

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice-President, Academic

Memorandum

To: Senate

From: J.M. Munro, Chair, Senate Committee on Academic Planning

Subject: External Review - Department of Archaeology

Date: 19 March, 1992

Attached is a summary of the report of the Department of Archaeology External Review committee for the information of Senate. The review was discussed at the Senate Committee on Academic Planning, and the committee voted to receive the report.

The report of the Review Committee and the response of the Department, is available in Secretariat Services, Registrar's Office, for any Senator who wishes to read the complete documents.



Attachment

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

EXTERNAL REVIEW

17-19 February, 1991

Reviewers:

Dr. Nicholas David, Chair
Chair, Department of Archaeology
University of Calgary

Dr. Paul Healy
Department of Archaeology
Trent University

Dr. Emöke Szathmary
Department of Archaeology
and Dean, Faculty of Social Science
University of Western Ontario

Dr. Arthur Roberts, Internal member
Department of Geography, SFU

Executive Summary

Departmental Resources

1. The Department of Archaeology boasts a first-rate faculty, whose publication and external funding records are excellent, and who enjoy well-deserved national and international reputations. An obvious gender imbalance (8.5:0.5) needs to be corrected.
2. The existing faculty complement is inadequate to support the current undergraduate and graduate programs. The Committee recommends the appointment of two new faculty, the first in the area of physical anthropology (human genetics), the second in archaeology (complex societies).
3. The Department has been well-served by its administrative and clerical support staff. Restructuring of duties will be required at the retirement of the DA. The University's Financial Services should offer better

- support to the Department and its members, especially in the area of grant accounting.
4. A third member of technical staff is urgently required whether or not the mandates of the Museum and Laboratories of Archaeology are revised in order to realize their potential contributions to the University and public at large.
 5. While space for teaching, research and offices is very inadequate, renovation of existing space (mainly the Museum and Loading Bay) combined with provision of storage away from the main campus would solve immediate problems relatively cheaply, and do more than anything else for departmental well-being and productivity.
 6. The Department is fairly well supplied with equipment of all kinds. However, lack of funds for maintenance and replacement is resulting in a major debt to the future.
 7. While the Museum and Radiocarbon Laboratory operating budgets are inadequate to ensure effective functioning, in other respects the operating and capital budgets, although small and diminishing in real terms, are unfortunately not out of line with those of similar programs at other Canadian universities.
 8. Retention of the TA and Sessional budgets in the hands of the higher administration results in greatly reduced capacity of the Department Chair to plan the strategy and tactics of departmental development.
 9. Library holdings in archaeology are not keeping up with the needs of a Department with active graduate and research programs.

The Undergraduate Program

10. The strength of the undergraduate program lies in its strong focus on methods and techniques and on North Western North American archaeology.
11. The high proportion of courses currently taught by sessional instructors devalues the degree. The addition of two faculty would, in conjunction with the provision of larger teaching laboratories, largely solve this problem besides adding a new dimension to the archaeological side and rendering the physical anthropology program fully viable.

12. Increased enrollment in Archaeology courses requires increases in faculty, teaching laboratory space and the Department's efforts in advertising their courses throughout the University.
13. The redesign of the undergraduate program currently in progress should result in restructuring of prerequisites and course sequences, greater consistency in expectations and grading, and reassessment of the division of labour between continuing faculty, sessionals and TAs.
14. The Committee recommends that certain graduate courses be made available to senior undergraduates.
15. Initiatives such as the Co-op program and possible joint degrees with Anthropology and the Biological Sciences are to be welcomed. A BSc in Archaeology would be appropriate given the makeup of the Department.
16. While relations between staff and students are generally good, the faculty must guard against gender bias.
17. Both the academic and social aspects of the field school require to be more formally stated in order that faculty and students expectations may coincide.

The Graduate Program

18. By the measures of research, publications and marketability of graduates, the MA and PhD programs are demonstrably successful.
19. Nonetheless the course offerings are inadequate and contribute to an excessive average length of time spent in program. Many of the constraints here are the same as in the undergraduate program and must be similarly overcome.
20. The reassessment of the Graduate Program presently in progress should include reconsideration of the necessity for formal colloquia and possibly also supervisory committees at the MA level, and in any case emphasize the supervisory committee's collective responsibility for guidance of students.
21. The benefits in terms of future job opportunities of greater exposure of students to cultural and social anthropology and anthropological linguistics also require reassessment.
22. The departmental *Guide to the Archaeology Graduate Program* should be expanded and made available to all applicants for admission.

23. Long completion times and high drop out rates in the MA program have complex causations that we lack evidence to diagnose in detail. However, lack of availability of graduate courses and in some cases excessive demands by faculty are certainly contributory factors, as is inadequate financial support.
24. No doubt similar factors also contribute to the long completion times and a high withdrawal rate among male students enrolled in the PhD program. Some restructuring is also required in this area.
25. Present sources of graduate funding are inadequate. A small downsizing of the MA program until such time as graduate funding can be improved should be seriously considered.
26. To encourage excellence, any additional Graduate Fellowships that may be instituted should be awarded on the basis of student and departmental quality.

The Laboratories and the Museum

27. The present radiocarbon laboratory should be reconfigured as an Archaeometry Laboratory under the direction of Dr. Erle Nelson.
28. The Museum had failed in terms of its present mandate well before the recent appointment of an energetic and innovative curator. It and the 'Laboratories of Archaeology' should now be integrated into a 'Museum of Archaeological Science' for which an exciting future seems assured if some renovations can be undertaken and a third member of technical staff recruited.

Administration and Governance

29. The Chair requires increased authority in order to exercise leadership and to oversee effectively the future implementation of the major reappraisal of the teaching and related functions of the Department that is presently underway.
30. Membership of departmental committees should be reviewed with a view to substantial reductions in their memberships.
31. External relations of the Department both within and beyond the University appear excellent.

THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

An External Review

12 April, 1991

submitted to Simon Fraser University

by

Nicholas David (Chair),
Department of Archaeology, University of Calgary

Paul Healy,
Department of Anthropology, Trent University

Emöke Szathmary,
*Department of Anthropology and Dean, Faculty of Social Science,
University of Western Ontario*

Contents

PART I - INTRODUCTION		
I	Preamble	1
II	The review of 1975	2
PART II - RESOURCES		
III	The Faculty	3
	1. Size and background in relation to responsibilities and workload	3
	2. Research and teaching contributions, and external research support	5
IV	Support staff	6
	1. Administrative, Secretarial and Clerical	6
	2. Technical	7
V	Physical plant and other material resources	8
	1. Space	8
	2. Other resources: budgets, equipment, computers, library	9
PART III - PROGRAMS AND ORGANISATION		
VI	The Undergraduate Program	12
	1. Program and course structure	12
	3. Staff-student relations	17
	4. The Field school	18
	5. Appeals and Consistency	19
	6. Undergraduate support	19
VII	The Graduate Programs	20
	1. Introduction and quality of graduate student research	20
	2. Program content and structure	21
	3. Graduate supervision and guidance	23
	4. Graduate student progress	25
	MA level	26
	PhD level	27
	5. Adequacy of support for graduate students and the size of the program	29
VIII	The Laboratories and the Museum	30
	1. The Radiocarbon/Archaeometry Laboratory	30
	2. The Museum and the 'Laboratories of Archaeology'	31
IX	Administration and Governance	33
	1. Internal	33
	2. University relations	34
	3. Beyond the University	34
X	A Brief Conclusion	35
PART IV - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY		
	Departmental Resources	35
	The Undergraduate Program	36
	The Graduate Program	37
	The Laboratories and the Museum	37
	Administration and Governance	38

PART I - INTRODUCTION

I Preamble

The members of the 1991 Review Committee of the Department of Archaeology were Dr. Nicholas David (University of Calgary), Dr. Paul Healy (Trent University), Dr. Emöke Szathmary (University of Western Ontario) and Dr. Arthur Roberts (Geography, Simon Fraser University). The Committee decided that Dr. Roberts should participate in all of its activities except the interviews held with members of faculty, staff and students of the Department of Archaeology. Preparation of the Review Report was the responsibility of the external members of the Review Committee.

Members of the Review Committee assembled on the evening of February 17 for a preliminary consultation with Dr. J. M. Munro, Vice-President (Academic). During the next two days interviews were held with Dr. R. C. Brown (Dean of Arts), Dr. B. P. Clayman (Dean of Graduate Studies), and with members of faculty, staff and undergraduate and graduate students of the Department of Archaeology.

Professor J. D. Nance, Chair of the Department of Archaeology served as the Review Committee's guide to the Department. Interviews were held with Professors D. Burley, R. Carlson, J. Driver, K. Fladmark, B. Galdikas, B. Hayden, P. Hobler, J. Nance, E. Nelson, M. Skinner. Time did not permit an interview with Professor Emeritus R. Shutler, although informal discussion was possible. Meetings were also held with particular responsibility/interest groups. These included the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (all faculty, but with Professors Driver, Hayden, Nance, Nelson and Skinner [Chair], and Mrs. I. Nystrom [Departmental Assistant] actually present); the Graduate Committee (all faculty, with Professors Carlson, Driver, Hayden, Hobler, Nance, Nelson [Chair] and Skinner actually present); undergraduate students (speakers: K. Berry, L. Erickson, P. Merchant, S. Montgomery, J. Turner); graduate students (spokespersons: C. Knusel and W. Prentiss); the Curator of the Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Barbara Winter; the Departmental Assistant, Mrs. I. Nystrom, and technicians and secretarial staff (L. Bannister, A. Barton, J. Breffit, and D. Kask, a former member of the clerical staff, recently transferred to another department). The review concluded with a final meeting of the Review Committee with Dean Brown and Vice-President Munro, and Ms. A. J. Watt, Director, Academic Planning Services.

The Review Committee wishes to acknowledge its appreciation to the administrative officers of the University and to the members of the Department of Archaeology for their frankness. In particular we wish to thank the faculty and students for the courtesy shown to us, and for their prompt and satisfactory responses to our requests for more detailed, supplementary information.

Documentation sent to the members of the Review Committee prior to the review visit included the *Internal Review Report* prepared by the Department of Archaeology, the *Internal Review Appendices*, and the *1990-91 Calendar*. Materials received during visit included a written submission (40 pp) from the Archaeology Student Society (undergraduate students), *A Guide to the Archaeology Graduate Program* (revised, 1990), the *Collective Agreements between Simon Fraser University and the Teaching Support Staff Union*, the *Simon Fraser University Fact Book* (Dec. 1990), and the *Graduate Studies Fact Book* (Jan. 1991). Dean Clayman also provided the Review Committee with current Archaeology graduate statistics, and Professor Nance assembled a set of data on past and present graduate student enrollments and outcomes together with a file of recent CVs of MA and PhD graduates of the programme. We later also received the tripartite external review of the Department carried out in 1975.

II The review of 1975

The first external review of the Department was carried out in 1975 by Professor R. D. Daugherty (Washington State U.), Professor R. B. Forbis (U. of Calgary) and Professor Emeritus C. E. Borden (UBC), each of whom responded individually. At that time the Department had seven continuing full-time staff (CFL) if we count Dr Mark Skinner, who was about to replace the recently deceased Dr McKern. The Department today numbers eight CFL, plus one half-time (Fladmark) and one one-third-time (Galdikas) CFL faculty.

If one discounts some apparent rivalry between UBC and SFU, there was substantial agreement between the external reviewers who considered that:

- a) the Department had excellent faculty and (in spite of gross inequities in funding between the Faculties of Arts and of Science) offered one of the best archaeology programs in Canada and the best in British Columbia,
- b) after an initial period during which the prime concern had been to establish the teaching programs of the Department, it was time to emphasize research,
- c) more faculty (up to three), support staff and space were required (the Department was about to move into its present accommodation and this was already perceived as inadequate),
- d) the undergraduate program was generally satisfactory and produced good students even though course offerings were somewhat irregular. In CEB's view more integration of anthropology *sensu lato* was needed and the field school raised particular concerns,
- e) the products of the graduate program were appreciated in the job market (which CEB seriously underestimated), however
- f) the graduate program itself was too unstructured and the ratio of faculty to supervisees was too low,
- g) resulting in various problems regarding the funding of graduates and their length in program.

Fifteen years later the Department has amply demonstrated its collective ability to conceive and carry out first class research and its members enjoy well-deserved reputations within the discipline. In this respect the wheel appears to have turned full circle, and it is time to turn attention again to the teaching function. Otherwise, it is our contention, the same issues that exercised the reviewers of 1975 are of concern today -- though we lack the information to track their trajectories in the intervening years.

PART II - RESOURCES

In Part II we consider the resources available within the Department, and amongst them the faculty members themselves. For convenience sake, the research carried out by faculty members is also discussed here, rather than in part III.

