

**Report of the Panel to Review the Academic Programs of the
Department of Anthropology and Archaeology
Memorial University**

Panel Members:

Karyn Butler (Memorial University)

Roy Carlson (Simon Fraser University)

Peter Sinclair (Memorial University)

Lawrence Taylor (National University of Ireland, Maynooth)

Introduction

This is the first time the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology has undergone a program review. Our review, ideally, will establish a baseline evaluation and recommendations for the future that can then be considered by any subsequent panel. However, this is complicated, as will become evident, by the panel's conclusion on the matter of governance.

In June 2007, the department produced its self-study report, which was later amended with contributions from several faculty members and additional materials, mostly related to teaching, which was requested by the panel. Unusually, this report presents separately compiled reviews of teaching, research and service by the archaeology unit and by the anthropologists. This material was assembled and introduced by the head. The self-study report includes information on seven retired faculty, who continue to contribute to the life of the department, mainly through their

on-going research activities. Our terms of reference were spelled out in a document *Procedures for the Review of Units and Programs* provided by Memorial, and in addition we were given copies of the *MUN Calendar* and the *MUN 2006 Fact Book*.

On the evening of October 3, the panel met with Dr. H.E.A. (Eddy) Campbell (Vice-President Academic), Dr. Noreen Golfman (Associate Dean of Graduate Studies), Dr. Reeta Tremblay (Dean of Arts) and Ms. Joan Bessey (Coordinator from the Centre for Institutional Analysis and Planning) to discuss what should be considered in the review process and to respond to any initial questions from members of the panel. On October 3 and 4, the panel worked intensively, meeting with department faculty, staff and students, observing available space, compiling initial findings and reporting back to the Dean of Arts and the department. We appreciate the frank and seriously considered input from almost all faculty present in St. John's, all staff, and representatives of students, both undergraduate and graduate. Dr. Peter Pope met with us on three occasions, including lunch on the 4th, and conducted an informative tour of labs, storage spaces, classrooms and offices. He also provided additional information at short notice.

We are grateful to all involved for their cooperation. Special thanks are due to Ms. Bessey for her exemplary organization and attention to detail without which we could not have remained on schedule or achieved so much in such a short time.

Overview

We were already aware before the review of the department's excellent reputation in the study of northeastern North American prehistoric and historic archaeology in particular. Our review of the documents and our meetings with members of the faculty, staff, and students did not contradict our high expectations. We did, however, identify major

issues regarding the structure of the department and its governance with related budgetary and space implications. The overall academic excellence of the undergraduate and graduate programs never came into question. Our review begins with the issue of structure and governance of the department, then moves to other issues, and ends with several recommendations.

Governance Issues

Governance issues have flared up in recent years in a highly contentious manner. We note that the move back to Queen's College after years of physical separation has probably contributed to the problems, but is not the key factor. More critical is the social organization of the department as a whole.

There are no sound intellectual reasons for the continuation of archaeology and anthropology as part of the same department. The current departmental structure is based on an intellectual affiliation that no longer exists. Whereas both anthropology and archaeology have several differing intellectual origins dating back to the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the most common situation in North America was what has been called the American Historical School or the Boasian School of Anthropology that centred on the study of non-western and usually non-literate peoples and cultures. Anthropology departments were established to study such peoples socio-culturally, linguistically, biologically, and archaeologically, and curricula were set up that required students to become somewhat proficient in all four of these areas even though specializing in one or more of them. For a number of reasons this curriculum began to break down in the 1950s with socio-cultural anthropology beginning to diverge toward sociology and British traditions of social anthropology which began to include the study

of western societies as well as non-western, and archaeology and biological anthropology beginning to require students to have some mastery of the physical sciences, particularly geomorphology, C-14 dating, genetics and paleoecology. The vast accumulation of knowledge in all the anthropological sub-disciplines has also contributed to this breakdown. The advent of historical archaeology, meaning the excavation and interpretation of archaeological sites dating to the exploration and colonial periods, has come to require more linkage with history than with anthropology. Today there are still some anthropology departments that require four-field anthropology particularly at the undergraduate level, but the department at Memorial is not among them, and most of the faculty at Memorial are comfortable in only one of the sub-disciplines. Linguistics was the first of the anthropological sub-disciplines to form a separate department at many universities, and has been followed by archaeology at several Canadian universities. The near absence of linkages (three courses) between the anthropology and archaeology curricula and the strong linkages (39 of 55 courses) between the anthropology and sociology curricula at Memorial is a clear indicator that these disciplines are following the main trend, and that there is no compelling intellectual reason that archaeology and anthropology should remain united in a single department.

