnout was low. Only two students attended the meeting, one junior and one senior.
   ● 1:30 – 3 pm, Thursday, Feb. 22, the first meeting with the faculty. Seven faculty members attended at least a significant portion of the meeting.
   ● 1:45 – 3:30 pm, Friday, the second meeting with the faculty. Six faculty members attended the meeting.

3) In her email messages to faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate majors to set up the meetings, Sissel identified all committee members, included Pan’s email address, and stated explicitly that the Committee welcomed them to contact the Committee directly, if they wished to discuss issues in settings outside of the scheduled meetings. Nobody took us up with regard to this invitation.

4) Pan compiled the notes from the organized meetings and shared them among the Committee members as a way to pool the “data” together. The committee then met on 3 – 4 pm on Thursday, March 1st, to discuss what we gained from these conversations and notes.

5) We then requested more materials from Sissel, including the 2006 Self-Study document, the evaluation of the 2006 Self-Study document, the enrollment and TA figures for
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Anthropology 104 and 105, and teaching valuation numbers of Anthropology 102 and 321. We also developed an outline of this report.

6) In preparation of completing our report, we held a final meeting with Sissel at 3 pm on Wednesday, March 6 to clarify some issues from our internal discussion. We (Ivan was absent due to traveling) also met with College of Letters and Science, Associate Dean Greg Downey and Elaine Klein to discuss various facets of our planned recommendations on March 15.

Throughout our review process, Sissel has been extremely responsive, open, cordial, and efficient. All faculty members, undergraduate students and graduate students who we talked were open and responsive to our questions. Pooling the information and ideas from these discussions, and the data that we received, Pan put together the initial draft. All committee members have been fully involved in discussing and rewriting the report. What is presented here reflects the consensus of the Committee.

3. Assessments: Strengths and Weaknesses

(1) Reading the Self-Study in context

Our review started with reading the Self-Study. We found the document to generally be thorough, comprehensive, and clear with regard to the strengths and challenges of the department’s programs. On every aspect of the undergraduate and graduate program, the Self-Study renders assessments based on carefully presented data. The program overview of the Self-Study also outlines the discipline that the department embodies and the significance and contributions of the department in liberal arts education on UW-Madison campus.

Based on our discussions with faculty and students, we do feel that the Self-Study could have documented more substantively the far-reaching contributions that the department makes to the missions of the university, via (1) its faculty research in various locations of the world and our own state (aligned with the Wisconsin Idea), (2) its course offerings that provide students across campus with unique opportunities to be exposed to more holistic and comparative understandings of human diversity and to broaden their international and ethnic studies horizon, (3) in relation to international studies, an important strength of this university, and (4) outreach with the faculty with regard to fieldwork that involves indigenous peoples in the state, and elsewhere. We also feel that the Self-Study could have offered a more fully developed narrative on the philosophy and the scaffold of the department’s governance. For example, it was a pleasant surprise for us to find that the department has a graduate representative attending its open portion of faculty meetings. It was also a surprise to find that the administrative layer of the department is very thin, suggesting to us that it is highly efficient and at the same time has its resources stretched to the upmost limit.

Reading the Self-Study together with the 2006 Self-Study was an experience of continuity. The 2006 Self-Study stated clearly that “the Department of Anthropology is a well-governed program with sound academic values”. This statement can be readily adopted to summarize what we have learned from our reading of the new Self-Study and our meetings with faculty and students. The Department of Anthropology has its distinct tradition of having three foci, archaeology, biological anthropology, and cultural anthropology; it makes vital contributions to the missions of the College and the University in faculty research, undergraduate and graduate education /instruction and training.
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The 2006 Self-Study depicted the overall backdrop against which to read the 2017 Self-Study, which highlights shrinking resources and downsizing. The 2017 Self-Study reflects the consequences of this overall trend. Placed in this context, we find that the faculty and staff have been doing a very admirable job in keeping the programs at high levels of vitality and productivity with shoe-string resources. Of course, the department got strong support from the College of Letters and Science (L&S) to stay healthy and strong. After the departure of five faculty members in 2012, the faculty size is now back to 19, with hires aided by the cluster initiatives and support from the Mellon and Luce Foundations. But it is still below the 2006 level by four people. The department has a very limited base budget for TAs, 21 in the fall and 19 in the spring, at no more than 40% level, making it unable to meet the enrollment demands on some of its undergraduate courses. For example, as one faculty said in a meeting with us, “You give me one TA, I’ll give you 80 students!”

