WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM FACULTY RESPONSE TO THE USHE BOARD OF REGENTS FIVE-YEAR REVIEW EVALUATION TEAM REPORT April 2017

Compiled by Brooke S. Arkush Professor of Anthropology and Anthropology Program Coordinator

Full-time faculty members of the Weber State University Anthropology Program have reviewed the evaluation team's recommendations, and our collective response is as follows:

Recommendation #1 - Allocate one additional tenure-track line specifically to the Anthropology Program.

Faculty response – We tend to agree with this recommendation but do not know at this time if our program's Student Credit Hour average over the last five years or so warrant a sixth tenure-track line. If we were allocated a new full-time position in Anthropology, then we probably would hire either a Biological Anthropologist or a Linguistic Anthropologist. At the present time, two of our faculty members focus on Cultural Anthropology and two of them focus on Archaeology. Therefore, hiring either a Biological or Linguistic Anthropologist would allow us to develop upper division courses in one of these two sub-fields, which would be a welcome addition to our curriculum.

Recommendation #2 - Improve adjunct compensation in consideration of the commitment of its adjuncts in this Program.

Faculty response – We certainly agree that our adjunct faculty, as well as many other WSU adjunct faculty members, deserve a higher pay rate. It is our understanding that the University-wide adjunct pay rate is \$920/credit hour (\$2,760 for a 3 credit hour course). This rate has not increased much over the past ten years or so, and probably is lower than that paid by comparable USHE institutions such as Utah Valley University. Of course, any increase in the adjunct pay rate hinges on additional funding being provided by the State Legislature, and then allocated by the State Board of Regents, the WSU Board of Trustees, and the WSU Faculty Senate's Salary, Benefits, Budget, and Fiscal Planning Committee.

Recommendation #3 - Provide funding for faculty study abroad leadership and participation.

Faculty response – We prefer that full-time faculty who lead Study Abroad Programs receive in-load teaching credit for this activity, as has been the case since the Summer of 2016. If a full-time faculty member desires to receive overload teaching remuneration for a Study Abroad trip, then it should be built into the Anthropology Program's Continuing Education budget for that term.

Recommendation #4 - Increase the standard amount per faculty member for travel and professional development.

Faculty response – We wholeheartedly agree with this recommendation and hope that the Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences can consistently allocate additional funding for faculty professional development activities in the immediate future.

Recommendation #5 - Develop at least two upper-level courses in biological anthropology to provide a robust learning experience in this field.

Faculty response – In general, we agree with this recommendation. If our program hired a tenure-track Biological Anthropologist, then we would request that she/he develop two upper division Biological Anthropology courses (e.g., Paleoanthropology) within their first two years on campus. During the last five years, various Anthropology Program graduates who have completed exit interviews indicated a desire to have completed upper division Biological Anthropology coursework, so student demand for such classes does exist.

Recommendation #6 - Seek to enhance the linguistics component of the program by incorporating some aspects of the linguistics minor into the electives list for Anthropology, or, if this cannot be done, it might be appropriate to examine the wisdom of trying to maintain a "four field" anthropology major with only one introductory linguistics course.

Faculty response – We certainly can explore the possibility of incorporating courses that can be used to satisfy the Linguistics Minor into the General Anthropology Track electives section for those students who are interested in Anthropological Linguistics. Examples of such course are COMM 3080 – Intercultural Communication, and ENGL 3040 – History of the English Language.

Recommendation #7 - Develop assessment procedures and measures that can be administered above and beyond the use of grades on assignments.

Faculty response – We will investigate ways of doing this in selected lower division General Education and upper division courses. Perhaps such a goal can be accomplished through preand post-testing on core anthropological concepts (e.g., cultural relativism, biological and cultural evolution, adaptation, and ethnicity vs. race) in all sections of ANTH 1000. The level of understanding of these core concepts by our majors in their junior and senior years could then be gauged by administering this test once again in either the Anthropological Theory or Anthropological Research Methods course.

Recommendation #8 - For the current assessment procedures and measures, develop a statement of learning thresholds for acceptable performance on measures.

Faculty response – We plan to begin discussing the establishment of a program-wide learning threshold. For example, we could require that 60% or more of students in all Anthropology courses must answer course-specific, competency-based questions correctly at the level of 60% or better for this goal to be achieved.

Recommendation #9 - Revisit the Mission Statement to ensure that it does, in fact, reflect the priorities that faculty are emphasizing in their courses and the course outcomes.

Faculty response – This is a timely suggestion. With two new tenure-track hires over the last two academic years, we should revisit the Anthropology Program's Mission Statement in order to make appropriate changes that reflect new emphases in our core lower and upper division courses.