The current structure of anthropology and archaeology is an anomaly at the university because the archaeology unit has become informally a self-governing section of the department with its own chair. The unit votes on various matters and then requests action from the head as necessary. Meanwhile, the head of the department must deal directly with anthropologists and indirectly with archaeologists on many issues. For example, the head, if an anthropologist, is not welcome to attend meetings of

the archaeology unit and must wait to be informed about their decisions on expenditures, hiring, and curriculum. The committee finds this degree of segregation within a department to be unacceptable. The former Head, Wayne Fife, challenged the exclusion of the head on the grounds that it violated the collective agreement.

Hiring is handled by completely separate committees that do not consult with the department as a whole. Promotion and tenure committees contain one member of the section from which the candidate does NOT come. This degree of segregation and informal structuring seems in violation of the collective agreement. Even if some consider such rules unreasonably bureaucratic, these arrangements put the department at risk of challenges to any decision on the basis of the procedures followed.

Undergraduate programs are under the separate control of each section. Consequently, there are two advisors and these advisors (the unit chair in the case of archaeology) are now charged with recommending courses and teachers to the head. While the head can and perhaps should seek advice, it is the head's responsibility to determine teaching assignments. It seems extremely difficult for the head to behave appropriately with respect to teaching in this decentralized, unbalanced structure. An informal understanding that the head alternates between the two sections has now broken down. Moreover, one senior member advised us that no anthropologist would be willing to become head of the department in the future.

Undergraduate and graduate students are excluded from all governance. We believe it is appropriate and helpful in many cases for graduate students to have one or two members participate in departmental meetings that may be organized to deal with graduate matters. The current graduate coordinator in the anthropology section is absent from campus for the entire Fall 2007 term; a graduate representative could, in

such a case, be a spokesperson for the group in lieu of the coordinator. (The panel wonders how any stipend or teaching remission has been handled for this person this year.)

Space has become an issue for both sections. Most members recognize that they are well off compared with most other departments in Arts, but that does not help when all available space has been allocated and expansion is desired by both sections. At present, with graduate enrolments rising quickly, especially in archaeology, archaeology members claim that space allocated to anthropology is less crowded and that some should be available to their students. Some anthropologists note that the shared office (among the five allocated to graduate students) has actually become, de facto, an archaeology office. The understandable desire of archaeologists for processing and storage space to meet the needs of active personal and graduate student research faces the reality that the arrival of anthropology in the building means that expansion cannot occur.

The department has a single operating budget. Unless they have research grants that cover their expenses, members must request funds from the department. The budget situation is strongly contested by archaeologists, some of whom argue that they are more likely to be denied what they believe is necessary when the head is from anthropology. Evidence in the self-study and in our meetings with individuals points to strong disagreement over process and the actual amounts allocated to the two sections for various matters. We do not wish to adjudicate on these disputes, but to record our understanding of the tension and frustration that has built up around budgeting.

The conflict within the department is rooted in the structural situation, although made worse at times by how some perform their roles. We are especially concerned

about the impacts on those in subordinate positions. The current state of tension affects the experience of both undergraduate and graduate students, although the students themselves are not in dispute with each other – quite the opposite. However, the stress felt by staff working in this environment is unacceptable and the university must act quickly to improve the situation.

Future governance

The committee felt from the outset that we were asked to evaluate what seemed like two departments, and that is what most members wish to become. The appearance of current separation is created partly by the existence of the archaeology unit within the larger department as mentioned above. It is also evident in the structure of programs for students. Undergraduate programs are quite separate and the two sections have their own student societies. The only required overlap is a single introductory course in the ‘other’ section. (The archaeology unit’s planning calls for a second course in the future.) Graduate programs are entirely separate, even if the students themselves report that they do interact with each other. Moreover, the research interests of faculty show little connection either in terms of geographical focus or in subject matter. Archaeologists are more likely to find useful connections with cultural anthropology, but the focus of most anthropologists is on power, inequality and conflict. Although Newfoundland and Labrador is the site of some anthropological research, it does not approach the degree to which archaeology is focussed on the province.