Another indication of how the department struggles under severe resource shortage is that it is one of the few major academic departments in the College of L&S that does not have an undergraduate advisor on its staff. Instead, the department has to designate a faculty to take on that role at the expense of one course release. As a way to share the burden, this role rotates among the three sections. But then anybody new to this role needs to invest a significant amount of time to familiarize him/herself on the ins and outs of course selection, requirements, and procedures related to completing a major. As one undergraduate student pointed out, they have to “rely on self-advising (a characterization verified by the Self-Study and our meetings with the faculty), and it is frustrating.” Another student said, they “feel sorry for the faculty undergraduate advisor who has a long line of anxious students waiting to see her.” With a faculty in this role as a part of his/her job, it is also impossible for the department to maintain continuity in advising its majors, attracting students to its majors or the Archaeology Certificate program, all of which negatively impact maintaining and nurturing alumni relations and development efforts.

It is important to note, the department has no leeway to hire a person to meet this critical advising need because it is, under the present budget model, more than $180K in debt. Shifting its already small TA budget to hiring a staff person would mean not only further limiting the enrollment of some popular classes, hurting the department’s role in student learning on campus, but also undermining the graduate program in that it will further reduce the intake of graduate students. This will mean severely limiting the department’s ability to offer graduate seminars and creating difficulties for core research areas of the department to reach a critical mass necessary for their viability.

Below, we’ll integrate the information from the Self-Study and our meetings to discuss the undergraduate and graduate programs separately.

(2) The undergraduate program

Undergraduate major in the department is well managed, despite the severe limitations of not having an undergraduate advisor on the department’s staff.

First, the courses are all well lined up in the sequence of introductory courses, intermediate and advanced electives, and a capstone, and they are offered regularly. We did not hear of any students whose timely graduation was hampered by not being able to complete a required course on time. The course line-up and requirements for the major clearly reflect the learning outcomes specified and the department has put in place assessment methods and schedules in relation to such outcomes.
Second, the courses are also very well taught. A clear indication is that there are three recipients of the Chancellor’s Distinguished Teaching Award. Two introductory courses, Anthro 104, Cultural Anthropology and Human Diversity, and Anthro 105, Principles of Biological Anthropology, serve a larger number of students from across the campus. The department has recognized a strong student demand for these courses but the enrollment of each is limited by the TA budget. Sissel told us that the department is expecting a possible infusion of $19,800 as part of the College’s response to the anticipated expansion of student population on campus and has decided to allocate that to create a TA position for Anthro 105.

Third, despite the national trend of declining undergraduate degrees awarded in basic liberal arts departments, the anthropology major remains strong with around 100 undergraduate majors. In addition, 38% of the majors also complete at least another major. A growing number double-major in anthropology and biology or zoology, making for a strong pre-health professional track. The department also houses the Archaeology Certificate program, which averages 12 awards each year. In addition, the department runs two Summer Field School programs, enrolling 7-8 students in Wisconsin and 8-9 in South Africa.

Fourth, the anthropology majors tend to take slightly longer than the campus average to complete their degrees. But a significant portion of them also take on a second major, participate in the Archaeology Certificate program, or decide to major in anthropology later than those who choose other majors. It may also be related to inadequate undergraduate advising as a result of not having an undergraduate advisor on staff.

Fifth, it is no less significant but often neglected that when placed in the national context, the anthropology majors, and possibly, many anthropology courses that attract non-majors, are an important part of channeling women and first-generation students to STEM, as these courses contribute to preparing students to develop their interest in medical sciences, biology, zoology, environment, and climate sciences.

A significant feature of the undergraduate program in anthropology is the multi-faceted services it provides to the undergraduate curricula in Letters and Science and the campus as whole. Four of the courses meet the university’s breadth requirement in ethnic studies, including Anthropology 104, which has an average enrollment of nearly 800 per semester. Many of the anthropology courses are an integral component of the curricula of international studies and women and gender studies. In addition, the department has set aside discussion sections for Anthropology 104 and 105 for students taking FIGs.

The Self-Study (p. 10) summarizes some statistics from the department’s senior exit survey and discusses how the department has stipulated the learning outcomes and procedures of assessments and how it has also conducted such assessments in accordance to the established schedule (pp. 9-10, with more details in Appendices B & C). Both give out solid indications that the department has invested carefully and strategically in strengthening the undergraduate program with severely limited resources.