III The Faculty

1. Size and background in relation to responsibilities and workload

There are eight (8) continuing full time faculty and two (2) continuing part-time faculty in the Department. These individuals constitute the core of the archaeology program. Their efforts are supplemented in the areas of teaching and supervision by one professor emeritus, three associate faculty (of other departments), an adjunct professor, and a significant and growing number of term appointments.

The background of the continuing, regular faculty is strong, with some members internationally recognized in their discipline. All but one have doctorates, with a good institutional representation (primarily from major Canadian universities, but also from the U.S. and England). Overall, the regular faculty are at mid-career (average age: 43.3 years) with only one retirement likely in the next seven years (when another external review is scheduled). All faculty ranks are represented in the Department but with a larger proportion in the senior levels (1 Asst Prof, 3 Assoc. Prof, 6 Full Prof). There is an obvious gender imbalance in the Department faculty with 10 men and only 1 woman (a part-time faculty member). The imbalance is all the more serious in that female students compose about half of the undergraduate and graduate enrollment in archaeology, and a number of these expressed a strong desire to see the imbalance alleviated through new appointments.

It was apparent from the Internal Review Report (IRR) and from separate committee meetings with both undergraduate and graduate students that the continuing full-time faculty complement in Archaeology is inadequate to maintain either the current undergraduate or graduate programs (per the SFU calendar). The four course workloads (eight class hours/week in two of the three trimesters), to which must be added substantial graduate student supervision, are normal. As indicated in Table 2.3 of the IRR the

Department has been forced, more and more, into the less satisfactory position of employing short-term appointments (sessionals). In recent trimesters up to 45% of regular archaeology undergraduate courses were taught by sessionals and the committee heard negative comments from students claiming to have never had the opportunity to take a senior course from a regular faculty member on staff. Some complained bitterly of being disadvantaged in their applications for graduate school admissions because of the heavy usage of sessionals in the Department. See VI.1 below.

While part of the problem is related to the tradition in the Archaeology Department of permitting faculty to operate multi-credit summer field courses, thereby nearly satisfying in one term their annual teaching workload obligations, it remains apparent that the program needs additional faculty.

At the graduate level the problem is equally serious, and compounded by the part-time status of two senior faculty. Graduate students complained of an inadequate number of graduate-level course offerings in any trimester due to undergraduate teaching commitments by current full-time faculty. Given the small number (8) of continuing full-time faculty the program has a large number of graduate students, and attracts strong applicants from across Canada. There was serious student interest expressed during our meetings in the expansion of the physical anthropology component of the Department, and a strong desire (expressed by students and faculty alike) for one additional archaeologist (with a specialisation in ancient civilizations according to the IRR). With additional appointments in these areas the teaching load problem could be alleviated, regularization of graduate courses would be possible, as would a greater diversification of undergraduate offerings.

The committee is of the view that the Department, in order to continue its current undergraduate and graduate course offerings, must be provided by the University with additional faculty as soon as possible. As will be described in the next section (III.2), the Department has done an excellent job in attracting external funds and publishing its research. It is a first-rate academic unit and made a strong case, in the committee's view, that for curricular renewal, and to handle the growing number of students enrolled in archaeology, they need at least two additional positions (above the current complement). It was the view of the external committee as well that the first of these new appointments should be in physical anthropology, to provide real critical mass in an area that has long been under serious pressure, and the second in archaeology.

With regard to the former, the addition of a new physical anthropologist to the faculty would alleviate one of the current human resource problems in the Department. Professor Skinner is overextended, as he does a very considerable amount of graduate supervision (MA and PhD) and disproportionate undergraduate teaching in his field. From a disciplinary perspective, a third

person would add depth and variety of course offerings. With three physical anthropologists on faculty, Simon Fraser would have the largest aggregation of physical anthropologists in the province, and would be the only BC university that could easily supervise students through a reasonably balanced graduate program. The Departmental brief indicated preference for a human biologist. This makes good sense, given the Department's focus on British Columbia which contains a large and diverse Native population whose genetics and biology are virtually unknown. A laboratory-oriented person with a genetics focus would be equally useful, given the research potential offered by excavated human remains. Modern techniques in molecular biology permit determination of inherited traits from mummified tissue as well as bone. The addition of such an individual would put the Department at the frontier of research currently undertaken by physical anthropologists.

As to the additional archaeological position, we are of the view that a specialization in the archaeology of complex societies would, by adding an important topical domain, offer the most benefit a Department that specializes in the archaeology of hunter-gatherer and other relatively simple societies. The Department's request for a third additional member of faculty is less pressing, though a palaeoethnobotanist would nicely round out the range of topical expertise presently existing in the Department.

2. Research and teaching contributions, and external research support

The publication and external funding records of the continuing faculty are excellent. In the 5-year period from 1985-1990, the 10 regular faculty produced 12 authored or edited books, 85 refereed articles, 29 book chapters, and collectively delivered more than 60 professional papers. The journal publications include some of the most prestigious outlets available to the disciplines of archaeology and physical anthropology. Similarly, external funding, awarded from major federal research councils (SSHRC or NSERC), or provincial contracts, has been both frequent and substantial during this same period. More than half of the regular faculty, for example, have been awarded in excess of \$100,000 each (some twice that amount, one individual three times the amount). From 1985-1990, the average external funding (grants and contracts) per faculty member/annum was about \$29,000. Every member is actively involved in on-going research. It is a very productive faculty, and one which has brought considerable national and international recognition to Simon Fraser University.

While the research and publication contributions of the faculty is uniformly impressive, the committee received somewhat more mixed reports from students about the teaching in the Department. Certainly most faculty received, overall, quite favorable ratings and it is clear that the faculty are regularly developing and introducing new academic courses, while dropping less effective ones, to enhance the Department curriculum. These are important, and time consuming, measures which deserve

recognition and activities which should be continued. A review of course syllabi, required texts, and final examinations in archaeology, revealed fairly standard topical coverage and expectations for the course levels indicated. Despite these efforts, there were some consistently negative remarks by both undergraduate and graduate students which hint at problems in the teaching area. These complaints ranged from faculty indifference to problems with grading. The committee also received some disturbing comments about gender bias, and has alerted the Department chair to concerns in this area for internal follow-up. See V1.1 below.

Obviously, in a brief site visit such as the one undertaken here, it is difficult to differentiate between what are fairly typical student grumblings (found to some degree on all university campuses) and what are actually more serious, deep-seated local academic problems. Part of the teaching malaise in this particular Department almost certainly derives from insufficient continuing full-time staff. The current complement, particularly younger members, indicated frustration with their teaching loads, and their collective sense of being unable to satisfy student needs under the working conditions which exist in the Department. There was a general sense that there were simply too many students and too few full-time staff to service satisfactorily the varied interests and needs of those students.

IV Support staff

1. Administrative, Secretarial and Clerical

The Department has been exceptionally well served by its Departmental Assistant, Ingrid Nystrom, who is shortly to retire, and has an efficient Chair/Graduate Program Secretary in Linda Bannister. At the time of our visit the third position, that of Clerk/Typist, was held by a temporary employee. The IRR has called for an additional Receptionist/Clerk position and upgrading of the Clerk/Typist to Secretary. Such changes may be justifiable, but the review committee regards them as low priorities. While the faculty expect and receive no more secretarial assistance than they perhaps deserve, it is nonetheless more than in many other comparable departments. Faculty also have relatively easy access to assistance from students under the Work Study program. Furthermore the central administration should provide better service to the Department in the area of research grant budgeting.

The DA, in part by virtue of long service and her role as 'mother of the Department' at present has an extraordinary range of responsibilities that include : management of the Department office, the departmental accounts and the research grants of faculty members, scheduling and, to some extent, staffing of courses, academic counselling of students, and 'primordial source of important information'. The Chair/Graduate Program Secretary serves as confidential secretary to the chair and for the graduate program. It would seem highly unlikely that the DA's replacement,

however talented, will be able to take over all her roles, and a significant redistribution of tasks and responsibilities is inevitable. The details of such a reorganisation go well beyond our mandate and we limit ourselves below to a few suggestions.

First, it will probably be necessary on Ms Nystrom's retirement for the next DA to work more closely to the Chair, and preferably to act also as his confidential secretary. The present Chair/GPS would then work to other members of the Department and in particular to the two Program Chairs. To facilitate this, the responsibilities of the administrative and clerical staff could, and in our view should, be reduced in a number of areas, thus relieving some of the pressure resulting from increasing enrollments. First, as implied above, research grant accounting should not pass through the departmental office but be a matter for the University's Financial Services Department working with the individual faculty member. Second, undergraduate advising would be more appropriately handled by a member of the faculty; whether the Undergraduate Program Chair or another, rather than by one of the support staff. Third, we were informed that an inordinate amount of clerical time is taken up in copying documents for faculty and students on an out of date machine that incidentally blocks movement move about the main office. Rental of one machine for office use and of another easily accessible to both faculty and students and to which access would be by card would allow the support staff to work more efficiently. The cards purchased by students would also bring revenue to the Department.

2. Technical

Both Mr Barton, the Archaeology technician, and Mr Breffitt, the Manager of the Radiocarbon Laboratory, are Archaeology graduate students 'on leave' from the program. They have given good service. In a Department as large as this one and with such a substantial equipment-dependent science component, the responsibilities attributed to Mr Barton's position as specified in Appendix 2.1 of the IRR are quite beyond the capacities of any one person. It is apparent that the technician has not had the time to devote to the servicing and maintenance required by much of the Department's equipment. Mr Breffitt's title is a misnomer; he is the sole member of the Radiocarbon Laboratory staff, but does not have full managerial authority.

It is noteworthy that the departmental support staff do not include a draftsman/cartographer/illustrator. Neither does the Museum boast a full time Curatorial Assistant/Preparator.

We argue below that the mandate of the Museum should be rewritten to incorporate the 'Laboratories of Archaeology' and that the Radiocarbon Laboratory be transformed into an Archaeometry Laboratory. We strongly support the Department's request for a third technical position and, if our recommendations are accepted would see these as being: an overall Laboratories and Equipment Manager, a curatorial/technical assistant/preparator with

particular responsibility for that part of the Laboratories of Archaeology associated with the Museum, and a technician with particular responsibility for the Archaeometry Laboratory. This we regard as a minimal level of staffing. As the IRR demonstrates, a fourth technician would certainly not be underemployed.

The Department should also consider upgrading the positions of both the existing technical staff, the range of whose responsibilities may well be militating against their career progress.

V Physical plant and other material resources

1. Space

According to the section on departmental history in the IRR (p. 3), on the very day that the MPX was dedicated, Dr Carlson wrote to the Dean of Arts protesting that new building was inadequate. Ever since, the Department has suffered from the results of a 'last minute pre-construction shuffle [that] resulted in the loss of the physical anthropology teaching lab., graduate student space, the geoarchaeology lab and that part of the Museum that is now the outdoor museum patio.' In the intervening years substantial increases in research and teaching have not been accompanied by attribution of new space to the Department, and lack of usable space is now the factor that most impedes departmental performance in all areas and that most contributes to lowering of morale.

In the present economic climate it would be futile for the review committee either to advocate a new building or the takeover by Archaeology of space presently occupied by another Department or Faculty, say, Education. Instead we recommend that Museum space be reassigned to incorporate some of the Laboratories of Archaeology and that the large MPX 8617 loading bay area be renovated to accommodate teaching, research and office space. A renovation plan exists, although we have not seen it.

Given the comparability in size of the two programs, a crude comparison of space distribution in the SFU and Calgary Archaeology departments will be instructive.

	Approx. areas in square metres	
	SFU	UC
Teaching labs, classrooms, reading rooms, commons	299	741
Faculty offices	140	238
Dept. and support staff offices	55	99
TA, Grad. student offices	120	338
Faculty and research labs	435	523
¹⁴ C/Isotope labs	87	54
Museum	370	34
Storage	404	34
Totals*	1910	2061

*Note. These totals do not include trailers which are used at both universities though for different purposes.

Despite strikingly similar totals, space is used quite differently in the two departments. The figures go a long way towards explaining why there are stresses and strains at SFU and limitations on departmental performance that are felt to a much lesser extent at Calgary. In particular: at Calgary quite large laboratory classes can be accommodated within the Department; there is a large departmental reading room; the Department office is less cramped; TAs have rooms in which to meet with students; graduate students have far better accommodation; the museum is reduced to a storage area; and expensive space in the Department is scarcely used for storage.

The reality of the many difficulties and dissatisfactions with existing space noted in the IRR is given strong support by these statistics, and lack of space is a leitmotif underlying discussion in many of the following sections. For example, the small size of the teaching lab (20 students) necessitates the teaching of certain courses more often than is otherwise required, an extremely cost-inefficient use of faculty teaching time. But the statistics also suggest that if only the University can find a warehouse or other cheap storage space for vehicles and equipment and for collections that are not sensitive to humidity and temperature changes, and if funds for renovation of the museum and loading bay can be made available, the Department probably has sufficient space in its current inventory to support a major increase in productivity, and an accompanying rise in departmental, and especially graduate student, morale.