We asked all 13 faculty with whom we talked individually about whether or not they wished to divide the department. Eight members, evenly distributed between the two sections, favoured a split and most spoke strongly for that course of action. Two

were against splitting, but only one was firm in that opinion. Three were ambivalent or undecided. Administrative staff also felt that their problems would be resolved by setting up two departments. The students who met with us and who signed a subsequent statement were generally in favour of maintaining the existing department, and several spoke strongly for this option. In making a decision on how to proceed with reform of governance, the university should take these opinions into account as it will be difficult to move towards a cohesive and effective department if most do not accept what is proposed. We do recognize that structures are for the long term, not for particular individuals, and thus the change we propose must have a strong rationale beyond the desires of current members.

The self-study report presents four options – the status quo, two departments, reorganization within the existing department, and establishment of an Institute of Archaeology. We reject the first option because the situation is so serious that it is impossible to move forward without change of some kind.

Reorganization within the existing department is actually discussed in part under the status quo section of the self-study in which the possibility of a head as moderator of two formally separate sections is proposed. It is correctly pointed out that the establishment of two separate units within a joint department would leave the problem of budget allocation to be worked out. This matter is highly contentious and must be transparent. However, more critical is that our understanding of what it means to be a department is violated by the suggestion that it be divided into two separate units, which would, for all practical purposes, have no reason to meet together because the only common matter would be the budget. Presumably, each section would wish to make its own requests for faculty positions and space. The role of the head would be

minimal unless some powers remained with the head – such as providing an independent recommendation on hiring decisions, promotions and tenure. In that case, the old problem of bias depending on the disciplinary identification of the head would likely appear once again.

The idea of an institute of archaeology, along with some degree of reorganization seems unwieldy and unworkable. It would likely lead to confusion as to the responsibilities and budgets of the joint department and the institute. For example, it is unclear how the proposed interdisciplinary teaching of the institute would relate to the general responsibility for teaching that the self-study document would leave with the department. How teachers might be allocated is unclear as well. With a separate department of archaeology, the proposed activities of the institute could probably be undertaken without a separate organization.

The final possibility is to split the department into departments of anthropology and archaeology. This is the option that the committee supports. We have reached this conclusion because:

1. There remains, as previously mentioned, only the most slender thread of common intellectual pursuit to bind the two sections.
2. The current organization of the department is unacceptable and extremely awkward within the framework of the university and its collective agreement. However, it is clear that without even further autonomy, particularly on budgeting, a unified department would be bitterly opposed by most archaeologists and now by most anthropologists.
3. The current tensions, recognized in the self-study and abundantly clear to the reviewers, make collaboration within a unified department practically impossible.

This is the case even if a minority enjoy good links with the other section, personally and intellectually. Indeed, we believe that in separate units and in the same building, anthropologists and archaeologists should experience a better relationship, and those who do have common interests will be able to interact without the competitive tensions that currently exist.

4. Although some believe that a large department will have more influence than two small ones, this is not necessarily the case if that large department is seen to be bitterly divided. Certainly, a department of archaeology must recognize that their budget is strongly influenced by undergraduate enrolment, which has been in decline. This may lead to more emphasis on undergraduate teaching than exists at present. Anthropology should fare well in an enrolment driven environment.

The disadvantages of a division include the necessity of finding space for two departmental offices in Queen's College. Perhaps the mysterious space behind the wall of the room where we held our meetings could be part of the answer, even if somewhat expensive to make usable. Those who do find collaboration attractive across the current divide would be more apart organizationally, but it would then be possible to create cross-listed courses and to major or minor in a combination of anthropology and archaeology, something that is impossible at present. In an atmosphere of less confrontation, students and faculty might be more rather than less likely to attend each other's seminars.

Students and Programs

There are many facets involved in teaching at a university such as Memorial.

Information pertaining to the undergraduate courses and undergraduate students, in particular, was quite sparse in the self-study provided to the review panel. There was a questionnaire administered to one 4th year section of an archaeology course; there could have been a broad and fuller survey of current and former students, both undergraduate and graduate. During the site visit, discussions with students and packages of course outlines became accessible. Information was also gained from the Memorial University self-service website to supplement the materials that the panel was given. Together, they form the basis for the following discussion.