A clear weak spot of the undergraduate program is inadequate undergraduate advising. This is explicitly recognized in the Self-Study (p. 13) and articulated prominently by both the faculty and students in their meetings with us. Having a dedicated undergraduate advisor on staff to introduce undergraduate students to the anthropology major, advise students to move through the program, provide career development activities for students to learn job
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opportunities and career prospect, and engage the alums continuously, has been identified as the department’s Number One pressing need.

Having such a person on staff is also critically important to realize the great affordances in the anthropology curriculum. The department offers many opportunities for students to develop hands-on skills and professional experiences through, for example, Summer Field Schools and Lab Work. How to address logistic and financial concerns related to such activities could be substantially aided by having an undergraduate advisor who has experience and knowledge in these areas. Without such advice, building summer Field School and study abroad components into one’s undergraduate program is likely to be a daunting task for an undergraduate student. In other words, a more effective advising system implemented by an undergraduate advisor would turn such worthy opportunities present in the curriculum into actual student learning and enrichment experiences.

(3) The graduate program

The graduate training takes place in three sections, archaeology, biological anthropology, and cultural anthropology. There is also an intersectional option. The graduate program is essentially a PhD program with MA/MS as an intermediate step. It is relatively small with 67 students currently, 19 in archaeology, 10 in biological anthropology, 37 in cultural anthropology and 1 who intersect with more than one section. The Self-Study provides a very clear description with data from existing surveys (Appendix E, p. 47) and a graduate student listening session (Appendix G, pp. 52-53). The department’s webpage also provides a very clear description of the requirements for PhDs (https://www.anthropology.wisc.edu/graduate-study/table-of-phd-requirements/) and Master’s (https://www.anthropology.wisc.edu/graduate-study/table-of-masters-requirements/). Clear stipulations of learning outcomes and the corresponding assessment regime are provided in the Self-Study (Appendix F, pp. 48-51).

The department has put in place an advising and professional development system for its graduate program. It includes the following elements: (1) Each student has a second faculty as his/her co-advisor; (2) a student organization called AnthroCircle organizes colloquia and social events; (3) the department fosters a non-prejudicial culture for students who decide to change their academic advisor; (4) the department organizes regular colloquia, brown bags, and/or lab meetings (in archaeology and biological anthropology). The system also includes a transparent procedure for TA assignment, which includes having a spreadsheet that lists the courses and TA positions tied to each, an annual survey of graduate students on their teaching experiences and interests that serves as their application for a TA assignment, and formal and informal TA evaluations by supervising faculty. In addition, the department also encourages students to seek extramural funding and conduct their independent research. As part of this culture, the faculty, through various informal and formal venues, provides guidance to graduate students on how to seek extramural research support. These include offering workshops on proposal writing, providing URLs of the likely funding agencies in course syllabi, meeting with graduate students to discuss how to obtain funding, etc. The Self-Study provides some statistics showing that a substantial portion of graduate students have succeeded in obtaining extramural funding in various forms (Table 9, p. 21).

The graduate program is also facing serious challenges. The Self-Study documents some of these challenges. Through our conversations with the faculty and grad students, we gained a better appreciation of them and became aware of some other challenges that are not fully documented in the Self-Study.
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First, the 10-year PhD completion rate is low (28%). While the Self-Study makes a convincing case that this number needs to be interpreted with a nuanced understanding of the historical legacy (p. 22), the data available via the Graduate School's webpage (https://grad.wisc.edu/) shows that the department's 10-year PhD completion rate at 37.5%, substantially lower than the AAU Peer rate of 57.8% in the same discipline.

Second, while the size of the graduate applicant pool is healthy (average 82 in the past 10 years for an average of 10 in-takes), the acceptance rate is low at 34.4% in the last 10 years (p. 19). The faculty made a strong case that the number should be interpreted with some nuances. The implications of going deeper into the applicant pool in admission and having such a low acceptance rate need to be considered in conjunction with the admission and advising practices. The department takes a more “holistic admission” approach by considering an applicant’s background, interest, and experiences, as they are reflected in the application files as a whole. Great emphasis is placed on a student’s personal statement and interaction with the faculty. By doing so, the graduate program is able to identify those exceptional students whose strengths are not reflected in test scores and to open the program to the outstanding students from severely disadvantaged background (e.g., first-generation college or graduate students, or international students from the “Global South”). Indeed, this observation is documented with statistics in Table 5 (p. 20). The challenge that such a graduate student population poses is that intensive faculty advising and mentoring and a strong sense of community among graduate students are particularly needed compared with some other program. This is a point brought up in our meetings with graduate students and faculty. Graduate students pointed out that many of those who exited without a degree did so because of a lack of funding. Faculty pointed out in addition to that, there were also personal reasons for leaving the program. Some were probably less prepared when entering the program.