2. Other resources: budgets, equipment, computers, library

For purposes of the external review the committee has included the following under the rubric of other 'resources': departmental operating budget, capital equipment budget, instructional computing budget, field and laboratory equipment, as well as computing facilities and library holdings.

a) It is clear that the departmental (excluding museum and radiocarbon laboratory) operating budget for Archaeology has declined strikingly since the high reached in 1980 (\$63,865). While the Department operating budget has increased since 1986, the present (1990) budget (\$54,400) remains almost \$10,000 below the level of 15 years ago, and is very considerably lower in terms of real dollars. While it could be argued that the Department budget was unrealistically high in 1980, the restraint measures which the Department has dealt with since then, and the cutbacks it has endured in the past decade, have had a cumulative negative impact.

The 1990-91 departmental operating budget is inflated by attribution to the Department of a \$6000 line item for 'Telephone Services - Supplement' which in fact represents university

infrastructure. The amounts attributed to materials and supplies (\$3,350), software (\$750), minor equipment (\$2000) and especially maintenance of equipment (\$3000) are extraordinarily small given the importance of the field program and the strong science component in research and teaching (see item c below).

Overall, the Department seems to have managed its diminished resources well and warrants continued increases at least in line with those available to other programs in the School of Arts. Indeed, as will be noted below, given the nature of archaeological research it could be easily argued that budget increases should be somewhat greater in Archaeology than in some other departments that have not been nearly as successful in research grant competitions nor in achieving external funding for the University. There was a clear sense in the Department that despite their successes in these areas, on behalf of the University, the Department was expected to skimp along on a less than satisfactory operating budget. Members of the Department also expressed fears that the higher SFU administration was tending to favour new programs and initiatives from less successful units at the expense of established high-achieving programs.

The stable and insignificant budgets of the museum (\$3600) and radiocarbon laboratory (\$7000), steadily being eaten away by inflation, testify to the need for renewal in these areas.

b) The Department has received regular, and often substantial, funding through the capital equipment budget to cover both major and minor equipment expenditures. Because archaeology and physical anthropology are, by their nature, equipment-intensive disciplines, the Department will continue to need at least the same level of support that it has recently received. The purchase of two vehicles, and a major Department commitment to the Geographical Information System (GIS), plus more than \$62,000 in minor equipment since 1985, suggests the Department is being well served. Indeed, the amounts and types of equipment expenditures by the Department appear reasonable. However, if the replacement value of all major and minor capital equipment were divided by \$17,120, the average capital budget over the past eight years, we suspect that the result would represent an unacceptably long lifespan for the average piece of equipment. This is potentially very serious given the unusually high rate of research activity in the program.

c) Over the past 20 years the Department has accumulated a large inventory of field and laboratory equipment (Appendices 9.1 and 9.2). The former is used primarily in the operation of multiple summer field schools, for which the Department has gained a national reputation for excellence. From the Internal Review Report (Chapter 9), and the site visit, it is apparent that the condition of some of the equipment has deteriorated due to intensive, rugged use and simply from age. While some department equipment (lab and field) can be legitimately acquired by faculty through external research grants and contracts, the University obviously has an important obligation to maintain suitable

equipment levels, and adequate maintenance of that equipment, for purposes of classroom, laboratory, and field school instruction. The present budget for this type of instructional field and laboratory equipment is inadequate to meet the needs of a department as active as this one. The Department is not receiving sufficient funds from the University to maintain its present inventory of equipment, and requires additional funds to upgrade (or replace) the aging and obsolete equipment now in use. The current department practice, for example, of requiring students to double up on and share laboratory equipment is hardly desirable.

d) All faculty in Archaeology own one or more desktop microcomputers, with assistance in financing from the University. In addition, the Department received \$10,700 in 1989 and 1990 for the acquisition of instructional computing equipment (IRR Table 2.9). The Department has used this funding to establish a modest microcomputing facility, which receives heavy student use. Some of the equipment the committee examined during the site visit was non-functional, and in need of repair. Unfortunately, the Department finds its Minor Equipment component of the capital budget to be inadequate for keeping the machines operational, despite obvious demand. On the positive side, the external review committee was favorably impressed with the larger university computing facilities in the nearby Academic Quadrangle. While perhaps less convenient than a departmental facility, these were obviously being heavily used by many SFU students. The facility was staffed by technicians and computing equipment appeared (superficially at least) to be new and fully operational.

e) The committee has serious concerns about the level of funding for library holdings in archaeology. A review of recent expenditures in archaeology (unnumbered last IRR appendix) demonstrates a growth of about 21% in archaeology purchases over the last five years (1985-1990), or an average of about 4.2% /year. This was less than the rate of inflation and, considering the rapid rate at which book and journal costs have risen during this same period, library purchases in archaeology clearly have not kept pace. The situation is particularly disturbing in the area of serials where there has been a 30% decline (from \$3665 to \$2550) over the same 5-year period. Despite assurances from Collections Management that these expenditures 'reveal a stable acquisitions pattern' there is inadequate growth in this area. There is evidence that even some senior undergraduate courses cannot be properly supported at this time. Given the importance of a first-rate research library to the preservation of quality undergraduate and graduate programs, and to the maintenance of doctoral programs in archaeology in particular, greater support from the University in this area is required.

Before leaving the topic of resources, it is worth considering what does NOT form part of the Department's annual budget. The retention of the funds for sessionals in the hands of the Vice-President (Academic) and of those for TAs in the Dean's necessarily reduces the capacity of the Department Chair to cope with the ups

and downs of university budgeting and to develop departmental strategy and tactics. It is ironic that in a university where the allocation of resources is heavily influenced by enrollments, the Chair is denied one of the critical tools needed to modify and increase them. For it is the last TA and the last sessional appointee that have the most effect on the numbers of students accommodated and courses offered.

PART III - PROGRAMS AND ORGANISATION

VI The Undergraduate Program

1. Program and course structure

The Department offers a varied undergraduate program leading to BA and BA (Hons) degrees with a strong focus on the topical areas of expertise for which the faculty are well known in the discipline. A Co-operative Education Program is a new and exciting initiative that will be closely observed and, if successful, emulated at other institutions. Other offerings at present include a Joint Major with Latin American Studies, a valuable minor in Quaternary Studies and a variety of Certificates (on which we do not feel qualified to comment).

According to data provided by the Chair, in the last four sessions, the numbers of regular courses (i.e. excluding evening [e.g. 101E] and correspondence [101D]) offered during the 3rd and 1st trimesters have been as follows:

Session	Courses	[with n	& (%)	taught by sessionals]*
87-88	24	4	(16)	
88-89	28	5	(18)	
89-90	26	11	(42)	
90-91	29	13	(45)	

* in each of these sessions one undergraduate course was taught by Professor Emeritus R. Shutler as a sessional. Students claim that much higher percentages of courses were actually taught by contract employees in 1990.

The courses are fairly well distributed between the two main trimesters and are sufficient in numbers. Physical anthropology and primatology, considered in some detail below, are at present clearly secondary and complementary to the main interests of the Department. In terms of subject areas within archaeology *sensu stricto*, there is a strong focus on archaeological methods and techniques, and on the archaeology of North Western North America. These are departmental strengths, and it would be unreasonable to expect any department to cover the full archaeological range, moreover the strengths of the SFU Department usefully complement those of other programs in Canada. Nonetheless, it would be desirable to increase the teaching of substantive areal archaeology, of the archaeology of complex societies, and of the history of archaeology in its broad anthropological context. The

addition of a faculty member specializing in the archaeology of complex societies would mark an important first step in correcting existing imbalances in the archaeological component of the program.

Of the 42 undergraduate courses listed in the Calendar only 6 focus on Physical Anthropology. The courses include 131 (Human Origins), 344 (Primate Behaviour), 373 (Human Osteology), 385 (Paleoanthropology), 432 (Advanced Physical Anthropology) and 442 (Forensic Anthropology). It should be remembered that there are only two physical anthropologists in the Department: B.M.F. Galdikas, whose research specialty is nonhuman primate behaviour, and M.F. Skinner, whose specialties include odontology, osteology and forensic anthropology.

Physical Anthropology is a discipline in itself, with a focus on the evolutionary biology of the Order Primates. The divisions of Physical Anthropology encompass paleontology, skeletal biology, anatomy/morphology, human and nonhuman primate biology (growth, development, physiology), genetics (cytogenetics, molecular, population) and nonhuman primate behaviour. Most North American departments of Archaeology and of Anthropology normally include Physical Anthropology in the curriculum, and have physical anthropologists on faculty. To do justice to the diversity within the discipline at least two full-time physical anthropologists are required to provide an adequate variety of undergraduate course offerings. It is difficult to conceive of a solid graduate program, especially at the doctoral level, without three physical anthropologists on faculty. In addition, formal relationships with faculty in departments of Anatomy, Biology or Zoology (as adjuncts, associate members, etc.) are highly desirable.

Given the features of the discipline it is commendable that Professors Galdikas and Skinner offer undergraduate and graduate instruction. However, because Professor Galdikas has reduced responsibility within the Department (one trimester of teaching; six months away from campus), the larger part of the actual workload falls on Professor Skinner. Three of the six undergraduate courses fall specifically in his areas of expertise; one reflects Professor Galdikas' focus; the remaining two (131 and 432) could be offered by both. In fact, since 1987 Arch 131 has been offered 12 times - 5 times by physical anthropologists, and 7 times by archaeologists.

The disadvantages of having too few physical anthropologists in the Department is reflected in the structure of the undergraduate program. Non-specialists have taught the Human Origins course more often in the past four years than the specialists. There is no 200-level Physical Anthropology course at all, which means either that the 131 introductory course is too elementary for any of the 300-level courses available, or that 131 is too advanced for the first year students enrolled in it, thereby discouraging their initial interest in the discipline.

The teaching of physical anthropology courses by non-specialist faculty members of course reduces the latter's ability to teach in the areas in which they are themselves specialists. In this connection, not only is an increasing reliance on sessionals disturbing in that it inevitably devalues the degree, but it is clear that sessionals are disproportionately responsible for teaching areal archaeology courses, and, more recently, even the senior undergraduate Archaeological Theory (471), which perhaps more than any other should remain in the hands of regular faculty members. Undergraduates and faculty also share justifiable concerns regarding

- a) the lack of an overall planned structure of prerequisites and courses leading to an orderly progression of students through their degree programs,
- b) the lack of consistency in certain courses, especially Archaeology Laboratory Techniques (372), and irregular offerings of others, e.g. Regional Studies in Archaeology: North America - Northwest Pacific (474) and Lithic Technology (485), that are desired by students, and
- c) the field school (treated in a separate section below).

Some causes of these imbalances are not far to seek.

1. Certain courses including 471, 372 and (on occasion) Quantitative Methods in Archaeology (376) have been taught by regular faculty in both the fall and spring trimesters, in part for lack of adequate facilities for larger classes. Otherwise these courses need be offered at most once a year.
2. Certain courses such as Special Topics in Archaeology (333/344), Introductory Zooarchaeology (340), Indian Cultures of North America (360), Quantitative Methods (376) and Archaeological Dating (411) are taught every (or almost every) year rather than every other year, which might well be sufficient, in large part for lack of equipment, specimens or laboratory space.
3. There has been some tendency for regular faculty to offer courses (besides field school courses) in the 2nd trimester. Although the number of such courses is small, the offerings of regular faculty during the main academic sessions are thereby reduced. Summer courses (excluding the field school) could well be taught by sessionals.
4. Dr Hayden's energies have been disproportionately taken up with the Introduction to Archaeology (101D) correspondence course that he developed but which might well be handed over to a sessional.
5. Better coordination of administrative, sabbatical and other research leave is required to even out the number and offer a broad range of courses in the third and first trimesters.

Undergraduates complained that they were able to proceed through the program with so little contact with regular faculty that they had difficulty in obtaining three references from them at

the end of their programs. Although such cases must, according to the data before us, be exceptional, they are nonetheless indicative of a need for reassessment and restructuring of the undergraduate program. Inasmuch as this process has already begun and there appears reasonable hope that two new faculty members, one specializing in human biology and the other in the archaeology of complex societies, will be appointed within two years, it is appropriate that the external review committee limit its comments on restructuring of the undergraduate program to generalities and to questions on which its advice has specifically been sought.

First, we concur that limited restructuring is needed, and we support and applaud the process of rethinking that Undergraduate Program Chair has already initiated. It is the development of a patterned yet not overly constraining structure of prerequisites and sequences of courses of increasing difficulty that needs most attention. The requirements of both the BA and BA Hons programs and the disciplinary balance between archaeology courses and ones taken in other departments appear quite satisfactory. The wide range of courses in other departments that are recommended to Archaeology students offers them more than adequate scope for developing their particular interests within the general framework of the degree. (We are unclear as to whether undergraduates receive sufficient guidance in choosing amongst this *embarras de richesses*.)

