Chairs’ Report: Greetings fellow Fosapians. If the salutation does not have an attractive resonance, then perhaps we can work together to design an acronym that does. Part of our presence has an improved name change; the newsletter was changed last year to ANTHRO-AT-LARGE: Newsletter of the Federation of Small Anthropology Programs. The feedback we have received is that this is a decided improvement on the FOSAP Newsletter. This will be one of the several topics at our annual business meeting at the AAA meetings in San Jose. We meet on Friday at 6:15 for an always lively discussion and then adjourn to a nearby restaurant for a convivial dinner. We encourage everyone to attend and share your ideas and suggestions. (Email one of us closer to the date for more details: John Rhoades jrhoades@sjfc.edu or Robert A. Myers myers@alfred.edu.

We are now listed in the AAA website as an "Interest Group" in GAD (under the "Interest Group" part of the "Sections and Interest Groups" heading. And if you click on our name you go immediately to the FOSAP website. Hopefully this will provide a little bit more visibility. We are working to also include FOSAP in the membership form as an interest group. We have recently finished updating and expanding the email list of our members (from only 100 to over 300 email addresses). By the time you read this most of you will have received an email informing you of the business meeting, and, for those in the San Jose area, a request for the names of suitable dining establishments—large capacity, not expensive and willing to provide separate checks. If you did not get the email then contact John Rhoades jrhoades@sjfc.edu.

We pride ourselves on being an open organization, not only in terms of suggestions for paper sessions and submissions for ANTHRO-AT-LARGE, but also for inclusion in our administrative structure. If you wish to get involved, here we are. New members and new officers include: John Rhoades joining Bob Myers as co-Chair, Carol Morrow and Julie Pelletier are taking over as newsletter editors, and Carol also taking the Membership chair and our new FOSAP list serve (directions for use at end of newsletter).
A special vote of thanks and appreciation is due to Cate Cameron, Paul Grebinger, and Betsy Baird. They have each given many years of effective service to FOSAP (Cate as Secretary-treasurer and Chair, Paul as Secretary-Treasurer and Newsletter Editor, Betsy as Membership chair). We look forward to their continued participation as members.

We have one invited session this year, organized and chaired by Clare Bollinger, “Speaking as the Anthropologist”: Representing Our Discipline On (and Off) Campuses with Small Anthropology Programs. This features papers by Rebecca Austin, Christina Beard-Moose, Amy Gazin-Schwartz, Charles Springwood, Robin O’Brien, and Susan Krook, and will take place Thursday afternoon from 1:45 – 3:30 PM. If you are attending the annual meetings please get this session on your schedule.

We hope to see many of you at the business meeting. We will have several things to discuss (other than a name change), such as the proposed inclusion of ANTHRO-AT-LARGE in AnthroSource and ideas for next year’s paper sessions.

See you in San Jose!

John Rhoades and Bob Myers, Co-Chairs

Minutes of the FOSAP Business Meeting at the 104th Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington, D.C., December 2, 2005
Robin O’Brien, Elmira College
robrian@elmira.edu

In Attendance:

Matthew Amster, Gettysburg College
Betsy Baird, Univ Sys of New Hampshire
Mike Billig, Franklin and Marshall College
Clare Boulanger, Mesa State College
Cate Cameron, Cedar Crest College
Dona Davis, University of South Dakota
Barbara Dilly, Creighton University
John Gatewood, Lehigh University
Paul Grebinger, Rochester Institute of Technology
Jen Jones, University of Minnesota, Duluth
Carol Morrow, Southeast Missouri State University
Bob Myers, Alfred University
Jane Nadel-Klein, Trinity College
Robin O’Brien, Elmira College
John Rhoades, St.John Fisher College

The meeting was attended by fifteen members. The first item of business was the election of new officers. John Rhoades and Robert Myers were elected co-chairs by acclamation. Robin O’Brien volunteered to be Secretary.

Discussion followed regarding the duties of the Membership Secretary. Carol Morrow
agreed to assume the duties of Membership Secretary. Carol and Julie Pelletier will edit the Newsletter, now titled *Anthro-at-Large*, and John Gatewood will be Webmaster.

Brief discussion followed regarding FOSAP’s relationship with GAD. One issue of interest was FOSAP’s possible participation in GAD’s column in the *Anthropology News*.

John Rhoades reported on his attendance at the AnthroSource editors’ meeting. The plan would be for the Newsletter to be on AnthroSource and would thus be available to all AnthroSource members. One thing we would need to do is provide copies of all back issues. M. Amster noted that the Newsletter is already available on Google Scholar.

If we undertake participation in AnthroSource, we might need to copyright the Newsletter. Currently it is estimated that the Newsletter will be available in 2007. The publication can remain in its current, e.g., newsletter, form. We might also consider accepting advertising; however, this would be dealt with through some central source. The cost to the General Anthropology Division is about $100.00 a year for either one or two issues, plus FIND THIS. Keeping it a newsletter might not make AnthroSource a useful choice given the attendant bureaucracy. One strategy could be to vote to table this until next year to see how much more development AnthroSource undergoes.

Cate Cameron and Bob Myers went to the General Anthropology Division business meeting. Not many people attended; Cate and Bob reported on FOSAP symposia and the newsletter. As FOSAP members, we can use the GAD website. It might be useful to post clear instructions about invited sessions on that site. The site needs upgrading and there has been some movement in this direction. There was some concern as to why COTA and FOSAP were separate. Carol Morrow noted that she attended meetings of COTA and would work as a liaison between COTA and FOSAP. It was noted also that GAD has 1764 members, a drop of approximately 200. This is, however, a smaller drop than in other sections. The total expenses for FOSAP publications were $1,800.00 while the GAD bulletin ran $6,824.

There was discussion regarding making awards for an emerging scholar whose work covers two or more fields (e.g., race and biocultural issues for instance). Carol Morrow suggested we make awards to small programs. Other possible uses include funding to bring students to conferences, including registration and hotel and funding to bring speakers to visit small programs.