Third, graduate student funding is the most severe stress point on the graduate program. As shown in the Self-Study, in the fall of 2015, two-thirds of graduate students received funding. The primary forms are teaching assistantships and outside fellowships. The 4-year guaranteed funding appears healthy at 62%. These numbers, however, tell an incomplete story. First off, the TAships are at the 40% rate, making them less attractive compared with those in some other L&S departments that are at 50%. Secondly, averaged over the past 10 years, only 45% of the graduate students received funding, with 36.6% in the form of TAships. The numbers are significantly lower than the university average of 62-73% (p. 20). Thirdly, anthropology PhDs take 6-12 years to complete (p. 22) and all need to conduct extensive fieldwork toward their dissertation. This means that all of them need to find funding from other sources for at least a significant portion of their graduate program. In sum, funding for graduate students appears to be more severely limited in anthropology than in many of the other programs in L&S; it is also likely more acutely experienced among anthropology graduate students than those in many other programs. This was clearly expressed by graduate students who met with us and also confirmed by one faculty who pointed out that the lack of funding “is a top stressor” for anthropology graduate students.

Fourth, as the Appendix G of the Self-Study shows, there are serious challenges in graduate advising, communication, community building, and pedagogical training. In our meetings with graduate students and faculty, we detected an alarming perceptual disparity between students and faculty. We feel that the best way to capture such a disparity is to show our summary from the meetings in a table, with the comments by graduate students and
responses from the faculty (we brought up students’ comments in our meetings with the faculty) displayed side by side (Appendix A).

4. Analysis and recommendations

Based on our review, we find the Department of Anthropology is strong in faculty research, and has well-constituted undergraduate and graduate programs. It makes critical contributions to the College and its mission and it is an indispensable and valuable player in shaping student learning experiences on campus. At the same time, the department is also facing serious challenges in areas of staffing, graduate student funding, shortage of TA office spaces and other general community spaces for grad students to use, and the challenges related to trying to preserve the present faculty or to grow it in the near future. Some of the perceptual disparities between graduate students and the faculty that we observed could be addressed via better communication. But in a significant way, the root of the problems is in the resource deprivation.

We recommend that the department consider the following measures aimed to address the perceptual disparities and identify venues for new resources:

First, staffing. We recommend the department address the pressing undergraduate advising needs by designing a 50-100% staff position of undergraduate advisor and hire a person to fill it as soon as possible. The department needs to develop a well-conceived description of the position. In addition to undergraduate advising for the department’s majors and those who are potentially interested in majoring anthropology, the person should be given the specific responsibilities of developing and implementing an exit survey of the undergraduate majors, maintaining an alumni database, and developing a newsletter or its equivalent for regular alumni relationship maintenance and development. The person should also be given the specific responsibility of helping students’ career development by organizing career fair activities.

Second, communication. We recommend the department develop a series of measures to improve its communication with and among graduate students. These could include:

1) Developing a faculty-led credit-carrying pro-seminar that serves as a go-to venue for professional development (on issues ranging from MA or PhD student course requirements to grant proposal writing) and community building (graduate students get to know the people, works and approaches in sections other than their own). It could incorporate some section-specific brown bags or colloquia.
2) Holding an information-sharing session with graduate students in each semester where the Chair, Section Chair, and Director of Graduate Studies share information on issues related to the graduate program, including how to get reimbursement for organizing colloquia and how TA assignments have been or will be made. We believe that greater, more systematic, and transparent communication will also help alleviate the anxiety and frustration about funding that surfaced in our meeting with graduate students. This point is of particular importance in the case of the first-year students insofar as their initial experience is likely to durably color their perception of the program. Students will benefit from learning early on their teaching responsibilities and the degree of autonomy and self-determination expected from them. It is also important that the graduate student representative at faculty meeting fully understand that her/his responsibility is to report to her/his fellow students.
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3) Developing a regularly updated Graduate Student Handbook that is available on the department’s website. Its contents and changes get discussed in pro-seminar sessions, the new student orientation, and the information-sharing sessions.