Second and following from the above, it is clear that the ideas put forward by faculty regarding joint degree programs with Anthropology and Biological Sciences are certainly worth further exploration and consideration. Indeed the makeup of the Department is such that it would be entirely appropriate for it to offer combinations of courses leading to a BSc degree in Archaeology, with an optional concentration in Physical Anthropology (that might with the addition of another physical anthropologist one day become a degree in Physical Anthropology and Archaeology).

Third, since it appears that course offerings have in the past been somewhat uncoordinated if not at the whim of individual faculty members, it should be firmly established that it is the responsibility of the Chair (acting in conjunction with the Undergraduate Program Chair) to ensure both equity in the distribution of teaching loads between faculty (an undergraduate course plus graduate add-on is not the equivalent of two courses), and that the mix of undergraduate courses offered in the two regular trimesters of any session adequately covers the range of junior and senior, topical and areal, etc. courses, required to service the undergraduate body.

Fourth, while it is no doubt necessary that certain 100-level courses be offered twice a session, this should not be the case with higher level courses, some of which could be offered once every two sessions without, theoretically at least, denying students access. In this regard, the provision through renovation of existing space of at least two teaching laboratories, one able

to hold up to 40 and the other up to 30 students, must be regarded as an urgent priority.

Fifth, we recommend a reassessment of the division of labour between regular faculty, sessionals and TAs. It appears that while certain topical science-oriented courses demand that the faculty member responsible take direct charge of both lecture and laboratory components, in several courses TAs could take more of the tutorials and labs. This should free faculty to teach other courses that are at present taught by sessionals - who may indeed be graduate students.

Sixth, while it is apparently not part of SFU undergraduate culture to take courses developed for graduate students, there are definite advantages if certain courses can be made available both to high performers among the senior undergraduates and to graduate students. We commend to the Undergraduate and Graduate Program Chairs this idea, which (besides having obvious benefits for small departments) is particularly suited to a discipline such as archaeology in which breadth of knowledge contributes greatly to depth of analytic interpretation.

As to specifics of individual courses:

Human Origins (131): examination of course outlines and examinations suggests to us that this course as presently taught is too specialized for a 100-level course (and too limited in scope to serve as a general introduction for students wishing to specialize in physical anthropology).

Archaeology Laboratory Techniques (372): the problem with this course is that it is not a course with a specified content. Rather it is, as taught by a variety of instructors, a variety of courses that have in common the provision to undergraduates of useful 'hands on' experience. This is indeed valuable, but it might be preferable to offer a standardized -- possibly team-taught -- introductory course at the 200-level that could be followed up by more advanced courses taught by faculty under the 33x Special Topics or other labels.

Advanced Archaeometry (410) and Dating (411): we agree with faculty that it would be appropriate to offer 411 as a 300-level course. 410 might well be a candidate for redesignation at the 600-level, where it would be available to both senior undergraduates and graduates.

Museology course: a senior undergraduate course on Museology taught by the new Curator should be introduced as soon as possible.

2. Enrollments

While the present number of undergraduates majoring in archaeology appears very satisfactory, it is clear that many advantages accrue to departments with larger overall course

enrollments. The Archaeology Department has taken various measures, including the development of The Evolution of Technology (105), to attract enrollment both within and from beyond the Faculty. The faculty members' belief that no large lecture halls are available is apparently mistaken. More could be done in this area by aggressive advertising of archaeology courses (and of their value in satisfying faculties' breadth requirements), and perhaps also by redesigning as necessary certain courses so that they would be acceptable to the Faculty of Science as Science courses.

One mechanism the Department might consider in seeking larger undergraduate enrollment (a need expressed by Dean Brown) is the restructuring of the undergraduate curriculum discussed above. From the perspective of Physical Anthropology a more desirable program structure would have a one 100-level course that serves as a general introduction to Physical Anthropology and to Archaeology. Such courses exist in most departments of Anthropology, for example. The current 131 course could be refashioned into a 200-level course taught in the fall semester which would focus in depth on the major fields of Physical Anthropology, with enough information provided that students should be able to understand the fundamentals of the literature in the major branches of the discipline. This might also be done with Arch 101 (Introduction to Archaeology), for balance. The sequence of availability of 300- and 400-level courses should be spelled out in either the Calendar, or in a departmental handout available at registration time.

Of course if certain senior courses could be taught less often to larger numbers of students, freeing faculty members to teach other courses, overall enrollment might also increase. As noted above, two large, dedicated archaeology teaching laboratories are needed for this purpose.

3. Staff-student relations

Relations between staff, both faculty and support, and students are generally very good with students appreciative of the efforts of staff members on their behalf. Naturally opinions of individual staff members varied, with the dedication of Drs Driver and Burley frequently being singled out for especially favourable mention.

We must also report that during the course of our visit we received from all categories of departmental membership indications of gender bias that has resulted in women feeling discriminated against or intimidated in their interactions with certain faculty. This feeling even extends to certain men students who do not conform to a traditional male image - call it 'macho', 'cowboy' or or just 'good old boy'. The allegations are neither limited to one faculty member nor do they extend to all. The undergraduates' written presentation contains specific allegations regarding the field school that must be taken seriously. The conduct of the field school is discussed separately below. With regard to the larger issue of gender bias, it appears clear that some faculty members

require sensitizing regarding sexism, overt and covert, conscious and unconscious, and the damage it can do to faculty-student relationships. To this end we have already strongly suggested that the Chair invite the University sexual harassment officer to address a faculty meeting.

While it would perhaps be easy either to ignore or to exaggerate the allegations of gender bias within the Department, we believe that the Department should do neither. There clearly is a problem, but one that we think can be dealt with quickly and effectively and without leaving scars.

4. *The Field school*

An archaeological field school is a vital element in the credibility of an archaeological program, and the one at SFU, requiring a semester's full time study, has a long tradition and a substantial reputation. Its four course structure (433, 434, 435 and 436), which comprises preparatory work undertaken before going into the field and a field report completed after return, is excellent. Nonetheless it is clear that over the years it has had its ups and downs (see C. E. Borden's comment in the 1975 review), and the undergraduate brief contains elements of both appreciation and criticism.

We do not accept all the criticisms of the students, who have not sufficiently understood the differences between the classroom, where it is generally possible to build a course over a trimester, and the field in which the archaeologist in charge is constantly having to cope with unique and often unexpected excavation and other problems. Nevertheless there have clearly been failures of communication between faculty and students, and several of the requests of the undergraduates regarding the field school appear to us to have considerable merit.

While the faculty will no doubt wish to include detailed consideration of the field school in the context of the restructuring of the undergraduate program, we recommend that as soon as possible

- a) minimum prerequisites for participation in the field school be established,
- b) students be supplied with a clear written statement of the skills to be learned and of ancillary tasks to be performed at *any particular field school*,
- c) that they be similarly informed of the nature of both the formal and informal instruction they may expect to receive in the field, and
- d) before going into the field, students be formally apprised of their grades in preceding coursework, and that they receive regular feedback on their performance at intervals during the field school itself.

Second, since on the one hand an archaeological dig is both an experiment and a social institution and there have been specific

complaints, we recommend that a code of field school conduct be developed, preferably by a committee of faculty and students working together, and agreed to by both no later the start of the field portion of the 1991 field school. Such a code of conduct should include description of the day to day camping, cooking, etc. tasks to be undertaken by students taking the field school, and guarantees of privacy, including separate lodging and washing facilities, for men and women.

We also recommend that more attention be paid to safety, for example in training students to use chain saws (even in BC this is not necessarily part of their cultural heritage !), and to ensuring that adequate first aid skills and equipment are available.

We commend the initiatives the Chair has already taken in regard to the field school and in the matter of appeals, treated in the next section.

5. *Appeals and Consistency*

Undergraduates have complained of the lack of a formal and accessible appeals procedure. While it does not seem that there is any general dissatisfaction with grading procedures or grades, it would appear easy enough to make information regarding the appeal process easily available to students. This has already been taken up by the Chair.

Student concern is in fact not so much with appeals *per se* as with inconsistencies in grading between faculty members and especially in courses taught by sessionals. Departmental standards for course outlines, exams, and grading should be established during the discussions of the undergraduate program, and the Chair or Undergraduate Program Chair should make a special effort to discuss expectations and to explain grading procedures to sessional instructors.

In this connection, we agree with the suggestion that certain especially important pieces of undergraduate work, and in particular the Honors Essay, be graded by more than one faculty member.

6. *Undergraduate support*

We sympathize with the undergraduate student complaint that access to work study programs is limited to single students from British Columbia who live apart from their parents. It seems incongruous that the provincial government should in this manner discriminate against the nuclear family.

VII The Graduate Programs

1. Introduction and quality of graduate student research

The graduate program in archaeology has been operational since the inception of the Department in 1970. The Department offers both MA and PhD degrees in Archaeology and has produced 17 PhDs, beginning in 1977, and about (statistics vary) 54 MAs, the first in 1973. A review of the titles of theses and dissertations (IRR Appendix 4.1) shows that a large majority of the databases on which these theses are based are North American, and mostly Western Canadian. While most discuss substantive issues of regional prehistory, the methodological strengths of the Department are very evident in the choices and treatments of materials. The average length of M.A. theses (205 pages, n = 50) and Ph.D. dissertations (424 pages, n = 13) seem, on the whole, to be reasonable for the discipline (although there were about 6 M.A. theses 300 pages or more, which is a bit worrisome). While time constraints of the visit to the university did not permit any sort of thorough examination of theses, one member (P. Healy) cursorily reviewed two Archaeology M.A. theses and two Ph.D. dissertations (chosen on the basis of interest) and found each of these to be of high calibre. Many of the theses/dissertations are obviously based on self-directed student research (i.e. quite distinct from on-going faculty research projects) and this reflects (at both the masters and doctoral level) considerable student initiative, independence, and capability.

The Internal Review Report of the Department also provided a partial list of publications by current and former archaeology graduate students (Appendix 4.3). This was supplemented during the site visit by a set of up-to-date CV's of nearly two dozen former graduate students. It is apparent from these that significant number of program graduates remain actively involved in archaeological research activities and in disseminating their results in a range of published media, including various refereed professional journals. While the occasional publication is jointly authored with current (or former) graduate supervisors or other Department faculty, this is not particularly common. In this regard, and since we received hints of one or two disagreements over ownership of intellectual property, we would urge the faculty, whose own reputations are well-established, to be uniformly generous in assignation of senior coauthorship and even single authorship to students. Concerns of this kind should probably be addressed by the Department, and internal guidelines and procedures considered.

Another measure of the success of the graduate program, and indirectly of the quality and quantity of graduate student research, is the diversity of current career positions in archaeology held by these former graduate students. The list includes positions in university and college teaching, provincial government archaeology, federal government agencies, consulting,

museums, and others. Many of the program graduates have also garnered major research grants from federal granting councils (SSHRC and NSERC) and some SFU graduates are prominent young scholars in Canadian archaeology and physical anthropology and hold positions in a diversity of institutions across Canada (e.g. Memorial, Waterloo, Alberta, the Geological Survey of Canada and SFU itself).

Overall, the graduates of the SFU M.A. and Ph.D. program in Archaeology have proven themselves to be a very professional, articulate, and successful group. They are obviously well trained, and many are quite productive scholars who have displayed excellence (or potential for excellence) in their chosen careers in archaeology and physical anthropology. These are substantial guages of the success of the graduate program.

As to the future, the Department receives an adequate number of good quality applicants for admission to its graduate programs. Trent and Calgary faculty (among others) regularly recommend SFU to their graduates who wish to enrol in MA or PhD Archaeology programs.

2. Program content and structure

In spite of the program's overall success in producing good graduates, there are several areas that have been identified by either faculty or graduate students or both as needing improvement. If not actually low, graduate student morale could stand raising. Its present state is a complex function of inadequacies, real and perceived, in program structure, academic and financial support, and space and facilities. The fact that only 14 graduates completed the questionnaire is both indicative of a lack of cohesion of the student body and a caution against taking its somewhat pessimistic reading as necessarily representative. We shall consider first the structure of the program and the effectiveness of its delivery.

The number of courses that are required to be taken by students in the MA and PhD programs, the PhD comprehensive exam and other requirements for advancement to candidacy appear generally satisfactory. Problems arise rather with delivery of the program. If we exclude the Graduate Seminar (872 and 873), which together constitute the departmental seminar at which talks are given by faculty, students and visitors, and M.A. Thesis (898) and Ph.D. Thesis (899), reserved for thesis writing, there are left eleven graduate courses listed in the calendar. Very few are actually offered in any academic session, and six -- including two of the only three concerned with substantive areal prehistory -- have not been offered at all in at least the last four sessions. Graduate students can, and occasionally at least do, pass through the system with virtually no formal graduate coursework other than the required Selected Topics in Archaeological Theory (871). The following table excludes ARCH 872 and 873 and reading courses offered on an *ad hoc* basis to one or two students.