Cate Cameron mentioned that the fund should be driven by GAD and be open to all undergraduates. Mike Billig said that going to the AAA meetings would be an enriching experience for students. Another suggestion was a grant for an undergraduate ethnography journal.
Symposium ideas for the next Annual meeting were suggested and included:

- Assessment and Accreditation
- Research and how to do it
- Websites for Small Programs
- Beyond the Exotic Other II.

Respectfully submitted, Robin O’Brian
(Elmira College: robrian@elmira.edu)

There was a FOSAP panel and a session at the 104th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association in Washington D.C., fall 2005. A brief summary of the panel is provided below; a fuller report was published in Anthropology News, March 2006 issue

“Small Anthropology Programs: How Many Anthropologists Does It Take To...?” was organized by Matthew Amster and chaired by Clare Boulanger. The seven participants finished this question on different, related topics. Several of them explored the problems and opportunities involved in setting up a minor with only one anthropologist, and a major with only three. Clare Boulanger’s task was to pull together all of the diverse responses to answer, and lead a discussion on the final question, “How many anthropologists does it take to support the four-field approach?”

As is always the case with FOSAP sessions, anthropologists in small programs came together to explore issues relevant to their situation. As we learned, there is a lot that just one or two anthropologists can do with a program.

The FOSAP session: How to Survive Evolutionary Events in Academia: Extinction vs. New Niches, co-organized by Julie Pelletier and Carol Morrow, dealt with another issue relevant to any small program in today's University budget crunch climate.

**ABSTRACT:** Higher education funding has been severely mangled in the past decade, particularly on the level of state budgets. State legislators are examining colleges and universities carefully, and demanding more accountability. Private colleges and universities are facing shrinking budgets and increased competition for resources. Administrators in turn are developing new organizational strategies to use their resources more efficiently and economically. Often, these strategies include both program restructuring and elimination using academic prioritization models. Because anthropology is not perceived as a "practical,
job-focused degree", it faces potential extinction, particularly in small programs. However, this perilous environment also creates new niches or opportunities for anthropology. A number of topics are covered in this session. First, we offer information about how other anthropology programs have dealt with academic prioritization reviews, including pitfalls and strong areas for small programs. Second, we give strategies for aligning anthropology with 'applied' degrees (another niche) and identify new, so-called ‘growth areas’ (as perceived by university administrators and student demand) that anthropology can expand into, such as the field of forensics, on-line technology, distance learning, and reciprocal agreements with other universities and colleges. Third, we explore how the environment (or market) for anthropology has shifted in terms of parental/student demand for ‘practical’, career oriented majors. Finally, we offer strategies for identifying anthropology as essential in the 911 environment in terms of understanding tribal cultures and how they play a critical role in today’s global politics. All of the authors come from very small anthropology programs; hence our perspective is focused on flexible and creative strategies for survival in competition with larger, more ‘stable’ degree programs.

Keeping an Anthropology Program Alive by Sending Students Away: Survival in a Small Program

Julie A. Pelletier, Ph.D.
University of Minnesota, Morris

Introduction: As our panel title indicates, we are interested in the survival of small anthropology programs and are proposing a number of strategies to avoid our extinction. The specific strategy I intend to focus on is how a small program can attract and retain majors by, in various ways, sending them away. I have also included a discussion of an simple assessment tool that small programs can utilize to identify their strengths and weaknesses as part of an overall approach to retaining majors.

The University of Minnesota at Morris, or UMM, is the liberal arts branch of the state system. We enroll about 1,800 students and are located in a small rural community of approximately 5,000. Most faculty live in or near Morris; our students are also our neighbors - it is a very intimate little world! The Anthropology program, or discipline as it is known at UMM, is made up of three cultural anthropologists. While anthropology has been taught at UMM for thirty years, the major is only in its fourth year. UMM is ranked third nationally among public liberal arts colleges, a designation of which it is very proud. The school is also known for its history as an Indian boarding school and, subsequently, for offering
tuition-free education to Native American students. Our students are excellent – bright, motivated, and interested in everything. They are also a bit spoiled by the level of personal interactions with professors – I have had students drop off papers in my mailbox at home or ask for academic advising as they serve me a pizza!

The small size and remote location of our campus does tempt students to transfer to other schools after their first one or two years. The small size of the Anthropology Discipline and its subsequently small array of course offerings also tempt our majors to transfer or to switch majors. One strategy to retain majors is to provide them with opportunities to diversify their anthropological experience and education while remaining enrolled in the Anthropology Discipline at UMM. The strategy is multi-pronged and includes internships, study abroad, student exchange, independent directed research, and field schools. These efforts can require time and organization but the payoff is worth it when you retain a student who feared that your small program could not meet his or her needs or interests.

It is necessary to identify what your students’ interests and perceived needs are in order to effectively design and implement a strategy of sending students away in order to keep them. The research for this paper is based primarily on short surveys of the 47 students who have declared a major in anthropology at UMM. My response rate was 38%, less than I hoped for but helpful nonetheless. (the survey is printed at the end of this newsletter) The purpose of the survey was two-fold – to provide information specifically for my interests in the pedagogy of anthropology and as a basic assessment tool for the UMM Anthropology Discipline.

I asked students to identify their specific interest or interests in the fields and subfields. In addition to the classic four fields, I included museum studies as a separate category since many students have expressed a particular interest in that area. To determine what other opportunities our majors are pursuing that may keep them at UMM, I asked about participation in study abroad, student exchange programs, field schools, internships and directed independent research.

The University of Minnesota system has comparatively rigorous requirements for undergraduate research with human subjects that can impede the facility and subsequently, frequency, of undergraduate anthropological research that must usually be completed in a semester’s time. I have been concerned that these requirements may “turn off” our majors so I included a question about the student’s intention to conduct human subjects research while at UMM. The survey concluded with an open-ended question about strengths and weaknesses of our anthropology program.

Two questions specifically generated data for use by the Anthropology discipline. I asked our majors to list other majors and
minors; UMM students tend to declare several and I was curious to see what else our students are studying. I also asked about plans to attend graduate school. In my conclusion, I will note weaknesses in the survey and plans to change it for future use.