4) Organizing and publicizing every year a preparation session laying out expectations and assessment criteria for the qualifying exams.

5) Designating the Director of Graduate Studies as the faculty liaison for AnthroCircle (Undergraduate advisor could serve as a staff advisor and logistic support), which is encouraged to organize social and professional development activities. It appears that AnthroCircle needs more faculty focus and involvement of the undergraduate advisor, so that it serves its purpose.

6) Including in the end-of-semester check-in form an item that requires the faculty and the student to indicate that they have discussed or have scheduled to discuss the student’s activities as reflected in the form.

7) Developing an annual Professional Activity Report (PAR) template for graduate students to track and report their activities each year. There should be more transparency to let students know that TA assignments and nominations for fellowships or awards will make use of the information provided in PARs.

8) Making the physical space of the Department more user friendly by (a) adding signs on office doors allowing students to identify administrative responsibilities (b) devising a community space where students can meet.

9) Devising an exit survey for graduate students, to be complete after their oral defense or other departing occasions. It should collect information on their appraisals of the program, their experiences, and their next stop.

Third, resource planning. We recommend that the department continue its efforts to identify opportunities where additional resources could be brought in to the department. These include cluster hire initiatives, hiring and teaching assistantship opportunities that may be available in various Title VI centers, teaching and research development opportunities on campus, and graduate student support that is allocated via Graduate School. We also recommend that the department explore ways to upgrade the Archaeology Certificate program to bring more students to the department and ways in which it can utilize the archaeological research collections in public events and/or exhibits that could have development opportunities, namely, generating interests of potential donors and alums.

We are acutely aware that we conducted this review in the larger context where higher education in the United States and the world is in the midst of a major transformation. While many innovations are being developed with new technologies, new models of forging alliances with stakeholders, and new pedagogical approaches that encourage participatory and network-based learning, an unmistakable trend is the spread of a neo-liberal mode of thinking about higher education, which is characterized by, arguably, an over-emphasis on essentialized students’ demands, job market statistics, and efficiency statistics measurable to serve the administrative systems (e.g., number of course credits per faculty) but not necessarily sufficient to capture classroom dynamics (e.g., student experiences in exchanging ideas, encountering different perspectives, engaging in critical thinking and exploring imaginations). This trend is not friendly to departments of basic liberal arts disciplines. Anthropology is one such department. This is a national trend; it is also clearly observable at UW-Madison. The comparative reading of the Anthropology Department’s 2006 Self-Study and the 2017 one clearly shows negative impacts of this trend on the department’s capacity to improve its programs: It has suffered a net resource loss, and the shrinkage of resources noted in 2006 has continued since then.
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The department has taken measures to address the resource shortage in the new era with faculty hires through the Mellon and Luce Foundations and it is in the process of preparing a cluster hire proposal with the medical school and biomedical center to fill its critical need of hiring a faculty in the area of archeological chemistry. But one thing is also plainly clear to us: Not all L&S units are equally capable of devising revenue-generating innovations. Such variations may arise in part from differences among disciplines. If, for example, a significant portion of communication discipline can be creatively linked to revenue-generating innovations (e.g., online courses with a broad appeal) due to its ready interface with daily practices (e.g., developing interpersonal relationships) or industries (e.g., designing digital media), this is not a readily transportable model for the basic liberal arts departments such as anthropology or philosophy. Further, mechanisms to incentivize revenue-generating innovations by L&S units may also work better for larger units with the ability to re-configure their resources to devise and implement such innovations. The anthropology department does not seem to be in that position either. The impossible situation related to the undergraduate advisor is a case in point. While the Chair, the Faculty Undergraduate Advisor, and the faculty in general all recognize that without such a person on staff, “it’s hurting our students,” they simply do not see how to identify a movable piece in their available resources to hire such a person. In our view, allocating faculty resources of one course reduction to meet that need is both inadequate and wasteful.