One very noticeable and somewhat alarming aspect of the self-study was the placement of the information about the undergraduate program. In both anthropology and archaeology units, the description of the undergraduate courses with summary tables on majors and minors appeared after the graduate section. The “tone” of the discussions of the undergraduate program was subservient to the graduate sections. While the panel fully recognizes the important of graduate students in the university, their positioning before the undergraduates is perhaps indicative of the departmental culture. Representatives from the two undergraduate student societies told us that they felt somewhat neglected in the department. They saw the graduate students as being more important in the eyes of many of the faculty. The fact that these two large societies do not have dedicated space in Queens College is indicative of their place in the priority order.

Undergraduate students are the primary *raison d'être* of Memorial University. Most of our students are from this province; Memorial is the only university in this

province. We have a moral obligation to focus on their well being, academic and social. On a more immediate note, the budget of this university is driven by undergraduate enrolment, so we would all be well advised to pay close attention to our students and their needs.

The course information which we received showed a wide variety of undergraduate courses offered by the two sections of the department. The number of different topics and sub-disciplines was impressive, as was the thoroughness of the curricula. The self-study mentions that both sections of the department strike committees from time to time to review undergraduate programs. This panel believes that it is timely for a complete curriculum review of all undergraduate courses and requirements. The numbers of course is immense; many of these are inactive courses, but there is still a massive list, particularly in the anthropology section. The faculty profiles at Memorial have changes dramatically in the last 10 years; many faculty have retired and new people have been hired. All departments have had to deal with these changes by employing some or all of these tactics:

- deleting and adding courses
- tightening up regulations for majors and minors so that fewer courses need be offered in a given term
- having larger classes at the first year level to allow the offering of necessary courses at the bachelors, masters and doctorate levels.

What will work for anthropology and archaeology will depend on the emphases that faculty members deem important. However, this panel would recommend that a thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum begin immediately. It has been noted

that the archaeologists have started this process of curriculum review and their proposals have made several improvements in the current structure.

Undergraduate programs in archaeology in Canada vary in their comprehensiveness and in their areas of specialization. In general, an archaeology student needs broad knowledge of the development of humanity, both biologically and culturally, from the distant past to modern times, and knowledge of the theoretical and technical concepts and procedures for contributing to and critically evaluating the results of archaeological research. Undergraduate programs are normally organized from the general to the specific with understanding of the content of 3rd and 4th year courses partly dependent on 1st and 2nd year courses.

Anthropology offers double the number of sections compared with archaeology in Fall 2007. There is a good mix of distance and evening sections which increases the student pool for these courses, but there are so many courses and sections - too many, it seems, for the enrollments. There are 13 courses with fewer than 10 students. Curriculum review, which perhaps would include developing a more structured major core, would allow for more focused teaching.

Archaeology course offerings are all in standard daytime slots this term. The panel's concern about the severe drop in enrolments in ARCH 1030 was put to rest for now. However, the first year intake is the foundation of the undergraduate program, and so care must be given to the courses and the fluctuations in enrolment. Some of the archaeology undergraduate students claimed that there were some problems of access to courses; one student commented that faculty could not teach as many courses as were needed because they were busy with graduate students and research.

There seems to be a great deal of imbalance within the first year courses of both sections of the department. The difference in maximum class sizes seems to be greater than would be expected; variations range from 50 to 100 per section. On examination, it would appear that fewer sections of courses could be offered of the first year courses. This, of course, would necessitate establishing a more standard class size and most likely having to teach the course outside of Queens College. However, examination of the course syllabi shows that this increase in size should not jeopardize the academic integrity of the courses; many are now evaluated solely by tests. Evaluation schemes vary greatly with instructors; some of them seem inventive and manageable for a class of 100, for example. The panel would encourage faculty assigned to teach the first year sections to meet and discuss some "best practices" for teaching freshmen in large classes. Many departments are willing to share their experiences.

There is tremendous variation in the course syllabi we examined. Many are descriptive and complete, while others provide a scanty amount of information. While the content and means of evaluation are really matters of academic freedom, the syllabus should provide a comprehensive overview of the course for the student. The Instructional Development Office offers a workshop to faculty and whole departments who want to improve their course outlines for students.

There is some confusion about the status of some ARCH courses which are called "lab courses". If they are indeed lab courses, then they must be designated as such in the calendar and in the time slots. In order to obtain teaching equivalency of 1.5 courses, a course must have six contact hours per week with full responsibility for the laboratory. For courses with considerable scientific content, this designation of

lecture/lab courses should offer students a fuller educational experience and at the same time award appropriate teaching credit to the faculty member.