I was initially relieved to note that all but two of the respondents selected “cultural/area studies” as at least one of their specific interests in anthropology, because, except for one physical anthropology course, cultural anthropology is all we teach at UMM! However, half of the respondents commented negatively, in the open-ended question, on the lack of courses in the other fields of anthropology and on their perceived need for more anthropology professors with varied backgrounds. The greatest lack perceived by students is coursework and fieldwork in archaeology. Students did mention that they can and are supported in their own efforts to learn more about the other fields through directed independent research, internships, and domestic or international field schools. As one student put it:

....the only difficulty is the size, in that, I wish sometimes I could delve deeper into the other sub fields (sic) of anthropology. But I can do that on my own as well and should not complain to (sic) much.

I have placed one student in an archaeological field school for two consecutive summers at another school in Minnesota but have been frustrated in my attempts to place students in the main campus' archaeological field school, due to their unwillingness to waive certain prereqs. for UMM students.

So, are our anthropology majors taking advantage of alternative or independent study opportunities made available both by the institution and by our discipline? According to my survey, they are. To be fair, one of our major requirements is the completion of a senior independent research project so I was not surprised to have several respondents check that box. However, several of the respondents have completed more than one independent research project, revealing a program strategy of meeting students' needs and interests outside of scheduled course offerings. (I have personally supervised twenty-one directed studies in three years that were not senior projects and have supervised an equal number of senior projects.)

From a student's perspective, this arrangement is ideal; from the faculty's perspective, it is quite demanding. We are not financially compensated for directing independent research during the academic year; nor are we granted any release time. In addition, two of the three anthropologists serve as coordinators for two area studies majors (Latin American Studies and Native American Studies). They are called upon to supervise directed studies in those majors as well. Therefore, we are being forced to say “no” to more and more students and only agree to supervise the required senior projects. I am concerned by
this since working one-on-one with faculty is seen as a significant strength of our small program and our small school, as one student commented:

“The departments (sic) biggest strength is the availability of the faculty - due to the small size of the campus, it is easy to discuss your own research interests and work one on one with the Anthropology Department.”

This same student went on to write “I would, however, like to see a wider variety of classes added.” She spent a semester at the main campus taking courses not available at UMM and will graduate with a UMM degree in the spring.

One-third of the respondents have participated in study abroad programs and more than one-quarter have had an internship placement. Other respondents, including a freshman, indicated plans to participate in these opportunities in the future. I will first address the value of emphasizing study abroad and other such programs. UMM has a strong commitment to international study and to cross-cultural experiences, as does the anthropology program. For the institution, this commitment helps set UMM apart from other small schools. For the UMM anthropology program, the commitment to cross-cultural experiences is also an important recruitment and retention tool for our major and, not insignificantly, is an excellent fit with the anthropological mission. Recent anthropology offerings include a field school in Mexico, a summer session in New Zealand, and a summer session in the American West.

A new and growing commitment to anthropological internships also appears to play a role in retention of majors. Most of our internships take place at museums, both small regional facilities and larger facilities like the Chicago Field Museum. Individual students who are seeking museum experiences close to home usually identify internships at regional facilities. These arrangements, therefore, require little additional preparation work by the faculty supervisor.

Internships with larger institutions often require some “courting” by faculty, who must convince prestigious institutions that UMM undergraduates are exceptionally bright, self-directed, and mature. I recommend carefully selecting the first couple of interns to make the best possible impression so the internship site will be willing to continue working with you. When I tell a major that he or she can stay at UMM and have a better chance of landing an internship at the Chicago Field Museum because of our good working relationship, this goes a long way toward retention. By the way, our first Field Museum intern was accepted in large part because he had completed an independent research paper with me on the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act. I have begun the process of expanding our internship offerings by drawing upon relationships I have developed with a home for troubled girls, a tribal college, and other institutions in the area.
The open-ended question revealed another strength of our program that I did not include in the survey – our close relationship with the Sociology Discipline. Students are able to apply sociology credits toward their anthropology major and several courses are cross-listed in the two disciplines. Another strength, not unexpectedly, is faculty accessibility, which has positive outcomes for students. We may be more likely to include them in research, train them as teaching assistants, write strong letters of recommendation, recommend them for scholarships and awards, encourage participation in conferences (including the AAAs which UMM undergrads have attended in relatively large numbers for the past four years!), and work hard to identify ways to retain them as Anthropology majors and as UMM students.

While the small size of our program can be a detriment, with several respondents commenting on the need for more courses and more professors, they also commented positively on the varied specializations found in the anthropology faculty. We recently undertook a drastic revision of our discipline homepage to further play up the differences in our specialties. None of us is an archaeologist but we can and do cover a broad spectrum in the field of cultural anthropology. In addition, we remind our students that they can gain knowledge and training in the other fields of anthropology elsewhere, if necessary, while retaining their place at a top liberal arts college.

Conclusion:

I would like briefly to evaluate the survey instrument I created. I see the use of this survey as an ongoing part of my discipline’s assessment process, as well as providing data for my own interests in pedagogy and anthropology. It is an evolving document; I wish to keep it short and simple to increase the likelihood students will fill it out while still providing valuable data. One change I plan is to include Medical Anthropology as an optional area of interest in the first question – an embarrassing oversight since I teach medical anthropology! I want to add an option as well for students to indicate participation in research with faculty, an activity that is highly valued at UMM.

A question that draws out the importance of anthropology’s relationships with other majors seems necessary, considering how this year’s survey revealed the importance of our sister discipline of Sociology. The small size of UMM means that several of our majors are multi-disciplinary and feed students into anthropology courses, a situation that not only has a positive effect on our class numbers but leads some to declare anthropology as a separate, complementary major. Of these are Liberal Arts for the Human Services, a pre-social work degree; three area studies majors; Women’s Studies; and a Social Science focus for education majors.
Overall, the survey both affirmed what I know about the Anthropology discipline at UMM, such as the tension between the intimacies of a small program versus the lack of diversity in course offerings, and reminded me of other aspects, such as the importance of our complementary relationship with Sociology, that I tend to take for granted. I think such a survey can be a valuable basic assessment and planning tool - simple to construct and administer, quickly analyzed.