Session	Courses (excluding 872 and 873)		
	3rd	1st trimester	
87-88	2	3	(840, 871, 876, 881, 895)
88-89	1	1	(871, 876)
89-90	2	2	(840, 871, 876, 895)
90-91	1	3	(871 twice, 881, 895)*

* In this year 871 was taught once as selected topics in archaeological theory and once as selected topics in physical anthropological theory. North American Prehistory (881) appears to be taught as a graduate-level add-on to ARCH 476. Special Topics (895) was offered but not taught for lack of registrants.

The problems of understaffing in the area of Physical Anthropology are also reflected at the graduate level. Of the 13 courses listed in the 1990-91 Calendar, only one focuses on Physical Anthropology (875 - Seminar in Paleoanthropology). Recently a seminar in 'Physical Anthropology Theory' has been substituted for the required 871 course (Selected Topics in Archaeological Theory) for students who specialize in Physical Anthropology. ARCH 875 does not appear to have been offered for at least four years. Given understaffing, it may be impossible to offer this course annually. However, at least one graduate course in Physical Anthropology should be taught either in the fall or in the winter trimester of each year. Course 875 itself should be available at least in alternate years.

While deficiencies in regular listed courses can to some extent be made up by reading courses, the number of graduate courses regularly taught is inadequate; the paucity of offerings must certainly contribute to the difficulty reported by graduate students in completing course requirements. It is probably significant that the Department's self-study failed to include any graduate course outlines. (These were subsequently received and vary enormously in content from a few lines (881) to, and more commonly, extensive and informative listings of topics and accompanying reading lists (e.g. 871).) Recommendations made above regarding less frequent teaching of certain senior undergraduate courses and the opening up of certain graduate courses to the best among the senior undergraduates should simultaneously result in the freeing of regular faculty to teach more graduate courses and help to increase enrollments so that it becomes worthwhile to teach them. We are unclear as to why so many graduate seminar courses are for 5 rather than 3 credit hours.

The content of graduate courses again reflects the great strengths of the Department in methods and techniques. It is unlikely that there will ever be sufficient student interest to make it worth while offering areal courses other than 881 (North America) on a regular basis, but it would be desirable to introduce regularly numbered courses on, for example, the Origins of Agriculture and the Archaeology of Complex Societies, since these are both important foci of archaeological analysis and concern. With regard to the ARCH 871 course on Archaeological Theory and its

Physical Anthropological version, we consider that all graduates who expect to receive degrees in Archaeology should take this course in its original and intended form. A graduate course on current issues in Physical Anthropology and Primatology is indeed most desirable, and should be given its own number but should not be considered an alternative to the course on archaeological theory. Furthermore, since the interests and expertise of Drs Skinner and Galdikas are very different, there would seem to be no reason why each should not teach a separate course.

Like the undergraduate program, the graduate program is presently being reassessed by the Department under a new Graduate Program Chair. One topic that we have not addressed is the extent to which graduate students do or should receive instruction, formal or informal, in cultural and social anthropology and in anthropological linguistics, the subdisciplines of anthropology that, with archaeology and physical anthropology, constitute the syllabus of the typical North American Anthro 100 general introduction to anthropology. A willingness and ability to teach such a course certainly adds significantly to the marketability of holders of PhD and MA degrees. The current reassessment will no doubt also include consideration of an in part related matter, the students' comments on the comprehensive exam.

Several of the suggestions made above are already under consideration, and further comments by us on this aspect of graduate studies are unnecessary -- except to insist that after a phase of frequent changes of Graduate Program Chair, during which there may have been some degree of failure to press the Department's case in various forums, there is paramount need for a period of stability and consistent development. We must admit that at our meeting with the Graduate Program Committee - which is a committee of the whole - we were struck by two things: the near unanimity of the faculty on the need for restructuring, and the major disagreements on the strategy and tactics of that restructuring. It was as if there had been little or no prior discussion on these issues. The Graduate Program Chair clearly has his work cut out.

We recommend below (see IX.1) that the Graduate Program Committee be reduced in size. However it would be advantageous in our view if the streamlined committee were to include, for all matters not involving individual students, one representative of the graduate students.

3. Graduate supervision and guidance

As of January 1991, there were 23 MA and 10 PhD students in program, some of whom were on leave. Students are distributed among supervisors as follows:

	MA	PhD
Burley	4	3
Carlson	2	1
Driver	1	2
Fladmark	2	
Galdikas	1	
Hayden	2	1
Hobler	2	
Nance	1	
Nelson	1	
Shutler		1
Skinner	2	1
Unassigned	5	1

It is clear from these statistics that, with the very evident exception of Burley, faculty are not overloaded, nor will they become so when the six recent entries are assigned to supervisors.

Upon entering the program, graduate students are subjected to a ritual of interrogation by assembled faculty that is designed, through detection of their strengths and weaknesses, to match them with the appropriate supervisory committee and program of coursework. This 'big' or 'initial meeting' is perceived as fearsome by the graduate students, and indeed it seems unlikely that all faculty are as familiar with each and every student's transcripts and records as they should be in order to make the most of this evaluatory process. We would favour a less intimidating induction involving a tour of the Department, informal introductions to faculty members and support staff, and subsequent evaluations by groups of three or possibly four faculty, some of whom would continue as members of the student's supervisory committee. The meeting would be chaired by the faculty member provisionally designated as supervisor at the time of the decision to admit, and would lay out a provisional program of coursework and study.

While students rate their supervision in the program as good to excellent overall, they are somewhat dissatisfied with their supervision in the first and second years. We believe that these dissatisfactions are largely functions of the lack of graduate courses and of the lack of definition of the role of the supervisory committee in the early stages of graduate work. The external reviewers are divided regarding the necessity for formal supervisory committees for MA students. On the one hand the student's interests are better protected by a committee, especially if, as we were told was the case, faculty vary in the effort they expend on supervision and in their expectations. On the other hand students might be better served by a closer relationship with one faculty member and access to others as needed. Narrower focussing of individual faculty members' responsibilities on the work of a smaller number of students could also have advantages. Students might receive more feedback, and perhaps benefit more from their

advice during the critical period during which they are developing their research projects. However this may be decided, and we suspect that the present system will be maintained, the *collective responsibility* of the supervisory committee should be emphasized.

Once students have embarked upon a research project, the supervisory system generally works well. Students do complain about exaggerated expectations on the part of certain faculty regarding the amount of research students are expected to conduct and to incorporate into their theses and dissertations. While this is not peculiar to SFU, it is noteworthy that neither in the General Regulations of the Faculty of Graduate Studies nor elsewhere (as far as we can determine), are expectations for theses or dissertations specified in even the most general terms. This is a matter for the Faculty. Our very hasty observations suggest that some MA theses go beyond, whether in range or depth, what we regard as the requirements for this degree. No doubt this is an area in which the supervisory committee and the student should work together in order to define the requirements for acceptability -- while recognizing that ultimate publication of the results may at one and the same time include both much more and much less than the actual thesis.

A booklet, *A Guide to the Archaeology Graduate Program*, which shows signs of having been hastily thrown together, is intended to guide graduates through the program. We recommend that a fuller and more informative text, including details of areas in which faculty members are prepared to supervise and of course offerings, and of the support available to graduate students, be made available to all students considering entry into the graduate program.

4. Graduate student progress

The interview with the Graduate Committee revealed that the Department did not consider the data in the *Graduate Studies Fact Book* to be accurate. Thus, although the Department's own *Internal Review Report* stated that 'Students have tended to remain in the program for much longer than the University average' (p. 33), several members of faculty rejected the 'official' data, which nevertheless revealed the same pattern as the Department's own record!

In an effort to determine the reasons behind this discrepancy of opinion, the Department's graduate student record was compared with data provided by Dean Clayman. The Department's record did indeed contain 42 more MA and 8 more PhD students than did the Dean's list. However, all of these additional students earned their degrees before trimester 85-3.

The *Graduate Studies Fact Book* data on degree completion times and withdrawal rates pertain only to the period 85-3 through 90-2 (as of January 7/91) - that is, not for the entire period of the Department's existence. The University's baseline begins with graduands completing degrees in 85-3. While this does not capture

all of a Department's performance history, the standard baseline does permit comparisons of performance across departments. Furthermore, because departmental faculty complements and programs have shifted over a 25 year period, it may be more relevant to look at current performance history, as does the 'official' University record.

The Review Committee was able to examine the published data on graduate performance (85 through 90-2) for all departments, and Dean Clayman also provided information for the period 85-3 through 91-1 for Archaeology alone. The latter differed only marginally from the data for 85-3 through 90-2.

MA level

At the MA level, Archaeology graduate students are older on average than their peers at Simon Fraser. However, analysis by sex shows that only women students are older. The men on average are younger than other male MA students. Withdrawal rates by sex differ only slightly (women = 40%, men = 38%) as do degree completion times (women = 14.56 semesters; men = 13.75 semesters). The fact that women students tend to be older (average = 38 years) may be a factor in 'chilly climate' issues articulated by the graduate students, and may be a factor in the slightly higher female withdrawal rate and slower degree completion time. So may the demands of motherhood, etc.; we lack evidence.

Quality of scholarly performance may also be a factor, but female students in Archaeology (MA + PhD) displayed slightly higher average, median and weighted cumulative grade point averages (CGPAs) than the men. Ordinarily, higher performance scores would predict a faster progress through the program and a lower drop-out rate than what is observed among the women.

Having said this, an important caveat also needs to be noted. Without knowing what the CGPAs and age of those who earned degrees and who dropped out, we cannot be certain that it is valid to extrapolate backward from observed ages and CGPAs of student currently in the program. Dean Clayman's office should gather and tabulate age and CGPA data on those who completed degrees and on who dropped out to rectify this problem. Without it, any conclusion about the roles that 'climate issues' and other factors may play in the progress of female MA students must remain tentative.

With respect to the very long completion times for MAs regardless of sex, there is no question that the requirement of coursework, fieldwork and thesis constitute an impediment to rapid progress to degree completion. While we accept the components of the program, the coursework portion is a major stumbling block because there is no defined structure to the pattern of course offerings. Many courses are listed in the Calendar, but few are available in any one year. Students cannot plan their sequence of courses because they do not know what courses will be offered. If

members of faculty choose to offer their courses during the summer trimester, students entering the graduate program in the fall will be at a decided disadvantage. From the faculty's perspective the MA program offers flexibility and permits tailoring of the program to individual student needs. In practice the small size of the faculty and the absences of faculty during the third or the first trimester of a calendar year greatly limit the courses available. Both students' and faculty members' abilities to plan would benefit from a listing of courses to be offered over the next two years.

An additional stumbling block in the time it takes for students to complete their degrees is the timing of the Colloquium - a student's presentation of his/her thesis problem to the Department. This commonly occurs near the end of the student's second year, and only after the proposal is accepted can fieldwork begin. Some faculty suggested that the Colloquium could be held much earlier, perhaps at the end of the second trimester spent in the MA program. This would permit students to go into the field during the summer of their first year of graduate study. It seems to us that a fairer thing may be not to require formal Colloquia of MA students at all, on the premise that MA fieldwork and theses should not be of either the breadth and depth of PhD theses. Provided that the student has satisfied his/her graduate committee that the thesis problem is appropriate, the goals realistic and methods adequate, wholesale scrutiny by the Department of the project proposed seems superfluous at this level.

Faculty and students wish to retain the fieldwork and thesis components of MA training, and with this we agree. However, taking a whole year to do fieldwork (as many graduate students do) is simply too long an expenditure of time. Fieldwork at the MA level should be restricted to one trimester's effort, with no more than a year assigned to subsequent analysis and write-up. An MA program that takes three years for completion (9 trimesters) is generally considered long, yet Simon Fraser's track record for Archaeology is even longer than this.

Finally, the Department needs to consider whether its annual intake of graduate students is not too large, preventing the close supervision that normally facilitates rapid progress through a graduate program. If the Department feels that one of its strengths is its ability to draw students (including international ones) and that student intakes should not be reduced, then the faculty must also consider streamlining its program, for example requiring a set number of supervisory meetings and performance reviews of students during the course of the year.

PhD level

At the doctoral level, the age distribution is similar to that observed for the MA students. Archaeology female doctoral students are older on average than other female doctoral students, and the Archaeology male doctoral students are younger than their peers. Here the similarity with the MA students stops. The two female

doctoral students who completed the program between 85-3 and 90-2 required only 13.0 semesters, compared to 23.67 semesters for the six males who completed the PhD over the same time period. Withdrawal rates by sex also differ, with no women, but 40% of the men dropping out of the program. (In the period 85-3 to 91-1, completion times for three women were 17 semesters, and for seven men, 22 semesters. No data on withdrawals were provided.)

Even speculation about the cause of these sex differences is precluded by the data available in the *Graduate Studies Fact Book*. Thesis titles suggest an explanation for their fast progression through the program; one female student did a laboratory-oriented thesis and the other a library-based one.