There was some discussion with individual faculty members about the process of allocating teachers to courses. Some felt that there were inequities; that people who were obliging were penalized with changing course allocations and loads, while others were immobile and were handed fewer disruptions to their schedules. Problems such as these are serious, especially for faculty members who are relatively new and/or untenured. For example, there are at least three faculty members who want to teach the field courses, but feel as if there is a current monopoly on them by someone from outside the bargaining unit. "First refusal" of courses should be given to regular ASMs. The departmental administration should be cognizant of these concerns.

Field courses seem to be crucial to students in anthropology and archaeology. The panel suggests that both units seriously consider making some sort of field course mandatory for all majors. This could be a general 3 credit-hour course, while a more comprehensive 6-credit-hour course one might be required for honours students. There could be opportunities for courses in distant geographic locations and/or nearer to campus. While cost is a large factor in enabling students at Memorial to do field courses, there are ways to keep costs minimal while, at the same time, providing undergraduate students with an introduction to some of the major principles and practices in field work. Making the field courses a requirement for majors would necessitate regularization of costs, including program fees; at the present time there does not seem to be any rationale which is transparent to the students as to why they are paying the fees they are charged.

The website for the department needs to be clarified and updated. Most students get their first glimpse at a department through the website. They access it for program regulations and course descriptions. There is discrepancy between the two parts of the department in the accessibility of information; archaeology has clearer directions for students who wish to major/minor than does anthropology, which has only a hotlink to the university calendar. Students need things explained in understandable terms - what courses do I do and when are they offered? Both sections need a lot of updating of faculty and staff and student photos and information. This is a recruitment tool into which investment should be made.

The panel was impressed with the high number and the high quality of graduate students in the department. They were, in general, very content with the opportunities they had been given and the courses they had taken. Their time to completion was higher than should be expected, but most cited difficulties with field research as the cause of the delay. The students wanted to have a mandatory graduate research seminar course as part of their program. This would provide experience in presentations as well as providing more cross-fertilization of anthropology and archaeology. With the high numbers of graduate students, and the demands of undergraduate teaching, the two sections of the department should investigate some streamlining of their graduate courses too. Perhaps fewer courses with more students in each would be more feasible than the current situation. Students might not always take all courses directly related to their research field, but that might be a necessary compromise.

There were some concerns raised about the budgetary allocations of the two units. The panel heard complaints that there was no funding for teaching related activities under different headship regimes. The requests were for small amounts of

money; when they were denied, it caused undue stress. There were many problems such as this which stem from the departmental fault line and the rotating headship.

Problems involving the lack of collegiality have been transferred to both the undergraduate and graduate students. Both groups spoke about it as something that is unfortunate, but a fact nevertheless. The students see the benefits of a unified department of anthropology and archaeology, yet they do not envisage these happening in the near future. The current schism is the source of much stress within the student body.

Sociology/Anthropology (S/A) Program.

Since the department of sociology and anthropology split in 1973, the S/A program has provided interdisciplinary major, minor and honours options for undergraduate students. The S/A program is administered by a coordinator. In 2007, there were 52 majors and 13 minors. Any S/A course may also be treated as a credit in either an anthropology or a sociology degree program. S/A courses figure prominently in the calendar entries for both departments, constituting about half of the offerings with the precise number depending on how inactive courses and special topic blocks are counted.

Various claims about the history and current participation of the two departments have been contested as reflected in the statements found in the anthropology section of the self-study and the submission from Dr. Riggins, Head of Sociology. We shall comment only on the current situation. Although several members in the sociology department, including, Dr. Riggins, wish to retain the S/A program, this would only be possible with a major effort of joint review and reconstruction. Students can major with only two required senior courses and no methods courses of any kind.

There are no core foundational courses that provide a common grounding for upper division courses. We do not feel that students are well prepared for graduate work in either anthropology or sociology unless they consciously select courses from outside the S/A listings.

Perhaps these problems could be rectified, as Dr Riggins hopes, but (1) it is difficult to see what this program provides that would not be available to a student who majored in one department and minored in the other, and (2) there appears to be too little commitment to maintain the program. For example, in recent years anthropology has introduced anthropology courses on gender and the family, despite the existence of S/A courses on these topics. Sociologists have been unwilling to administer the program in recent years, although Dr. Riggins added it to his duties as head of sociology when no one else would take over.