My final conclusions have to do with the nature of survival for small anthropology programs. I have chosen to illustrate one tactic that takes multiple forms. Sending students away in order to keep them requires the time it takes to set up internships, learn about study abroad and other exchange programs, convince your institution to participate in tuition-reciprocal relationships, and perhaps most importantly, cultivate and maintain contacts across a broad spectrum of institutions, businesses, communities, and individuals.

At the same time, you must be clear in communicating to the students you are sending away that graduating from your program and from your institution is the best choice for them. Meet with your admissions people or at least ask them to send you materials they use to recruit students. These materials will provide a starting point for describing your school in the strongest light. You should know who your competitors are, who wants your anthropology majors or, simply, your undergraduates, and be prepared to provide an argument for majors to stay in your program. In my three years at UMM, every student that I have “sent away” has returned and graduated from UMM with a degree in anthropology. I am convinced that this strategy works, and urges you to be creative in applying it to ensure the survival of your small anthropology program.

NOTE: The survey form discussed above is printed on the last page of this newsletter in Appendix 1

Rapid Response to Radical Change: One small program's success.

Warren D. Anderson and Carol A. Morrow, Southeast Missouri State University

Introduction

The following essay is an autobiographical sketch of a small anthropology program's bid for survival in a context of radical budget cuts. A statewide fiscal crisis loomed over us, and we were not sure that the old standby criteria by which we had operated were any longer of relevance or value for our survival. Things change, and for us they changed fast and unpredictably.
We have chosen to cast our survival metaphorically as an evolutionary event because, from our vantage point, the parallels – an entity able to take advantage of accidents and unforeseen changes in environmental demands – are striking. Rapid change often leads to extinction, but it also opens up new niches. Below is a summary of the crucial things we learned through this trial:

- use your skills as anthropologists to listen carefully
- don’t be defensive – budget crises are not personal, and a defensive attitude only irritates people that you don’t want to alienate
- give up what you think is important – when survival is at stake, the administration and those they answer to decide what is important
- learn the rules and play by them

A brief description of the program is in order at the outset. We are a small program by any measure. At the time of the event under consideration, our majors numbered in the mid twenties, and our entire course rotation was staffed by two full-time faculty members, only one of which was tenured. Although, because of our complementary training, we were able to offer a four-field approach to the discipline, it has always been a bare bones, no frills program, equipping students well for graduate studies, but free of any specialized courses. Encouraged by new majors, we nevertheless, moved along rather unconcerned with our small numbers, content to inhabit the ranks of the “small” programs on campus.

**Evolutionary Event**

The status quo described above changed abruptly for us in the spring of 2003 when unforeseen budget recalls rattled the state of Missouri from top to bottom. Particularly hard hit was higher education, Missouri ranking high among all states for cuts to this particular sector. In response to the Governor’s budget recalls, the Board of Regents response was completely predictable: cut costs. The University response was equally unsurprising: satisfy the Board of Regents.

Briefly, the University’s response took three basic forms. The first of these was to streamline the academic side of service delivery by merging and realigning degree programs. The Anthropology program had for many years been coupled with Sociology, but that was to change. The department was shut down, and Sociology was moved to a different college altogether. Our small Anthropology program was suddenly an ‘orphan’ in the College of Liberal Arts, and we only had only a matter of weeks to decide what to do. Departments as diverse as English, History, and Psychology all considered taking on the program, trying to figure how to merge it cohesively into the programs they already managed. In the end, the Department of Foreign Languages “took us in,” and we became the Department of Foreign Languages and Anthropology, a union which has proved fortuitous for all programs
involved, but which was at the time a complete unknown insofar as how it might eventually work for the faculty members involved in the merger.

The second part of the University's response involved a campus-wide investigation into all possibilities for cutting costs. Athletics, Facilities, Student Life, Administration, and Academics all came under careful scrutiny, igniting debates across the campus and in the community. To the University's credit, every sector sacrificed; nobody was left unscathed or completely satisfied.

The final part of the University's response consisted of the development of a three phase, campus-wide program to streamline academic services, eliminate unproductive or wasteful areas, boost assessment and accountability, and move departments and their faculty to a forward looking growth posture. This Phase I, II, and III Review process was the subject of countless meetings, the predictable complaints on the part of the academics met by administrative explanations, and a vast quantity of reports and documents. Enjoyed by nobody, the process ground on over the course of a year. This was a bruising time for everyone involved, including the administrators.

The following discussion will focus on Phase I of the University's Review. During Phase I the Anthropology program was compelled to justify its existence in the midst of radical environmental change. In evolutionary terms, it was a major 'extinction' event. Academics, Athletics, Facilities, Administration all suffered some carnage. Within the realm of academic programs, three degree programs were cut; surviving ones were shuffled to other programs and colleges, and there were a number of 'forced' retirements and contracts that were not renewed. The Anthropology program survived.

Specific Environmental Demands
The University began by identifying for possible elimination the academic programs across campus whose population of majors fell into the lowest quartile. The Administration set as the cutoff for inclusion in the lowest quartile a number of 27 majors. Eighteen programs were named, some with as few as one major. This number was calculated as an average of the previous three years' majors counts, sampled at the fourth week of the Fall semester. Of the eighteen threatened programs, Anthropology had the largest number of majors with 26.3.

The threatened programs received instructions as a group from administration representatives. Asked to respond to a "review," the affected faculty members were actually presented with a series of data sets, numbers reflecting admissions, testing, productivity, cost-effectiveness, class size, and other quantifiable characteristics of each program. What was offered in the form of guidance was a series of constraints on program responses,
deadlines, and instructions for what could be included.

- The reports were to be directed to the Provost.
- The Administration was not interested in argumentation regarding the value of the programs.
- The program responses were to focus on numbers only.
- Any growth in major's numbers after the previous year's census date would not count.
- Minors did not count.

No program was permitted formal information about how other programs in the group were forming their responses. Moreover, the programs were offered little to help them predict what criteria would be used to evaluate the responses or how.