With respect to the long completion times among the men, several factors could be responsible. However, one likely problem is what has already been stated for the MA program. There is an absence of structure in the pattern of course offerings. In addition, there does not appear to be a stated time frame within which the comprehensive examination must be passed. If students receive reading lists for the comprehensives, the Review Committee was not advised of it. The time frame within which the Colloquium must be held is also undefined.

Members of the Graduate Committee noted that many students take time out from their studies to do contract research, or they begin paid employment before completing their theses. These factors contribute to the delayed degree completion times. However, such behaviour is not unique to Simon Fraser's Archaeology doctoral students. A more likely factor is the flexibility and 'tailor-made' doctoral program lauded by certain professors, but perceived as rudderless by many doctoral students. The general impression given by several members of the Graduate Committee was a refusal to consider that there may be fundamental problems with the unstructured doctoral program, and that this may be the overriding factor responsible for the slowness of their doctoral students.

There is no question that the graduates of the Archaeology graduate programs are talented individuals, and that many have demonstrated their abilities to continue to carry out research and to earn a living practising their specialty as archaeologists. The Review Committee acknowledges that there are strengths in the program. Nevertheless, for financial reasons, the pressure in all universities today is for graduate students to complete their studies in a shorter time than they have tended to do in the past. Simon Fraser is not an exception in having this view. Accordingly, the Department needs to find an appropriate compromise between what the University wants done, and the education the Department wishes to give its graduate students. Perhaps a more structured program will accomplish this, and it might also lower the very high withdrawal rates at the MA and PhD levels.

5. Adequacy of support for graduate students and the size of the program.

The total number of trimesters of support required for the 23 MA and 10 PhD students presently in program would be 99 units. Inasmuch as many students can find alternative sources of funding during the summer term, it would seem reasonable to hope -- assuming that all graduates are deserving of funding -- for about 75 units. In recent years graduate students actually received trimester support from the sources and in the approximate amounts shown below:

TAships:	19 (@ 4 base units each)
Graduate Fellowships:	9
Sessional Appointments:	4
Field School Lab Instructor:	1
Scholarships:	3?
PhD stipend	1?
Faculty Research Grants	0?
	<u>37</u> approx.

The difference of 38 units, presumably made up mainly by loans, salaries and wages, goes a long way towards explaining the long average duration of students in program.

Comparison with graduate support in the Archaeology Department of the University of Calgary is again instructive since the graduate student bodies are of identical size. At Calgary the large majority of students receive at least 2 units of support per annum, and these derive, in descending order of frequency from scholarships, TAships and (the equivalent of SFU's) Graduate Fellowships. There are far fewer provincial scholarships in BC, and it appears that SFU graduate students have not been successful -- and it would seem have not been particularly energetic -- in going after national scholarships and fellowships (SSHRC, IODE and the like). In spite of the efforts of the Dean of Graduate Studies, SFU also has considerably fewer Graduate Fellowships.

It seems clear from the above that present sources of graduate funding are inadequate and in part responsible for the long durations of students in program. Recent changes in SSHRC regulations now make it easier for faculty to build student support into their research grants, and no doubt they will take advantage of this wherever possible. Students must also be encouraged to apply for all the scholarships for which they are eligible, if necessary by sanctioning those that do not.

The review committee was surprised to learn that Graduate Fellowships were distributed to graduate students not on the basis of student and program excellence, but as a simple function of departmental enrollment in graduate programs. Now that a floor of fellowship funding has been established in this manner, it would seem highly desirable to distribute any increase in the number of fellowship units on the basis of scholarship. Otherwise how can

superior performance be stimulated and rewarded? The quality of the Archaeology Department is such that, given some restructuring of programs, it could not fail to benefit from such reforms.

However, even if the number of units of support can be increased by a variety of means, it is quite unlikely that the present shortfall of 38 units will be made up in the near future. An alternative would be to downsize the graduate program and concentrate support on fewer students, who would move more rapidly to the degree. It is clear that a reduction of even 4 students -- which might result in the loss of one unit of Graduate Fellowship, but a net reduction of about 9 units in graduate student needs -- would be resisted by the Department. We sympathize with that view but are of the opinion that, until such time as more units of support for graduate students can be found, a small decrease in the numbers of students, achieved through limitation of admissions to the MA degree, would on balance be advantageous. In any case, no increase in the number of graduate students should be envisaged, even with additional faculty to take on part of the supervisory load, until more graduate student support units are forthcoming from whatever sources.

VIII The Laboratories and the Museum

1. *The Radiocarbon/Archaeometry Laboratory*

Chapter 8 of the Internal Review Report presents a case for relocating and refunding the ^{14}C laboratory. There is no question at all that the present laboratory is underfunded, nor that its equipment is antiquated and operates under conditions that are unsuitable and indeed potentially dangerous to the staff. Although we have not had access to the accounts and there is disagreement as to the numbers of dates run for fees in recent years, it appears certain that the laboratory does not pay for itself. But lack of faculty interest is the prime and it itself sufficient argument for discontinuing the ^{14}C laboratory. Dr Nelson, the faculty member originally hired to develop it in 1978, has shifted his main area of research to new forms of ^{14}C dating in which he is indeed one of the leading innovators. Even though the laboratory continues to provide a moderate level of service to Archaeology and other departments and institutions, it cannot continue to do so for more than a little longer without a substantial input of fund-raising and management effort from faculty that is neither presently available nor among the strategic priorities of the Department.

If the ^{14}C laboratory is at the present time a white elephant, it is most emphatically not the case that the scientific capital and expertise that it and its manager represent are excess to departmental requirements. On the contrary, there is a very urgent need for a departmental Archaeometry laboratory which Dr Nelson would head and in which he could carry out some of his own research, besides providing expertise in archaeometric aspects of other faculty and student research. Given the interests and expertise of present faculty, such a facility would constitute a

valuable and highly productive complement to Department resources, and would reaffirm the Department's unique position among archaeology programs in Canada.

The present space allocated to the ^{14}C laboratory is equally unsuitable for an Archaeometry Laboratory and should be allowed to revert to the storage function for which it was originally intended. In any new building or renovation of departmental space an Archaeometry research laboratory should have high priority. It should be able to accommodate up to four research programs (student/faculty/visitor). A cost very provisionally estimated in the region of \$165,000 (renovation) to \$264,000 (new construction) for the absolute minimum required, a 600 square foot laboratory with standard physico-chemical equipment would appear a first rate investment for the University and faculty.

2. *The Museum and the 'Laboratories of Archaeology'*

Like the Radiocarbon Lab, the existing Museum is an anomaly. It takes up a great deal of space and contributes very little to the Department and not much more to the University as a whole. The Northwest Coast exhibits, while well laid out and presented, have not changed for many years and are in any case better done elsewhere in Greater Vancouver. From the account in chapter seven of the Internal Review Report, it would appear that failures in conservation of organic materials have been little short of scandalous. A large part of the existing collections is effectively uncatalogued. A very high proportion of the material excavated from archaeological sites and legally deposited in the Museum is in fact not curated but merely stuffed into a variety of insecure campus locations. The program of outreach to schools and the general public has been in abeyance since the loss of the Curator of Education position in 1983. With a bare minimum of resources, the Museum has failed in its task and can provide little in the way of service.

In stark contrast to the Museum, an institution without a program, are the 'Laboratories of Archaeology', an entity not recognized administratively but which comprises some of the most lively and innovative research activities in the Department. Under this heading fall the Zooarchaeological Identification Laboratory and collections, the Human Osteology collections, the Historic Archaeology Type Collection, the Lithics and the Paleoethnobotany collections.

It was a considerable relief to the review committee to find that not only did their preliminary appreciation of this Alice in Wonderland state of affairs correspond to that of a large majority of the Department faculty, but that they and the energetic, experienced and highly competent Museum Curator recently hired by the Department, were all thinking along similar lines. That is to say, they propose, and we concur, a radically altered Museum policy, one that will incorporate the vitality of the Laboratories of Archaeology into the Museum, that will involve students directly

in museum activities through one or more Museology courses, and that might well be renamed, following Dr Hayden's suggestion, a 'Museum of Archaeological Science'.

While the primary goal of the museum should be to contribute to the work of Department, and secondarily to the university community, the public are not to be excluded from such a museum. On the contrary, visitors would be offered the opportunity to observe what most museums still keep behind the scenes but which some of the more innovative (e.g. La Brea Tar Pits Museum, Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump) are revealing, and thereby often recruiting a useful cadre of volunteers. So far as we are aware, such a restructured Museum would not have competitors in Greater Vancouver, and would bring favorable attention to the Department and SFU. Furthermore, one thrust of the Museology course(s) might well be towards training students in the development of public archaeology programs aimed at schools and other audiences. Indeed the Curator's work with the History Department may already be tending in this direction. The students, under the guidance of the Curator, would benefit from becoming ambassadors of archaeology to the public at large.

Incorporation of the Laboratories of Archaeology -- excepting the Human Osteology Collections which for other reasons are best kept apart -- into the museum would provide them with administrative recognition and some curatorial support, besides precious space much of which would at one and the same time be laboratory and exhibition space -- inasmuch as laboratory activities would be a significant part of the museum display. This implies that only a small part of existing museum space would be retained for traditional display, and probably also that a substantial portion of the existing museum inventory be deaccessioned and redeployed to other museums in the province that have the necessary facilities for conservation and curation.

With regard to the materials from archaeological sites, excavated and analyzed by members of the Department, the University must acknowledge by the provision of adequate resources that, if it wishes to have an active archaeology program, it is accepting legal and financial responsibility to see to the proper housing of the excavated materials *in perpetuity*.

Changing the mandate of the museum along the lines suggested above will require a major input in terms of planning, and considerable renovation of existing museum space, though probably not, at least in the immediate future, of an extension into the patio area immediately east of the existing museum where footings for a building are already in place.

The developments suggested in this section would be impractical without the addition of a curatorial assistant/-preparator to the Department's support staff. However much part-time student and volunteer assistants can help, and it is a great deal, they cannot supply the necessary long term supervision and

other services of a full-time technician working under the Curator's direction.

IX Administration and Governance

1. Internal

Professor Nance is the current Chair of the Department, and has been in office for about a year. His predecessor, and long-time Chair of Archaeology, was Professor Carlson. Even before the external review Professor Nance had initiated a number of the changes suggested here; he has a clear understanding of the resource problems faced by his Department, and is appreciated by all constituencies within it. As a new Chair, he needs to establish his authority and set his own leadership style. He also deserves the explicit support of his colleagues in carrying out the Chair's increasingly difficult task.

The Department has the usual committee structures and procedures found in most academic departments. There is a Department Tenure Committee, an Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and a Graduate Program Committee. What is unusual about the Department is that the composition of the former committee includes seven members of faculty and of latter two committees all full-time members of faculty. A committee meeting then is not much different from a regular meeting of faculty, and the ability to resolve issues within committees is rendered difficult. Furthermore, by devolution of almost all policy and management decisions to committees, the Chair's authority is minimized. He becomes a facilitator rather than a leader.

It would be prudent for the Department to consider streamlining its major departmental committees in the interests of greater efficiency. It is hard to see how the Departmental Tenure Committee, on which sit all but three members of the faculty, can operate effectively. If the Department has a written constitution or a written set of procedures regarding biennial reviews of performance, decisions on hiring, and recommendations for tenure and promotion, the Review Committee was not informed of it.

The Undergraduate and Graduate committees could have elected representatives, perhaps two members of faculty and an elected Chair. The Graduate Program Committee might consider having an elected student member who participates in all deliberations except those involving individual students. Terms of office could be overlapping to produce continuity of experience and build institutional memory. Each committee could have the mandate to do much of the work required within its jurisdiction, and to make recommendations to the Department.

Regularly scheduled (and more frequent) Departmental meetings are an easy way to consult and to distribute information, incidental as well as major. The graduate student representative (or representatives) should be invited to these meetings, so that

the students develop the sense that they are junior partners in a worthy intellectual enterprise. Presumably all issues brought to Departmental Meeting are decided by majority vote. A consensus approach, while presumed workable for a small unit, often merely ensures the preservation of the status quo. If there are strong differences of opinion among faculty, much needed change may be virtually impossible to attain, especially if prima donna attitudes are not set aside for the good of the unit as a whole.

2. University relations

The members of the higher administration with whom we met regard the Department as a strong academic unit, capable of improvement certainly, but worthy of increased support. While it may be that the University's priorities have militated somewhat against Archaeology's achievements in research receiving sufficient recognition in terms of resource allocation, there can be no doubt that any and all efforts on the part of the Department to increase undergraduate enrollments and to reduce the completion times of graduate students will be very favourably received and quickly rewarded. Although the Dean of Graduate Studies can not and does not wish, it would appear, to exercise much influence over the assignation of faculty positions to departments, we were pleased to obtain a strong indication from the higher administration that, contingent in part upon the Provincial Government's maintenance of its Access Program, the Department is likely to gain two new faculty positions in the very near future.

