

**Department of Anthropology:
2012 Annual Report to CAPR
(Spring 2011-Winter 2012)**

A. Self-Study

The anthropology department at CSU East Bay continues to relish the challenge of delivering the highest-quality instruction we can possibly offer in the context of shrinking university resources. Our **5.2 FTE of faculty** taught a total of 49 sections between Spring 2011 and Fall 2012, with a total SCU of 7334, significantly over our annual PEMSA target. Because our discipline requires us to offer some smaller classes (for osteological and archaeological work, to study field methods, and for hands-on learning to design and mount the annual museum exhibit, as well as for our graduate program), we have had to balance these with a number of very large classes. Our fall 2012 undergraduate SFR (taken from institutional research data) was **34.5**, and we are consistently hitting quarterly SFR totals of 34 or higher. Given that we do not have a large, captive major pool, to reach this productivity goal we offer GE-qualified classes in a variety of modes and areas (science, social science, and humanities). The advantage of this is that it allows us to reach a broad swath of the CSUEB student body, exposing them to the message of the unity in human diversity, and to the specifics of human social and cultural products and processes. During this period our plucky office staff have been able to keep the department functional on an S&S budget this year of \$826 (\$68.83 per month, or **\$2.26 a day** – office supplies on less than the price of a latte). The used-book buyers trolling the hallways enabled the department chair to supplement this with a small kitty fund of tens of dollars acquired from selling old volumes of her own book collection.

Instructional FTEF trends: Between fall 2007 and 2011, our instructional FTEF was **efficientized by 25%**: we went from 6.9 instructional FTEF to a lean-and-mean 5.2. Our lecturer allocation has been whittled down from 1.6 to 0.5 FTEF, which has reduced our dependence on lecturer FTEF from 23% to just 10%. Wow! The small size of our faculty body facilitates a great deal of faculty participation in department governance, as in many cases all eligible faculty must serve on committees to meet minimum numbers. We have also been encouraged to tighten up our use of precious release-time resources, with Chair release time reduced from 4 classes to 3 classes per annum, the elimination of the one class release for a graduate coordinator, and holding the Museum Director to one class per year to manage the museum exhibits and collections. While this leaves us inadequate time to manage our programs, it does allow our department's TT faculty to teach a total of 2 more classes a year, at the cost only of inefficiencies in operations, lowered morale, and poorer health. The less than \$8,000 total that it would cost to reinstate the release time and hire lecturers to teach the two sections is, we understand, a luxury the university can ill afford. A realistic allocation of release time to run the museum is an even more ludicrous dream. We understand all that. We simply observe.

Student stress: We are witnessing the stress on students from increased tuition and

fees, anxiety about the economic environment, and fears about the future of the CSU. Many students who are performing poorly in our classes report that they are taking extra units in order to get the classes they need to graduate before the budget eliminates too many sections. They are disappointed to find that they do not do as well with such a heavy load (in addition to the responsibilities they have outside school), but we cannot dismiss their worries about degree completion, given the budgetary outlook. I'm sorry, but I can't think of a bright side to this one, except that the Chancellor's cap on units next year will put an end to this student strategy, and if it doesn't kill enrollments and quash necessary classes, it might help students do better. Oh, the other bright side is that more students come to office hours (or send emails to the professors) to complain about the grades they receive. This is an opportunity for one-on-one faculty/student contact.

Staffing Center: In Summer 2011 the anthropology department joined philosophy, criminal justice, and ethnic studies in a shared support staff structure. Overall, this seems to be functioning well, with two capable, full-time support staff members. Although in living memory these four departments were supported by four staff persons, it is amazing what two extremely well-qualified administrative people can accomplish! In truth, they are doing a fabulous job, but they are under enormous stress and an additional half FTE would clearly help them avoid burn-out. (As we cut staffing across the university, continuity is essential since the learning-curve is steep with fewer staff and broader responsibilities. It is also important to remember that as faculty and chairs are asked to take on more administrative tasks, our dependence on knowledgeable admin staff grows, further increasing the importance of continuity and worker satisfaction in those support positions.) 2.5 FTE across four departments would not seem to be excessive ... although there are people in management who are clearly drawing on a deeper base of data than I have access to when they make their rational decisions about staffing allocations. I expect the idea that faculty work hours are infinitely expandable despite their higher salary costs is part of the calculation, but I have not been privy to the discussions that have led to a reduction in administrative support at the department level.