**Anthropology's Response**

*Mental Posture*  Faced with these circumstances, we came quickly to grips with the reality of the situation. There was nothing artificial about the budget cuts. The Board and Administration would cut until they had satisfied the budgetary needs. Although the situation was hurtful, it was not personal. No matter how valuable we felt Anthropology to be, the cuts were not about us or the discipline itself; they were about numbers. Every threatened program on the campus was now fending for itself on an essentially equal playing field. Alliances and good credibility counted for nothing; it was all about numbers and their interpretation. Sentimentality, emotions, frustration, pride, and worries had no place in our calculations. We forced ourselves to train our focus on the resources we had at hand and to exploit them and present them in the most favorable way we were able. Determined to be brutally realistic, we both investigated other employment as well; the possibility of unemployment was all too real.

However, we also perceived that this review might be an opportunity to 'showcase' our program. We barely made the cut for small programs, and we knew that our program was good, and had a good reputation on campus. We viewed the process as an evolutionary event: some programs were going to be extinct, and some would survive. We decided that not only would we do everything in our power to survive; we would take this opportunity to situate our program for growth.

*Resources and Strategies*  Our small faculty size (two), while probably an original cause of our placement on the threatened list of eighteen programs, proved a valuable tool for us, affording us flexibility and agility as we planned our response. No large committees or the accompanying abundance of opinions needed consideration. We moved quickly and efficiently as we evaluated (a) the resources at our disposal, (b) general strategies we would use to frame our response, (c) specific strategies, (d) the general characteristics of the response (length, format, presentation, etc.), and (e) the contents of the response.
We knew that our environment was shifting to lean times, but we needed to know what the selective forces would be. Change does not occur in a vacuum. We needed to the basis for the administration's actions. It was quite evident from discussions across campus and presentations by the administration that the primary source of inspiration for the Phase I Review at our University was a single book whose contents were apparently being analyzed and implemented by many administrations and many universities. This book, Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services, by Robert C. Dickeson, 1999, was serving as the model for newly structured academic systems. We obtained the book and read it. In doing so, we acquired not only a closer approximation to the administration's perspective on the process, but also the lexicon necessary to communicate effectively with those overseeing and evaluating the changes.

We then took the stance that our approach had to be non-defensive. Although we felt under attack professionally, we were determined not to construct our response from that position. Instead, we wanted to be positive, proactive, and appropriately solicitous. Somehow we needed to convey our sense of our own program as genuinely high quality and valuable to the educational objective of the institution. To that end, we sought help and advice from administrators and colleagues. The constant refrain we got was 'work the numbers'.

We decided that our response had to be as lean and direct as possible, free of any details that were not necessary to make our case. We became keenly aware of the scope and quantity and detail of the issues that administrators have to deal with, and decided that if we could not make our case on the very first page of our response paper, we would likely lose their attention.

We played this process as a serious game - know the rules and follow them. Regardless of our opinion, we had to use only what counted as legitimate information and leave out everything else. Rules were everything, and this perspective helped us discover our new 'micro-niche'. A careful reading of the administration's justification for program and degree cutting was that the process was not only an opportunity to make the institution more efficient but also an "opportunity to enhance good programs." Taking them at their word, we presented our program as an example of one that should be enhanced, not cut. We 'worked the numbers' to illustrate our solid and impressive growth trend. Furthermore, we built our arguments using 'their' language from their source of guidance 'THE BOOK'. (Always find out what your administrators are reading and which conferences they are attending).

Results
The details of our report are specific to our own situation and program, but our format can be utilized by other small programs. Everything crucial for our survival was bulleted on the first page. The
rest of the report was tied to these bulleted points, which were supported by heavily detailed appendices. We used positive, non defensive language. Actually, we attempted to cultivate the mindset that the purpose of our report was to help the administration justify 'keeping' our program. Finally, we paid a great deal of attention to the report’s actual appearance and readability. We wanted it to look good - clean and clear, with good use of margins and bold face.

We came through this review professionally and academically unscathed. We were the only program under review that was not either cut or put through additional Phase II review. In fact, we gained a bit of a reputation as being a “little” program that asked for more, and the administration seemed impressed with our confidence. Now we are on record as having requested (and perhaps meriting) a new faculty line. Moreover, our administration is on record as having suggested that we, “Explore possibilities for expansion.”

Next semester, Spring 2007, we will be one of the first programs to move into ‘Phase III Review. The budget crisis has settled somewhat, we are both tenured, and one of us promoted to Professor status. In our new niche and equipped with the lessons we have learned adapting and changing to these “evolutionary events,” we are actually looking forward to this new review. We are waiting to get the guidelines, and will pay close attention to all of the nuances provided.

Our plan is to lay out our argument for a new faculty line. Wish us luck.

But What Can You Do With It? Maintaining Anthropology’s Presence in the Consumer Driven College

Robin O’Brian Elmira College

These days, the academy is an increasingly vexed place to work, or at least it seems so to me. Increasingly consumer- and market-driven, academe twists itself into knots trying to meet the demands of multiple constituencies, particularly those that pay the bills or make the rules: students and of course parents, taxpayers for public institutions; boards of trustees or regents, who may have a range of demands, requirements and other ways of affecting daily life; accrediting agencies, which validate an institution’s educational programs; and for nearly everyone, governmental agencies, which give money to nearly all institutions, public or private, in the form of grants, loans, stipends and work-study income to students and research grants of varying sizes to faculty at various places. Only a few institutions turn down that last pot of gold, usually those who do
not wish to follow various governmental regulations that must be met to qualify for these disbursements.

Most of us in colleges and universities are quite aware of these constituencies and their competing demands, but may often focus most on government agencies, particularly the case for public institutions, on accrediting agencies, which increasingly demand highly operationalized programs and measure of outcomes assessment, or boards of trustees or regents, which are involved to varying degrees in governance. In this paper I address the role of parents in this mix, particularly in the context of smaller and primarily residential colleges. Such institutions, which may be either private or public, are far more likely than comprehensive universities or communities colleges to serve so-called "traditional" students, those that are eighteen to about twenty-two, who have come to college directly from high school, and who may be living away from home for the first time. These students are still more likely to be middle-class or higher; and, depending upon location, the majority of such students may still be white.