In 2005, the academic program review of sociology recommended that the S/A program should be discontinued, but not the existing S/A courses. We similarly recommend:

- a) That the SA Program be discontinued with due provision for the completion of degree programs by student registered as majors or minors at the time discontinuation is approved.
- b) That a committee from anthropology and sociology decide:
 - i. which current S/A courses should be retained as cross-listed courses that provide students registered in either department with credits that count towards their major or minor;
 - ii. which courses should be reclassified as anthropology or sociology courses, and

- iii. which courses should be deleted from the Calendar.

Graduate Program

The strengths of a graduate program lie largely in the expertise of faculty and their areas of specialization along with their ability to attract and fund graduate students. The graduate students we met pointedly indicated that they would much prefer to have four years of guaranteed funding rather than the current three year funding. Although this is a desirable goal, in Carlson's experience the guaranteed graduate funding in archaeology and anthropology at Memorial is better than at SFU and UBC, although not quite as good as Toronto and McMaster. It is clear that both the M.A. and PhD programs in archaeology do attract highly qualified graduate students under the current funding arrangements. The same is true for anthropology, whose students are very high caliber. Given the lengthy field research period that is the sine qua non of the disciplinary methodology, three years is rarely adequate as a funding model.

There is a Catch-22 in regard to funding and meeting the objectives of the university. Memorial's call for expansion of graduate programs is in conflict with continuation of the policy of allocation of funds to department budgets based on undergraduate FTEs. Either funds must be allocated on the basis of both graduate and undergraduate FTEs or graduate enrollments need to be limited and undergraduate teaching expanded if any budget relief is to be forthcoming. The office staff in the department is seriously overworked as a result of the increase in graduate students and the administrative and accounting responsibilities for the grants that help support them and their research. As long as the undergraduate FTEs remain the bread and butter of

departmental budgets and graduate enrollments continue to increase, this situation will become worse rather than better.

Graduate Program in Archaeology: The research strength of the archaeology faculty, as is clearly pointed out in the self-study document as well as by the numerous research grants and publications, is in the concentration of specialists in the archaeology and prehistory of the north Atlantic region, particularly Newfoundland and Labrador, but including adjacent parts of the arctic and subarctic, and in the historic period archaeology of Newfoundland and Labrador. These are the regions in which graduate students will be expected to concentrate their theses and from which they would expect to gain employment. A student who completed the course requirements for a thesis M.A. and obtained a comprehensive knowledge of the archaeological techniques used in this region should enable him or her to obtain employment with an archaeological consulting firm anywhere in North America. A student with a completed PhD would be similarly employable, but would also have the advantage of competing for employment as a faculty member in a university or college anywhere in the north Atlantic region wishing to develop or add to a program in historic or prehistoric archaeology of that region. The addition of a faculty member specializing in Norse archaeology, as proposed by the archaeology unit, would add to this research strength. The strengthening of the conservation program as proposed in the self-study document would also add to the employability of graduands particularly in Museums and Consulting.

Graduate Program in Anthropology: The anthropology section has moved away from regional to a more topical set of foci. Judging by the quality of students attracted to the

program, this strategy has worked fairly well. A strong program will require recouping the quantity (and to some extent, quality) of earlier days, by adding at least three new positions. While it would still be a good idea to seek appointments in, for example, regional aboriginal specialists, we would not favor any appointment that sacrificed quality for specificity. Suggestions for the graduate curriculum (including a Graduate Research Seminar) are offered above.

Faculty Research and Scholarship

The total external research funding generated by faculty in the department of anthropology and archaeology from 2001 to 2006 has exceeded that of every other department in the Faculty of Arts every year except for 2003-04 when the History Department was marginally ahead (*2006 Fact Book*, Table 22A). This fact, plus the large amounts involved, in and of itself is a very strong indicator of the department's commitment to research and the scholarly abilities and reputations of faculty members.

Archaeology: Between 2000 and 2006, seven of the then nine regular faculty members in archaeology received a total of \$3,929,537 in external funding plus \$79,045 obtained by the conservator who is not a faculty member. In this same period internal research funding amounted to \$1,499,306 plus an additional \$195,230 in conference funds.

These amounts are very impressive and demonstrate both the commitment to research and the high cost of both archaeological fieldwork and the required laboratory and conservation work. The amounts listed above do not include the considerable research funding obtained by a faculty member whose grants/contracts are apparently not included in the Table 7.1 of the self-study document, but are listed in his c.v. The table of

publications of all archaeology faculty and perusal of their c.v.s indicate their strong commitment to publication in appropriate outlets including peer reviewed journals.