Faculty activities: The faculty of our department are engaged in a rich body of work in and outside of the classroom. Some highlights (not all professional activities are included): Laurie Price chaired a session at the annual meeting of the Society for Applied Anthropology; the session was called, "Energy and Climate Change," and her paper was "Climate Change Activists Across Cultures." Andrew Wong, with a colleague outside CSUEB, was a finalist in the Teaching Innovation Competition of the Marketing Management Association. With the same colleague he has, in press, an article on "Teaching consumer-oriented ethnographic research," to appear in the Marketing Education Review. He has also presented "Different in Context: The meanings of orthographic variation," at the New Ways of Analyzing Variation (NWAV40) Conference at Georgetown University in 2001. This year George Miller helped to install the *Virtual Machu Picchu* interactive exhibit in the UNSAAC-Yale International Center for the Study of Machu Picchu and Inca Culture and the Casa

Concha Museum, Cusco, Peru, August, 2001. He is curating *The Magic Lantern: Illuminating a Bygone Era* at our C.E. Smith Museum of Anthropology. Henry Gilbert was in the field in Ethiopia, conducting paleoanthropological research and working with the National Museum in Ethiopia on research and exhibits when this annual report was being prepared, and so he was unavailable to supply specifics of his achievements, but we will detail them in the next annual report. Laura Nelson completed her sabbatical year in the summer (2011), and since her return she organized a panel for the annual meeting of the American Anthropological Association (in Montreal) on transnational planning cultures and presented a paper at that panel on demographic planning in South Korea, and also was an invited discussant at a different panel of the same conference; in January she gave a colloquium talk on breast cancer in South Korea at Harvard's Korean Institute. Alan Almquist, Emeritus but still active in the department as an instructor and colleague, was appointed the scientific advisor to the Board of Trustees of the Leakey Foundation, and was re-elected to the Board of Trustees of the Stone Age Institute at the University of Indiana.

Majors and enrollments: Our undergraduate and graduate majors are holding steady over the past five years, after a doubling of the major in the middle years of the last decade (2000s). The official Fall 2011 count of 47 undergraduate and 28 graduate majors is not far off the Blackboard-populated list, which records 59 undergraduate and 31 graduate students. We would like to increase our majors, and have worked to support a student-led anthropology club, but it is difficult to find the time resources to recruit new students to the major, given the demands on faculty time. In a recent faculty retreat, we generated a few ideas for recruiting new students, and will work on these beginning in the summer. We are dedicated to the principle of recruiting new students, in part as a way to contribute to the diversification of the discipline: the majority of anthropology professors are still of Euro-American descent, and recruiting students from different cultural backgrounds at the undergraduate level is critical to increasing the diversity of interests, ideas, and role models in our field. We would welcome a time-release program for departments with similar interests to develop outreach activities to student groups that might not otherwise consider majoring in lesser-known but important fields such as ours.

Curriculum: We continue to make minor adjustments to the curriculum, both in the mix of classes and in the specifics of the class content.

B. Assessment Report

As per our Five Year Review, we altered our assessment procedures to make it easier to collect the data and analyze it. Due to the extreme restrictions on faculty time and our expanding workload in this budgetary environment, however, we have not systematically collected the data, nor have we analyzed it. We have some data archived, awaiting analysis. Henry Gilbert has also been developing new assessment tools, one of which will be piloted in Spring 2012.

C. Statistical Report

California State University, East Bay

APR Summary Data

Fall 2007 – 2011

Anthropology	Fall Quarter				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
A. Students					
1. Undergraduate	40	53	53	32	47
2. Graduate	22	22	22	27	28
3. Total Number of Majors	62	75	75	59	75
4. FTES Generated	187.3	188.7	166.4	142.1	160.1
College Years					
B. Degrees Awarded					
	06-07	07-08	08-09	09-10	10-11
1. Undergraduate	10	5	11	12	13
2. Graduate	12	8	5	10	6
3. Total	22	13	16	22	19
Fall Quarter					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
C. Faculty					
Tenured/Track Headcount					
1. Full-Time	4	5	5 (4)*	4 (3)*	4
2. Part-Time	2	1	1	1	1
3. Total Tenure Track	6	6	6 (5)*	5 (4)*	5
Lecturer Headcount					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	5	7	7	3	2
6. Total Non-Tenure Track	5	7	7	3	2
7. Grand Total All Faculty	11	13	13 (12)*	8 (7)*	7
Instructional FTE Faculty					
8. Tenured/Track	5.3	5.7	5.7 (4.7)*	4.7 (3.7)*	4.7
9. Lecturer	1.6	2.1	2.1	1.1	0.5
10. Total Instructional FTEF	6.9	7.8	7.8 (6.8)*	5.8 (4.8)*	5.2
Lecturer Teaching					
11. % Lecturer/Total Instructional FTEF	23%	27%	27%(31%)	19%(23%)	10%
12. FTES Taught by Lecturer	41.3	42.1	76	36	16.8
13. % FTES Lecture/FTES Generated	22%	22%	46%	25%	10.5%
D. Student Faculty Ratios					
1. Tenured/Track	24.3	27.8	26.1	28.4	33.1
2. Lecturer	7.5	19.7	38.1	34.9	31.5
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	16.3	25.5	30.5	29.8	32.9
4. Lower Division	31.1	37.9	38.4	50.1	60.1
5. Upper Division	15.1	24.0	30.0	26.0	32.6
6. Graduate	4.4	9.1	11.4	14.4	8.3
7. Number of Sections Offered	29	30			
8. Average Section Size	27	30			

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>

* During two consecutive years, 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, one TT faculty member was on sabbatical leave each entire academic year. (These were two different professors, each taking a one-year sabbatical.) The official (higher) number reflects the *employment status* as a member of the faculty, but during these two years FTE TT *teaching* faculty was one FTE less than the official records represent (and is shown in parentheses).