During the course of our site visit we obtained little information on inter-departmental relations, and none that this was an area of concern. On the contrary, the Quaternary Studies group, relations with Kinesiology and Geography, the involvement of the Museum with History and the number of Adjunct appointments all constitute indications of a healthy level of interdisciplinary activity.

We did not enquire into the contribution of Department members to university governance, although it is clear that in the case of senior members, and in particular Professor Carlson, this has been very considerable.

3. Beyond the University

Several members of the Department of Archaeology have played important roles within the scholarly community at the national level and international levels. Professors Carlson and Fladmark have each served on the SSHRCC Archaeology Review Committee. Professor Burley has been Vice- and Interim President of the Canadian Archaeological Association. Dr Galdikas is Professor Extraordinaire at the Universitas Nasional in Jakarta. Several faculty are or have been involved in various capacities with scholarly journals. Virtually all regularly serve as external reviewers for funding agencies, as referees for professional journals and academic presses.

At the provincial level the Department has developed and maintained good relations with the Archaeology Branch of the Ministry of Culture, British Columbia. The Department serves as a repository for artefacts unearthed in the province by individuals and groups not affiliated with scholarly institutions. Over the years it has made an immense contribution to understanding of the archaeology of the province, and cannot have failed to have informed and involved the public in ways highly favourable to the University as a whole. The development of the undergraduate Co-op program will lead to further contacts and interaction with various communities and institutions outside the University.

X A Brief Conclusion

Simon Fraser has in its Archaeology Department an extremely talented group of individuals who have, as requested by the last set of external reviewers, individually and collectively demonstrated their capacity to carry out, energetically and effectively, innovative and important research in their various areas of specialisation. This work has received favourable national and international attention within the discipline and reflects well on and has brought credit to the home institution. However, in part because the Department's achievements have not been sufficiently rewarded by the University in terms of resources, and in part because successful and creative research in archaeology is so often the product of individual imagination, drive and ambition, the unit at present lacks a certain synergy and departmental vision. As a result, its teaching function, which demands a collective and cooperative effort on the part of all staff, has fallen somewhat behind and now needs both some restructuring, which is an internal matter, and additional resources in the form of staff and funding (largely for renovations), which must come from the University.

Under its new Chair, with some administrative and spatial improvements, and with a renewed commitment on the part of an augmented faculty, the Department is ready to achieve that balance in its achievements that will make it a truly excellent all-round institution, offering programs in archaeology and human and primate biology that have their own distinctive character and are among the very best anywhere.

PART IV - EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rather than a listing of recommendations, many of which must be read in context to be meaningful, we summarize below our major findings and suggestions for the future.

Departmental Resources

1. The Department of Archaeology boasts a first-rate faculty, whose publication and external funding records are excellent, and who enjoy well-deserved national and international reputations. An obvious gender imbalance (8.5:0.3) needs to be corrected.

2. The existing faculty complement is inadequate to support the current undergraduate and graduate programs. We recommend the appointment of two new faculty, the first in the area of physical anthropology (human genetics), the second in archaeology (complex societies).
3. The Department has been well-served by its administrative and clerical support staff. Restructuring of duties will be required at the retirement of the DA. The University's Financial Services should offer better support to the Department and its members especially in the area of grant accounting.
4. A third member of technical staff is urgently required whether or not the mandates of the Museum and Laboratories of Archaeology are revised in order to realize their potential contributions to the University and public at large.
5. While space for teaching, research and offices is very inadequate, renovation of existing space (mainly the Museum and Loading Bay) combined with provision of storage away from the main campus would solve immediate problems relatively cheaply, and do more than anything else for departmental well-being and productivity.
6. The Department is fairly well supplied with equipment of all kinds. However lack of funds for maintenance and replacement is resulting in a major debt to the future.
7. While the Museum and Radiocarbon Laboratory operating budgets are inadequate to ensure effective functioning, in other respects the operating and capital budgets, although small and diminishing in real terms, are unfortunately not out of line with those of similar programs at other Canadian universities.
8. Retention of the TA and Sessional budgets in the hands of the higher administration results in greatly reduced capacity of the Department Chair to plan the strategy and tactics of departmental development.
9. Library holdings in archaeology are not keeping up with the needs of a Department with active graduate and research programs.

The Undergraduate Program

10. The strength of the undergraduate program lies in its strong focus on methods and techniques and on North Western North American archaeology.
11. The high proportion of courses currently taught by sessional instructors devalues the degree. The addition of two faculty would, in conjunction with the provision of larger teaching laboratories, largely solve this problem besides adding a new dimension to the archaeological side and rendering the physical anthropology program fully viable.
12. Increased enrollment in Archaeology courses requires increases in faculty, teaching laboratory space and the Department's efforts in advertising their courses throughout the University.
13. The redesign of the undergraduate program currently in progress should result in restructuring of prerequisites and course sequences, greater consistency in expectations and

- grading, and reassessment of the division of labour between continuing faculty, sessionals and TAs.
14. We recommend that certain graduate courses be made available to senior undergraduates.
 15. Initiatives such as the Co-op program and possible joint degrees with Anthropology and the Biological Sciences are to be welcomed. A BSc in Archaeology would be appropriate given the makeup of the Department.
 16. While relations between staff and students are generally good, the faculty must guard against gender bias.
 17. Both the academic and social aspects of the field school require to be more formally stated in order that faculty and student expectations may coincide.

The Graduate Program

18. By the measures of research, publications and marketability of graduates, the MA and PhD programs are demonstrably successful.
19. Nonetheless the course offerings are inadequate and contribute to an excessive average length of time spent in program. Many of the constraints here are the same as in the undergraduate program and must be similarly overcome.
20. The reassessment of the Graduate Program presently in progress should include reconsideration of the necessity for formal colloquia and possibly also supervisory committees at the MA level, and in any case emphasize the supervisory committee's collective responsibility for guidance of students.
21. The benefits in terms of future job opportunities of greater exposure of students to cultural and social anthropology and anthropological linguistics also require reassessment.
22. The departmental *Guide to the Archaeology Graduate Program* should be expanded and made available to all applicants for admission.
23. Long completion times and high drop out rates in the MA program have complex causations that we lack evidence to diagnose in detail. However, lack of availability of graduate courses and in some cases excessive demands by faculty are certainly contributory factors, as is inadequate financial support.
24. No doubt similar factors also contribute to the long completion times and a high withdrawal rate among male students enrolled in the PhD program. Some restructuring is also required in this area.
25. Present sources of graduate funding are inadequate. A small down-sizing of the MA program until such time as graduate funding can be improved should be seriously considered.
26. To encourage excellence, any additional Graduate Fellowships that may be instituted should be awarded on the basis of student and departmental quality.

The Laboratories and the Museum

27. The present radiocarbon laboratory should be reconfigured as an Archaeometry Laboratory under the direction of Dr Erle Nelson.

y28. The Museum had failed in terms of its present mandate well before the recent appointment of an energetic and innovative curator. It and the 'Laboratories of Archaeology' should now be integrated into a 'Museum of Archaeological Science' for which an exciting future seems assured if some renovations can be undertaken and a third member of technical staff recruited.

Administration and Governance

29. The Chair requires increased authority in order to exercise leadership and to oversee effectively the future implementation of the major reappraisal of the teaching and related functions of the Department that is presently underway.
30. Membership of departmental committees should be reviewed with a view to substantial reductions in their memberships.
31. External relations of the Department both within and beyond the University appear excellent.

Department of Archaeology
Simon Fraser University

Response to the Report of the External Review Committee

October 1991

Introduction

We begin by expressing our thanks to the ERC for their efforts in what is at best a difficult task. The Chair also thanks those faculty and staff who provided written comments on the Report.

Our overall reaction to the report is that generally those things most important to an academic program, namely quality of faculty, teaching, quality and level of research and publication, success of graduands, etc., have been accurately evaluated, and in fact are rated very highly by the Reviewers. For example, on page 4 the Department is described as ". . . a first-rate academic unit." We are gratified to learn that the ERC feel that our program is on target.

The reviewers identify also some deficiencies in the graduate and undergraduate academic programs, most of which we were aware of as a result of our internal review. Some of these are due to a need for additional faculty, while others require remedial action on our part. The required actions have begun already, and some were in process prior to the visit of the ERC.

We feel, however, that many details of the Committee's comments and recommendations (mostly those relating to less significant aspects of the review) often are based on misinformation, and/or reflect the fact that the Committee come from academic/administrative environments that differ from the SFU system. We are not convinced that the reviewers attained a complete understanding of how the University and the Department function.

We have attempted to keep our response brief. Below we go through the report piece-by-piece, but do not comment on the myriad details contained in it.

PART I - INTRODUCTION

In this part of the report the ERC summarize particulars of their visit to SFU and the last external review of the Department (1975). No comment is necessary here, except to note that Dr. Galdikas' holds a half-time appointment, not a one-third appointment as stated by the ERC (p. 2; Section II).

PART II - RESOURCES

III The Faculty

1. In this section the ERC make five major points. These are listed and commented on below:

a. Lack of women faculty - We are aware of the fact that female representation on faculty is inadequate and would welcome the opportunity to consider women candidates for appointment were new faculty positions to be allocated to the Department. Indeed, we consider addition of women faculty to be a priority. (NOTE: subsequent to the review the Department was authorized to initiate a search for an additional tenure-track faculty member. We are making every effort to attract applications from women candidates.)

b. The current CFL complement is inadequate and addition of two (possibly three) new faculty positions is desirable - Certainly we are in agreement with this conclusion and the recommendation. It can be noted, however, that, with regard to specializations of new faculty, the ERC reverse priorities set by the Department in our recent Five Year Plan. We are not unanimously in agreement with the Committee's priorities.

c. Inadequate faculty numbers have led to an undesirable dependence on term appointments to meet undergraduate teaching requirements. There is an element of truth in this conclusion. Increased use of term appointments in recent trimesters is related to several factors. Recent enrollment increases, especially in upper levels courses, have dictated that some courses required for the archaeology major be scheduled more frequently. These courses must be given priority and certainly this has made course scheduling problematic. At the same time, our attempts to accommodate the University's desire to increase summer trimester course offerings have drawn faculty away from fall-spring teaching, when student demand is highest. When these of factors are combined with the need to accommodate sabbatical leaves, release-time stipends provided through SSHRC, administrative leaves, sick leaves, etc., a complex picture emerges.

However, it is definitely not the case, as stated by the ERC (p. 4), that faculty have been able to satisfy in one term their annual teaching obligation by teaching fieldschool during the summer trimester. We are mystified as to how the Committee arrived at this conclusion. Faculty members who teach the summer fieldschool also teach either the fall or spring trimester, hence two trimesters per year, the same as any other faculty member.

d. Graduate course offerings are inadequate - We acknowledge that our graduate course offerings require in-depth review, and we have begun this process (see Part VII; Section 2). However, we are unsure about the complaint "of an inadequate number of graduate-level courses in any trimester . . ." (p. 4). It is a fact, as stated in the Report, that demands of the undergraduate teaching program make it difficult to schedule numerous graduate courses. Moreover, given the number of faculty in the Department, it is impossible to provide all the courses that graduate students might desire. Scheduling of graduate courses is a difficult undertaking that involves consideration of many factors: undergraduate program demands, required graduate courses, courses recommended by supervisory committees, special courses that graduate students may desire, small number of faculty, faculty interest, and the number of students who may desire a particular course, among others. It is difficult to convince sufficient numbers of graduate students to enroll in elective courses (we have refrained from coercion) and under these circumstances scheduling courses is risky because if a course must be cancelled due to lack of student interest it is difficult, if not impossible, to arrange last minute, alternate faculty teaching assignments. In spite of such problems we have offered an average of 1.6 formal graduate courses per trimester over the last nine trimesters (for fall and winter trimesters, 87-1 through 91-1, excluding the non-credit graduate seminar and directed readings courses). Clearly, course offerings have been sufficient for numerous students to complete their graduate degree programs. Therefore, we are not convinced with the ERC's conclusion that the number of graduate courses has been inadequate.

Judging from the statement about "serious student interest . . . in the expansion of the physical anthropology component of the Department . . ." (p. 4) and following statements in the same paragraph, we are led to believe that student dissatisfaction with graduate course offerings actually centers around the variety of topical areas covered in formal (non-readings) graduate level courses. We agree with the report that with additional faculty positions it would be possible to offer additional graduate courses and improve the depth and variety of graduate offerings.

2. Research and teaching contributions, and external research support

We are pleased that the ERC found the publication and external funding records of faculty to be excellent. And we believe that the ERC's conclusion that we "are a very productive faculty, . . . [that] has brought considerable national and international recognition to Simon Fraser University" is accurate. As we noted in our internal report all faculty are active researchers who have been very

successful in attracting research funding from a variety of sources. We place much value and emphasis on research and publication, and are proud of this record which we feel would compare favorably with any department in N. America.