The small residential college might be many people's fantasy of "college," seen in movies like "Mona Lisa Smile" or television programs like 2001's "The Education of Max Bickford"—verdant lawns, beautiful old buildings, preferably covered with ivy, thoughtful students pondering the meaning of life...these days campuses may indeed resemble this ideal but students run the gamut of interest and preparation. And many of them are incredibly sensitive to the costs their parents incur to send them to school. Parents are of course quite interested in getting their money's worth, and rightfully so. And parents today consider that footing this bill permits them to monitor with far greater attentiveness than they experienced, their children's progress through college. Hence the rise of the "helicopter parent", so called because she or he helicopters in when a child needs or may appear to need help negotiating the rigors of the college experience. The growth of such parents, who are found at all institutions, has created an entire secondary industry attempting to meet the needs of such parents, and when necessary, to discourage their help. Parents, for their part, have formed College Parents of America, an association that lobbies for parental rights, particularly in financial affairs (e.g., tax breaks, grants, and loans for tuition). The administrative side of the university has more direct contact with such parents and stories are both legion and humorous:

At the University of Georgia, students who get frustrated or confused during registration have been known to interrupt their advisers to whip out a cell phone, speed-dial their parents and hand the phone to the adviser, saying, "Here, talk to my mom." Other universities report having to teach kids basic safety skills, such as not propping open their dormitory doors at night. Even in class, professors "can't assume that students coming into the classroom know they already should have bought their books," says Gwendolyn Dungy, executive director of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. "All the decisions have been
made for these young people."

(WSJO, 7/29/05).

Still, administrators and admissions officers recognize the role that parents play, and colleges are increasingly organizing separate offices, programs, and/or computer message boards specifically for attentive parents.

Who are the children of these parents? For many on the administrative side of the academy, and for writers and observers of education, they are the “millenial generation” or “millenials”, a term coined by the writing team of Neil Howe and William Strauss. Howe and Strauss are the authors of a series of works that purport to analyze the attitudes and beliefs of generational cohorts (Generations, Thirteenth-Gen, The Fourth Turning, Millenials Rising). Particularly influential is the short book Millennials Go to College, co-published by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and LifeCourse Associates, Howe and Strauss’s marketing consulting firm. As colleges attempt to meet the needs of helicopter parents, so do they cope with at least some of the characteristics that are said to typify millennials, including conventionality, a sense of “specialness, insecurity and a desire to feel “safe”, an emphasis on “teamwork”, and a high degree of performance anxiety. Much of this service takes place in residence or student life offices where administrators hope to attract students with so-called “club Med” or “luxury hotel” dorm suites, with high end food products and a wide range of campus activities.

In the midst of all this, any faculty member can feel a bit lost. Where, after all, is the role of teaching? Do students want to learn? Here the new attitudes I described and some old familiar ones meet and blend. Some students are reluctant or unable to perform as individuals. Classrooms are noisy with a constant low-level buzz—the sounds of students endlessly whispering and muttering, checking their cell phones or pdas. Some students — this has happened to me — send all their written work home to their parents to edit or proof; in my own case the parent often wrote or rewrote the student’s papers until I found out and told the student to stop. This same student suggested I invite her mother to my class to lecture on “what it’s like to be a mom.” Thanking her for this suggestion, I nonetheless passed. Parents also may email or phone to monitor the behavior of their children or of the professor! Another, different student’s mother emailed me to ask that I remind her daughter to eat and go to sleep at night, and there have been instances of parents staying in their children’s dorm rooms until explicitly asked to leave by campus officials.

Naturally, if parents care to this degree, they are equally interested in what their children may choose to study. And a lot of students come to college “to get jobs”. We shouldn’t overlook that. Americans in particular value practicality and concreteness as a part of our culture and it’s no surprise that many of our students do as well. And a surprising number of parents may hold fairly dated or stereotypical ideas
about colleges, particularly residential ones, conceiving of our job as teaching and of teaching as the time we spend standing in front of a classroom. Who among us wouldn't want a job of 6 or 9 or even 12 hours of work a week? Of course we know that this isn't our complete workload at all. So what fills that time? Reading, research, and I include here the work done preparing for courses and keeping up with one's field, these are as much a part of our job as scholarly research, are probably some of our work that is most contested, most open to debate about its value and who determines that. And it takes place in the larger context of American anti-intellectualism. Most people after tend to think of reading as entertainment, and work as its opposite, a job seemingly composed of entertainment is quite suspicious indeed! I think that in some ways this is a perspective many of our students share. The uselessness—or actually the lack of commercial value—of knowledge is a point made by many critics of the academy. So what can you do when a parent demands “What can you do with that?” Parents are of course concerned that they aren't squandering the tuition bills they pay, and they're unlikely to be mollified by soothing words. I try to draw concrete examples, and I generally root them in professional training rather than the disciplines.

Perhaps the easiest way to begin is to note how increasingly integrated the world is becoming. Called by a number of things, “globalization”, “global capitalism”, etc., it's not really anything anyone can stop or avoid, short of hiding under a rock. For business, globalization is a done deal. Business, trade, labor, all cross national lines. What about other professions? In medicine, all professionals serve an increasingly diverse population of patients who have different perceptions and understandings of illness, disease, and wellness. This is no new-age frill, but can have direct affects on the response of a patient to treatment or of the health care professional on the understanding of the patient. Education is in a similar situation, dealing with students from “all over” and with a wide range of preparations (or none!) needing to teach them all. What about ancillary professions like speech pathology and audiology? Where could an anthropological perspective be illuminating? Well, there is a self-conscious perception on the part of many deaf to think of themselves as a “culture” and of treatment as a kind of attack. Is this silly political correctness? Is it bad or good? I'd suggest that it just is and that knowing about identity and social organization can help someone in this field better understand the needs and concerns of her or his clients.

Social work too will increasingly serve people from a range of places with a range of ideas, expectations, understandings, and knowledges. Having at least a degree of exposure to these things, combined with the critical thinking that the liberal arts provides, can make that service better—more sensitive and meaningful.