The self-study document lists seven full time tenured faculty including four professors, two associate professors, and one assistant professor in the archaeology unit. All of them have expertise in the archaeology of the north Atlantic region including adjacent parts of the arctic and subarctic, and this is the primary area of research of six of the seven faculty members, some of whom have also done research in and published on other parts of the world. It is appropriate for graduate programs to specialize in research in one particular region of the world as archaeology at MUN has done rather than attempt to cover the waterfront. A very important part of the archaeological world, south and west Asia, is the main area of research of one faculty member. This helps broaden world coverage, which is particularly important for undergraduate majors. All of the faculty are productive scholars and, as would be expected, the full professors have published more than the associate professors who have published more than the assistant professors. These publications in archaeology were prepared for a variety of audiences from the strictly professional to the general public, which is as it should be. Overall, this publication record is outstanding and is probably above the average for comparable units/departments in Canada.

Anthropology: Of the Anthropology faculty, excluding David Natcher (CRC), who with external funding of \$1,369,795 has recently resigned, three of the remaining eight regular faculty members have generated a total of \$382,811 in external funding, and three have received a total of \$24,800 in internal funding since 1999. The research supported by these funds has resulted in an impressive publication record of books,

book chapters, peer reviewed articles, and other publications. Overall, this record probably exceeds that of faculty in many other Canadian anthropology programs and demonstrates the faculty's strong commitment to research and publication.

Archaeological research is a much more expensive undertaking than anthropological and comparing research costs would be an apples and oranges situation.

Our evaluation of the research record and promise of the social/cultural section of the department is based on both the written record (faculty CV's, familiarity with faculty publications) and our interviews with most of the members of this section (Fife, Roseman, Tate, Whitaker, Gordon, Davis). In that regard, our evaluation was limited by the absence of both Rex Clark and August Carbonella. While Clark's absence was perhaps less problematic in terms of this section of the evaluation (given his length of service), we did feel somewhat hampered in the case of Carbonella, as we would have posed particular questions to which we now have no answers.

To begin, some general observations on research and publication expectations for comparable anthropology sections/departments. On the question of range of research specialties, anthropology departments tend to follow a number of different strategies, often depending on size. While very large departments often try to include a very wide range of regional, topical, and theoretical specialties, smaller or medium sized departments tend to be more focused on a narrower range in any or all of these areas. In the case of Memorial, the section, particularly in the heyday of ISER, was well known for its focus on North Atlantic anthropology, that included a productively comparative attention to communities on both sides of the water. That emphasis has continued to a degree with a widening circle on the European side and a bit more 'exotic' sites, such as New Guinea. But the section has chosen to seek coherence and focus more in topical

areas than geographical regions, and we find their self-picture convincing in that regard. That is to say, such topical foci make sense as a strategy, when they are not contrived and both sharp enough to attract interest and broad enough to be fairly inclusive and not too limiting in terms of future hiring, reputation in the field, and attracting students (all of which are of course interconnected). These criteria are realised in this case.

On the question of scholarly productivity, it is worth noting that very significant research and publication in the field of social/cultural anthropology can be accomplished with even minimal funding. Grants for short-term single researcher projects are often in the neighbourhood of a few thousand dollars, and longer projects are typically funded at the level of salary-replacement and travel expenses. Funding in the hundreds of thousands is typically associated with multiple-researcher projects and such projects are still the exception rather than the rule. Unlike archaeology, where research often requires far larger budgets that cover team efforts, equipment, etc., most social/cultural anthropological research is still carried out by lone scholars conducting participant observation research with little beyond a tape recorder and a camera. Although we note significant funding levels on the part of several department members, a more important gauge is quality work as reflected in a range of significant publications. While some Universities value only peer-reviewed articles in a narrow range of journals, in our opinion a department/section that contributes on a variety of fronts with publications that reach a variety of audiences is also making a valuable contribution.

It is with this broad definition of scholarship in mind that we have evaluated this section. Overall, we would characterise the research record of the section as mixed and, taken cumulatively, about average for comparably sized departments in Canada. By

mixed, we mean to indicate the fact that while several members of the department (both junior and senior) have clearly established research and publication records that compare well in the national and international contexts, others (again, both junior and senior) have disappointing records in this area.