Stated bluntly, it is our view that the department needs some help from the College and the Graduate School. We recommend that with the strong support from the College and Graduate School, the department develop a resource planning model that will strengthen its services to the undergraduate students on campus and the majors and do so in the way that will also help address the resource shortage challenge that its graduate program is facing. More specifically, this model needs to enable the department to:

1. Hire an undergraduate advisor;
2. Expand the department’s base budget for teaching assistantships so that (1) two TAs per semester are added to Anthropology 105 and (2) the Department is able to make TA appointments on a 50% basis without having to reduce the number of TAships offered to reach this goal.

It is our hope that in the long run, with the targeted allocation of new resources, coupled with the department’s initiatives, the department can reverse the source shrinking trajectory and start to stabilize and even grow back to its previous size of 24-member faculty.
Appendix A. A Summary of Meetings with Graduate Students and the Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues Raised</th>
<th>Responses from the Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ TA funding is limited.</td>
<td>□ 5-year guaranteed funding is not a suitable model for us because we need our graduate students to develop their independence as scholars, which includes getting extramural funding to support their field work. This is important for them to develop their career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Limited funding – both in the length of graduate and amount – makes us less competitive in attracting top applicants. We have to go deeper into the applicant pool, attract more non-traditional students and students who need more help and would otherwise not get an opportunity to go to graduate school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Expected to get outside funding but do not have enough professional development activities on how to identify potential sources of funding and write proposals.</td>
<td>□ The department at large and three sections separately, especially the archaeology and bio-anthropology, have weekly brown-bags or colloquia where such issues are discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ In some courses (e.g., Anthropology 901, Methods in Cultural Anthropology), the course syllabi list potential funding sources and online links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Faculty are available to advise students on such issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ TA assignments not known until very late and the process is not transparent enough.</td>
<td>□ The timing of TA assignments is not always under our control. It depends on when the Graduate School approves our TA budget and the enrollment figures. “We just don’t get information to plan ahead as we’d like.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Every semester, a survey was sent to all grad students. They are told that it also serves as an application. Ranking among the grad students is based on the information from the survey. Other things being equal, we give someone who has not had the opportunity higher preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ The faculty were indignant when hearing this complain. One said immediately, “Lack of transparency is not the term we’ll use.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commented [MOU9]: The course number is Anthro 909

Commented [MOU10]: The College of Letters & Science approves this budget. The process of making TA recommendations in the department is slow in part because of the need to review graduate student progress, especially performance on the qualifying exam, before assigning TAs. We have be trying to move this process forward over the past two years and will continue in this effort.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty advising varies greatly among individuals. Do not know who the Director of Graduate Studies is. The check-in form for each semester is only a formality. Assessment of the qualifying exams does not have substantive feedback and the result (&quot;MA pass&quot; or &quot;PhD pass&quot;) is not notified the students promptly.</th>
<th>The department has put in place a structure to advise graduate students. Each student has an advisor and a co-advisor. There is an institutional code that students are free to switch advisors. Advisors need to submit a check-in form on each advisee every semester to report their progress. It is substantive in that it is based on meetings with students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough training in pedagogy; graduate students’ teaching not observed and substantively evaluated.</td>
<td>Assessment of qualifying exams is done properly. For those of us who are physically present, we’ll give students substantive feedback and notification on their passage within 24 hours after the committee meets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tremendous progress has been made since the previous 10-year review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty advising varies greatly among individuals. Do not know who the Director of Graduate Studies is. The check-in form for each semester is only a formality. Assessment of the qualifying exams does not have substantive feedback and the result (&quot;MA pass&quot; or &quot;PhD pass&quot;) is not notified the students promptly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commented [MOU11]: We found this comment a little unclear and offer this clarification: the smaller size of the faculty and graduate student cohorts in the archaeology and biological sections may facilitate regular discussions about advising in comparison to the much larger cultural anthropology section.

Commented [MOU12]: This content duplicates the previous two boxes.
| | within 24 hours after the committee meets.  
| | Tremendous progress has been made since the previous 10-year review.  
| | Maybe in archaeology and bio-anthropology, we each have a smaller group. We do not have enough discussion on how to advise graduate students.  
| | Not enough training in pedagogy; graduate students' teaching not observed and substantively evaluated.  
| | This (a lack of faculty evaluation of teaching) is not true. We evaluate students teaching regularly and give them feedback. There are formal and informal evaluations. Faculty’s evaluations of graduate TAs go into their file.  
| | Grad students-organized workshops to discuss gender and sexuality in teaching.  
| | Indeed, they don’t have enough pedagogical training in the department.