I also note that for many students a major chosen in college is merely a prelude to a professional graduate program, and in
some of these the major is itself not important. Many students and their parents consider law school, and I note that any undergraduate major that teaches analytical and critical thinking, good writing, and thinking on one's feet is a fine preparation for legal studies. For those parents who worry that the only "employable" major is one in business, I suggest that the student take some business and mathematics electives and get the sort of on-the-job training that the business majors will also be acquiring. Again, employers look for good thinkers and writers and these qualities can carry a student far.

But parental demands are not the only concern that anthropologists in the academy must worry about. Sometimes it's all about the numbers—enrollments and a whole range of cultural factors like those parents I've been discussing, world events (the growth in numbers of students wishing to study Arabic has been amazing!), and even television—many criminal justice departments attribute some of their popularity to the currently multiplying CSI series on television. Such factors affect majors that appear "weak" where this is defined as limited enrollments, low numbers of majors and a seeming irrelevance to the current, unfortunately market driven needs of the college.

But here anthropology has an opportunity to reshape itself as part of professional training: with its broad focus, range of perspectives from the humanistic to the biological, and its tools of inquiry, anthropology can provide the tools that narrowly professional programs cannot, as I noted earlier. In my own case, anthropology courses are a popular choice among education majors planning to teach social studies; I use this as an opportunity to provide such students with a way of reaching a more diverse classroom and I encourage them to develop grade-level appropriate course materials based on some of the courses they take.

Anthropology as a profession has perhaps been slow at developing this, but here we are most likely to thrive. Far more students take anthropology courses at the undergraduate level than will ever go to graduate school; it is here that we reach out to parents and to future professionals alike to explain what we do best: describe, explore, and engage with the world.

The Crucible of Hard Budgetary Times: Connecting Anthropology to Trends in Higher Education

Debra Picchi, Professor of Anthropology
Franklin Pierce College
Rindge, NH 03461

These are bleak times. Prioritization, the arduous process whereby college administrators examine closely how funds are allocated to programs, has resulted in the termination of the sociology and women's studies programs at Franklin Pierce College where I work. We are not an exception. All over the country, higher education copes as
best it can with shrinking budgets and higher costs. Prioritization is considered one of the more rational ways that colleges and universities can decide which programs it will support with its limited funds. Yet where does that leave departments such as anthropology, never considered to be as central to the liberal arts as English or history?

Anthropology departments are developing strategies that ensure their survival and maximize their share of the budgetary pie. One such strategy involves connecting anthropology- program goals to larger higher education movements. Frequently such movements create the impetus for change in colleges and universities, and by linking up with them; anthropology departments demonstrate to administrators that they are on the cutting edge of education and that they might serve as an example for other programs.

One national movement that has received a great deal of attention at Franklin Pierce is the “Greater Expectations Initiative” sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities, referred to as the AAC&U in this paper. In 2002, this organization released a report that was based on two years of research. It describes a “New Academy” that embodies “intentional learning” for the twenty-first century. This New Academy provides high-quality undergraduate education that consists of practical, engaged liberal education. Such an education is inclusive, pragmatic, and socially responsible. To achieve this goal, the AAC&U calls for the end to what it calls “the traditional, artificial distinctions between liberal and practical education.”

In 2003, the AAC&U moved the “Greater Expectations Initiative” to Phase II. It named this phase “Achieving Greater Expectations.” Four working groups wrote practitioner guides, which provide professors and administrators with new curricular designs, pedagogical practices, and ways to assess student learning. In these guides, concepts such as the New Academy and intentional learning continue to be emphasized. However, outcomes, i.e. characteristics of intentional learners, are fleshed out. They are the ability to: (1) integrate knowledge across fields, and experiences (2) formulate and answer complex questions (3) understand and interrelate among global communities (4) engage in a diverse civic society.

The anthropology department at Franklin Pierce was convinced that much of what the AAC&U was promoting was consistent with anthropological goals and beliefs. It is clear that the discipline of anthropology, which consists of the four-field approach, requires the ability to integrate knowledge across fields. Most anthropologists routinely juggle biological, cultural, and archaeological/historical information in their research and teaching. Anthropologists also formulate and answer complex questions. Whether we are discussing hominid evolution or the
environmental impact of the European invasion of the New World, we seldom shy away from complicated subjects. I would also argue that we are one of the few social sciences that continue to deal with overarching questions that require holistic thinking. We take such questions such as “why are humans violent?” and “what forms does the human family take?” as a matter of course. Our fearlessness should push us into the public light more than it does, and it is perhaps because of our determination not to simplify the difficult questions that we frequently alienate college administrators and the media. Frankly, we lose them.

The third outcome or characteristic of an intentional learner has to do with the ability to understand and interrelate among global communities. If anthropologists cannot make the case that they do this and do it better than most, then something is wrong. For nearly two hundred years, we have painstakingly formulated the study of people and cultures. Generations of anthropologists have put together a huge bank of information. We also invented key concepts such as culture, cultural relativism, and ethnocentrism that have been appropriated by other fields, something that attests to their power.

Realizing that our program’s goals are compatible with those of the AAC&U’s was not enough. We had to explicitly frame them in terms of the New Academy and make sure that college administrators understood the connections if we were to survive and flourish in this financially-stressed environment. That was our first step. It is a process that we believe we will need to revisit time again until the next development in higher education takes place.

A second strategy took more thought and some curricular and pedagogical adjustments. The most general way in which the New Academy differs from the Old Academy is by the elimination of the distinction between the liberal and practical aspects of education. Briefly, the AAC&U is calling for more experiential, practical, and civically-grounded education. Toward this end we revised our curriculum so that we have book-end career-counseling sessions for our students. Book-end sessions imply that career counseling takes place at the beginning and end of the student’s academic career.

Specifically in one of the introductory courses students view the careers video made by the American Anthropological Association and do readings from Practicing Anthropology, the newsletter of the Society for Applied Anthropology. They write essays about which career appeals to them and why. Getting freshmen to begin the process of imagining what they can do with anthropology following graduation is a huge step. While it is appreciated by parents, students sometimes report feeling traumatized.