Among the significant scholarly achievements we would include funded and unfunded research involving projects in Canada and as far afield as New Guinea and Europe in the topical areas of the anthropology of tourism, gender, and pilgrimage. Work in these areas has been both theoretical and applied, and includes several articles that are widely cited in the discipline. Recent work on the conjuncture of pilgrimage and tourism is at the centre of contemporary interdisciplinary debate on both tourism and pilgrimage and, significantly, brings them together in a highly productive way. Those members of the department producing this work are, importantly, also clearly still very much engaged in progressing their respective research and publication agendas.

A very different picture emerges with several other senior section members whose publications in one case are well outside the broad realm of anthropology (and who was unavailable to discuss it), and in other cases, though based on good quality research, has produced rather disappointing results. Among the recently tenured or untenured section members the picture is also mixed. While several members show a considerable degree of promise, this is not the universal picture. As it stands, the research productivity and reputation of the department rests disproportionately on the work of several faculty members. The committee encourages the university and department to improve the quality of output in this regard by ensuring the necessary support for those who are productive, and to mentor and help direct the efforts of those

whose capability needs development, with an eye toward maintaining and augmenting the quality of the department. This section had a very good reputation in the past, and has a core of people who continue to work at that level; every effort should be made to bring the number of members back up to its previous level (well justified by the enrolments as well) and to seek the most qualified applicants.

Service to the Community, University, and Profession

The faculty in both anthropology and archaeology are heavily involved in service to the profession, the university, the department, and the community. The faculty in the archaeology unit have an exceptional record of community service well above and beyond the mandated teaching and research that justifies most of their salaries.

Archaeology is such a popular subject with the media and with local communities that archaeologists tend to be run ragged with requests for lectures, meetings with heritage societies, consultation with communities and Native groups, service on museum boards, and identification of “found” objects. This is particularly true at Memorial for the archaeologists whose research data base is Newfoundland and Labrador but extends to a lesser extent to other regions as well. Two of the younger faculty members pointed out during our interviews that between meeting the demands of teaching, research, committee work, and community service they have little time for anything else and their family life suffers considerably. It is very much to Memorial’s benefit that such community service take place not only because of its educational value to local communities and the general public, but to help dispel the ivory tower image of the university held by many taxpayers. The linkages between the archaeology unit’s research

and public communication, education, and involvement are truly exceptional and well beyond that found in many universities.

The faculty in anthropology are also involved in community service although not as much as in archaeology due to the differing nature of the disciplines and the much wider geographic extent of their specializations. Various faculty have worked on aboriginal land claims, primary school education in new Guinea, and various boards and policy committees and should be commended for this work.

Staff Support

There seems to be universal agreement among department members about the competence and attitude of the support staff. There have been difficulties, however, with access or at least the perception of accessibility of said staff rooted in the problematic character of governance in the department. If, as this report will recommend, there is a division of the current department into two departments, we feel these difficulties will disappear. There appears to be an excellent working relation among the three department assistants (secretaries).

In order to avoid future difficulties elsewhere in the University, the committee feels it should note what it perceives as a failure on the part of the University administration to act/intervene in what is clearly an anomalous (if not in breach of contracts and agreements) governance structure, which, in turn, has allowed a difficult situation to worsen.

Recommendations:

1. That the department of anthropology and archaeology be divided into a department of anthropology and a department of archaeology as soon as possible.
2. That a complete review of all undergraduate courses and requirements be undertaken by both sections or departments, depending on the outcome of resolution. Particular projects which need immediate work are:
 - a. First year courses – more consistency in class sizes, and evaluation schemes.
 - b. More structured major/minor program with a mandatory field course.
 - c. Designation of some ARCH courses as lab courses.
3. That the S/A Program be discontinued with due provision for the completion of degree programs by student registered as majors or minors at the time discontinuation is approved.
4. That a committee of anthropology and sociology decide:
 - i. which current S/A courses should be retained as cross-listed courses that provide students registered in either department with credits that count towards their major or minor;
 - ii. which courses should be reclassified as anthropology or sociology courses, and
 - iii. which courses should be deleted from the Calendar.
5. That the department budget(s) be based on graduate student FTEs as well as undergraduate.
6. That an additional office staff member be hired regardless of whether the disciplines split into two departments or not.

7. That a fact sheet listing the specific duties and responsibilities of the department head be prepared in consultation with faculty, office staff, and upper level administrators.
8. That the website be up-dated on a continual basis
9. That dedicated space be found for student societies.