Of course, career counseling continues in one-on-one sessions with students through their college careers, but the next milestone is the practicum that
students must complete prior to graduation. The practicum requirement is fulfilled by either completing a local internship or an archaeological or an ethnographic field school. The emphasis is obviously on the student getting out there and doing anthropology. Examples of internships include working in museums, preparing curricular materials for local schools, excavating for local private archaeological firms, and working in coroner's offices. Journal writing and final essays allow the students to reflect on their experiences and imagine that line of work for themselves.

The second book-end experience comes during the student's senior year when they take the capstone experience in their major. This senior seminar revolves around the study of theory, ethics, and career issues. It involves reading and writing of course, but it also requires working through ethical case studies provided by the American Anthropological Association. The cases along with the code of ethics can be downloaded from the AAA web pages. The students take this seminar seriously. Whether they are going on to graduate school or going into the job market, they now have enough experience to appreciate the importance of ethics and the career issues we pose.

Another way we try to make the anthropology learning experience more pragmatic and engaged concerns bringing anthropology alumni and alumnae to campus to speak. They are either working in the field of anthropology or using anthropology in the jobs. Although we are a comparatively young institution, we are fortunate that the anthropology program has been in existence for nearly forty years. Recently we invited to speak at an anthropology honor society luncheon a man who graduated twenty years ago and who now works in city government. Another speaker graduated five years ago. She recently finished a tour with the Peace Corp and is now doing an internship with the UN. These people spoke cogently about how anthropological concepts and methods served them well in their jobs. Divisional chairs, the dean, and parents who were present understood and valued the explicit connection these graduates were drawing between their careers and the anthropology curriculum.

Casting anthropology in the light of engaged, pragmatic education also benefits from demonstrating how anthropology can contribute to the successful delivery of popular programs such as criminal justice, international business, and education. These majors have clear applications in the so-called real world and provide career tracks that are easily understood by parents and students alike. Our department has aggressively sought to establish relations with these programs. We have been surprising successful with criminal justice in that we created a course called Violence and Aggression that is a popular elective for criminal justice students. We regularly fill two sections at a time and are always under pressure to open more sections.
Our efforts with international business were more straightforward in that we simply created a course directed at sensitizing students to cultural differences when they work abroad. This course does not generate a lot of student enrollment, possibly because business enrollments are down in general at our college. However, it has provided a foothold into the Business Division for us that we may be able to build upon in the future.

The education program has been our toughest challenge. However, it is one I believe we need to continue to work on because it is through helping to train future public school teachers that we anthropologists will effect positive change in how Americans approach their participation in the global community. The problems seems to be that in the state of New Hampshire, and at our college, education students have so many different requirements that it is nearly impossible for them to cram one more course into their schedules. Thus, we had to infiltrate existing programs, creating courses that would, at the same time, be acceptable to the faculty in the programs in question and attractive to education students. This was not easy. Our one clear success was *Women Around the World*, which anthropologists would recognize as a cross-cultural survey course but was accepted by the American studies faculty into their program because we agreed to provide a comparison of women in other cultures with those in America.

In conclusion, the anthropology program survived prioritization at Franklin Pierce College where sociology did not. I believe that linking the program to trends in higher education helped the administration to see it in a different light. Rather than emphasizing the study of hominid ancestors and cultures that exist on the periphery, we managed to convince administrators that our program was “relevant” in their terms, in terms of goals and objectives set out by organizations that are important to them.
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We have set up a list serve to provide an informal discussion forum during the year. This list serve is a 'machine' not a person-- there are two separate addresses to use.

To **subscribe** or **unsubscribe** - Send message to this address:

MDaemon@cstl.semo.edu

Your message will be **EITHER**

SUBSCRIBE FOSAP@CSTL.SEMO.EDU  OR  UNSUBSCRIBE FOSAP@CSTL.SEMO.EDU

To post a message - Use this address:

FOSAP@CSTL.SEMO.EDU

If someone is interested in what you post and replies, you should forward the reply and your response on to the entire list serve at FOSAP@CSTL.SEMO.EDU

Using this process, we can keep a 'thread' or discussion topic active among the subscribers to the list serve. To keep down too many messages, the person responsible for a topic might try to send out a single combined posting only once a day. If you start a topic, and want me to handle the replies, just forward the message to me, cmorrow@semo.edu and I'll handle the process.

**PLEASE BE AWARE OF THE TWO DIFFERENT ADDRESSES**

MDaemon@cstl.semo.edu = message to a machine (only subscribe or unsubscribe)

FOSAP@CSTL.SEMO.EDU = message to everyone on the list serve

If you find yourself stuck on this list serve and cannot get off, please call me during the week at work, or send me an email and I will call you to help.

Carol A. Morrow, Professor of Anthropology
Southeast Missouri State University; 1 (573) 651 – 5934  cmorrow@semo.edu
ANTHROPOLOGY MAJOR SURVEY

Julie Pelletier, Assistant Professor of Anthropology (University of Minnesota, Morris)

The following information may be used in a number of ways. Dr. Pelletier will include a summary of your responses in a paper she is presenting at the American Anthropological Association meetings in November on meeting the needs of anthropology majors in a small program. The Anthropology Discipline may also utilize the information as part of planning and assessment. Your participation is voluntary and deeply appreciated; I hope that you can appreciate the value of social research as you take a few minutes to fill out this survey. Feel free to add comments to the end of the survey and email it back to me at pelletja@morris.umn.edu with "SURVEY" in the subject line. Or print it and slide it under my door - 18 Camden - or hand it in at the Social Science office. Thanks again!

1. What is your specific interest in the field of anthropology?
   a. cultural/area studies
   b. archaeological
   c. linguistic
   d. physical/biological/forensic
   e. museum studies
   f. other

2. Have you participated in any of the following opportunities? Check all that apply.
   □ International study abroad, including May or summer sessions
   □ National student exchange
   □ Anthropology internship
   □ Anthropology directed study
   □ Semester or year at another campus
   □ Archaeological field school
   □ Cultural/area studies field school

3. Have you or do you plan to participate in IRB/human subjects research while at UMM?
   □ Yes
   □ No

4. Do you plan to attend graduate school?
   □ Yes
   □ No

5. List your other major(s) and minor(s).

6. What is your overall impression of the Anthropology Discipline at UMM? Strengths? Weaknesses?