We are pleased also to learn that faculty teaching is viewed overall as "quite favorable", and by the fact that the Committee found course syllabi, texts, examinations, topical coverage, and expectations for courses to be satisfactory. It comes as no surprise that there are teaching-related complaints -- simply, some faculty are better teachers than others. And we, like the ERC, find it difficult to differentiate between "fairly typical student grumblings" and real academic problems, but do not agree that there exists a "teaching malaise" of serious magnitude in the Department. Indeed, the Committee's use of this phrase is inconsistent with their conclusion that "it is clear that the faculty are regularly developing and introducing new academic courses, while dropping less effective ones, to enhance the Department curriculum. These are important, and time consuming, measures [that] deserve recognition . . ." (bottom p. 5; top p. 6).

Faculty in the Archaeology Department take teaching seriously and work hard on their courses. We do believe, however, that recent enrollment increases and demands of the trimester system, coupled with a long period of restraint have taken their toll on faculty morale, and have resulted in considerable feelings of frustration. We agree that additional faculty would go a long way towards reducing these frustrations.

The remarks at the end of the first paragraph on p. 6 are commented on later in this document (see Part III; VI; 3.).

IV Support staff

1. Administrative, Secretarial and Clerical

A reading of this section reveals that the ERC did not obtain a very good understanding of the demands of the trimester system, the nature of the academic support system at SFU, and working relationships among administrative personnel in the Department. For example, in suggesting that faculty should look to the Work Study Program for additional secretarial assistance, the Committee are unaware of the fact that Work Study students may not be employed to perform duties belonging to AUCE personnel. Similarly, the Committee seem to be under the impression that the Chair and Department Assistant do not work closely with each other, which of course is not the case.

While we agree that the D.A. has an extraordinary range of duties and responsibilities, we do not see the suggested reorganization of tasks and responsibilities as realistic unless the University undertakes a complete overhaul of the SFU job classification system. The changes suggested are beyond the Department's authority.

2. Technical

The thrust of this section is that the Department is understaffed in terms of technical personnel. We agree with this conclusion. With regard to the suggested reorganization, it can be noted that the Chair and a committee of two faculty have been engaged in a review of the "Laboratories of Archaeology", Radiocarbon Lab, etc., and it is expected that a plan involving reorganization of duties and responsibilities of technical staff will result, and that requests for additional technical personnel will be forthcoming. The possibility of developing an Archaeometry Lab, as suggested by the ERC, is being considered.

Two misconceptions in this section need to be corrected. First, Mr. Barton, the Archaeology Technician, is not a graduate student "on leave" from the program. Mr. Barton has held the technician position for almost 13 years and only recently was admitted to our M.A. program. Second, the Committee's impression that the Manager of the Radiocarbon Lab does not have managerial authority probably resulted from the fact that Mr. Breffitt is a temporary appointee, appointed upon resignation of the former Manager, while the above-noted review is in progress. It can be noted also that subsequent to the ERC's visit Mr. Breffitt resigned this position and that the Lab currently is inactive, pending the outcome of the above-noted review.

V Physical plant and other material resources

1. Space

The first paragraph of this section is somewhat misleading in that the Committee are unaware of the fact that the physical anthropology teaching lab, geoarchaeology lab, and forensic lab were constructed during the second phase of expansion of the MPX building, in spite of the fact that they were conducted on a tour of these facilities. At the time of the ERC's visit the geoarch lab was temporarily functioning as a lab for analysis of artifact collections, and this perhaps contributed to the Committee's confusion. The lab has since been returned to its original function.

A significant point made in the remainder of this section is that considerable space on the 8000 level of the MPX is being used for storage of equipment and archaeological collections, and that, were storage space made available elsewhere, this space could be renovated to provide additional laboratories and other badly-needed facilities. This is a good and realistic recommendation. As noted by the ERC, a plan for such renovations exists, and the Department has been asking for "warehouse" space for some time. It can be noted also that the Department was contacted recently by the Associate Vice President Academic regarding this issue and apparently plans are afoot to

provide some kind of storage facility. We look forward to this and to being able to proceed with plans for renovation of existing space that would be vacated.

2. Other resources: budgets, equipment, computers, library

a. Operating budget - The ERC has recognized correctly that the Department's operating budget has declined over the last decade and that, given the importance of field operations, the strong science component of the discipline, and the overall level of activity in the Department, this budget is severely strained to keep up with the demands made on it. While we would not argue that we should be given special treatment in budget allocations, the Committee is correct in noting that there is a feeling within the Department that new programs in the University are favored, and that too little attention is paid to allocation of resources in such a way that demonstrably successful units can further develop, improve, and round out their programs.

The observation that the operating budgets of the Museum and Radiocarbon Laboratory are inadequate is accurate and requires no further comment.

b. Capital equipment budget - We agree with the Committee that the amounts allocated to the Department over the last few years are "reasonable", but that given the equipment-intensive nature of archaeology, the demands of fieldschools, and the high level of faculty and graduate student research in the Department, in real terms these amounts may be marginal.

c. Condition of equipment - The Committee are correct in their assessment here. Much of our equipment is old, in poor repair, and in need of replacement. Funding over the last few years has not been sufficient for maintenance and replacement requirements.

d. Computing equipment - Again, the ERC are accurate in noting that while allocations to the Department have permitted development of a modest computing lab, funding has not been sufficient for adequate maintenance of computing equipment. The high obsolescence rate of computing equipment has made it impossible to improve and develop the lab and at the same time maintain existing equipment, given current levels of funding.

e. Library - It is undoubtedly true that library expenditures attributed to Archaeology over the last few years can be viewed as inadequate. The Department has communicated the ERC's comments here to the Library Review Committee.

f. TA/SI allocations - The ERC argue that TA and Sessional Instructor budgets should be decentralized and placed in the hands of Department Chairs to accommodate more effective planning. The point is well taken. With regard to TAs the Department has not experienced any particular problem here. Usually when additional TAs have been required, they have been allocated, albeit at the last moment after final course enrollments for a particular trimester are known. The situation with SIs has been somewhat different. It has been difficult at times to effectively plan course offerings two or three trimesters in advance (as required by the Registrar) without knowledge of the number of Sessional Instructor positions that will be available in upcoming trimesters.

PART III - PROGRAMS AND ORGANISATION

VI The Undergraduate Program

1. Program and course structure - In this section the ERC consider many details of the archaeology undergraduate program. Our response here is a general one and does not address all these details.

We agree generally with the ERC that limited restructuring of the undergraduate program is in order and that certain deficiencies could be remedied by additional faculty appointments. We have undertaken already a review of course prerequisites, and the Undergraduate Program Chair will be bringing forward in fall '91 a comprehensive proposal for modification of the existing course offerings, program structure, course content, etc. As well, the Department Chair has begun discussions with the Chair of Sociology/Anthropology regarding a joint Archaeology-Anthropology major.

While it is true that existing prerequisites have been added or deleted in something of a haphazard manner over the years, we believe that the Committee have overstated a perceived lack of program structure. The requirements for the Archaeology major include specific course requirements beginning at the 100 and 200 levels plus specific course and course-group requirements at the 300 and 400 level. The structure thus provides specific requirements to direct students to courses thought by us to be essential to the degree, as well as providing students with flexibility in choosing electives to satisfy individual interests.

2. Enrollments - The Committee propose that the frequency with which certain upper levels courses are offered could be reduced by increasing class size, thus relieving some of the pressures associated with small numbers of faculty. In theory this is possible, but, realistically, as the ERC note, it would require teaching

labs much larger than those that exist at present. We note also that this would require funds for the purchase of additional teaching equipment.

We are not altogether comfortable with this line of reasoning because it conflicts with what has been our basic pedagogy. We have avoided "mass production" approaches to teaching of these important upper levels courses, opting rather for a more personal approach associated with small classes. This approach is consistent with extensive use of the "tutorial system" that is traditional at SFU.

Errors and Misconceptions in this section:

p. 12 - Professor Emeritus Shutler's teaching since retirement has been done on a post-retirement contract and not as a Sessional Instructor. The data presented in the table are accurate, student opinion notwithstanding.

p. 14, #4 - Dr. Hayden's supervision of ARCH 101D does not consume disproportionate energies. As is common throughout the University, this course is done on an overload basis, and a tutor/marker usually is assigned to assist with it.

p. 16, second paragraph - In suggesting that TAs could take on more tutorials and labs, the Committee apparently are unaware of constraints imposed by unionized TAs.

3. Staff-student relations

We, like the ERC, perceive faculty-student (and other) relationships in the Department to be very good. We have long enjoyed a tradition of collegiality among faculty, staff, and resident and former students. It is not an overstatement to say that archaeology faculty, staff, and students constitute a "family" of sorts. We value this feeling of community in which Department faculty and staff relate to students not only as colleagues, but often as friends.

Therefore, we were taken aback by the allegations of gender bias communicated to the reviewers, and we are disturbed by them. We are disturbed also by the fact that we were not appraised adequately of the content and nature of the undergraduate submission while the ERC were on campus. Indeed, we were not presented with a copy of the undergraduate submission (laden with inaccuracies, misinformation, and misconceptions) until some time (approximately three weeks) after the ERC's visit, and this only after considerable prodding. The ERC received the written student submission only at the last moment, and did

not have the opportunity to read it until they had boarded their plane departing Vancouver. Thus, we were not provided the opportunity to discuss the undergraduate submission with the Committee, nor to respond to any of the issues raised in it.

As is always the case with sensitive issues, opinion varies as to the veracity of the claims of gender bias. We understand, for example, that some division of opinion exists within the student body regarding the nature, content of, and the motivation for, the undergraduate submission to the ERC.

While antipathies sometime develop between faculty members and individual students (of either sex), it would be an injustice to brand the Department as "sexist", or to imagine that faculty/student conflicts are any more common in archaeology than elsewhere. All archaeology faculty have supervised successful women graduate students and continue to do so. Historically, the ratio of female:male students in our graduate program has hovered around 50-50, the drop-out rate is no greater among women students than it is among men, and there seems to be evidence (ERC Report p. 26) that the grades of women graduate students actually may be higher than those of men students.

According to information supplied by the Records Division of the Registrar's Office, the ratio of women:men among archaeology undergraduate majors and honors students presently (spring 91) is 74/50. Cumulative grade point averages for women and men *in archaeology courses* are 3.17 and 3.05, respectively (medians are: women = 3.12; men = 3.04). These facts do not bear directly on individual cases, of course. However, assuming that male and female students are equally capable, neither do these data provide evidence of systematic bias against women students in the awarding of grades.

All of the above notwithstanding, the Chair, on the advice of the ERC, brought this matter to the attention of faculty. The University Harrassment Coordinator spoke at a meeting of faculty in April 1991 and subsequently relevant issues were discussed at length. All faculty are now more keenly aware of, and sensitive to, issues relating to faculty-student relations.

4. The Field school

We, like the ERC, do not accept all student criticisms leveled at the archaeology fieldschool, because, as the Committee note, students have not sufficiently understood the differences between the classroom and the field situation. We note also that on various occasions the Committee refer to the fieldschool as "excellent", as having "a substantial reputation" (p. 18), and as "having a national reputation for excellence." (p. 10)

Nevertheless, the Department Chair has undertaken an extensive review of the archaeology fieldschool with the assistance of an internal committee comprising a faculty member, an undergraduate, and a graduate student (both women). This committee has prepared a formal set of guidelines for the content and conduct of the fieldschool. The draft document currently is undergoing final revisions and shortly will be presented to the Department Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for formal consideration.

5. Appeals and Consistency

The Department does in fact have a formal grade appeals procedure. Information regarding this procedure has been posted in a conspicuous location in the Department. To promote consistency, suggested Departmental standards for course outlines, exams, grading standards, and procedures are being incorporated into a Faculty/TA Guide that currently is undergoing revisions before being submitted to the Department for approval. The guide was assembled by the Chair with the assistance of a graduate student, the Department Assistant, and one faculty member.

6. Undergraduate support

Like the ERC, we lament the limitations of the Work Study program. We note that during the fund-raising campaign conducted in the fall of 1990, the Department established an Archaeology Endowment funded by donations from faculty and staff. This fund has been earmarked to provide assistance to deserving senior undergraduate students in pursuit of their degree.

VII The Graduate Programs

1. Introduction and quality of graduate student research

In this section the ERC note that archaeology graduate theses are of high calibre, that graduates of our programs continue to be active in the discipline subsequent to graduation, and have attained a variety of career positions. They note also that some are "prominent young scholars" (p. 21) holding faculty and other positions across Canada. We are pleased that the Committee hold our graduates in high regard (see especially p. 21, paragraph 2) and are flattered that they themselves regularly recommend SFU to their graduates who wish to pursue MA or PhD studies.

2. Program content and structure

While we do not agree with all the details of the Committee's discussion here, we do agree with the need for a restructuring of graduate course offerings. As the ERC note, the process has begun. We also are considering seriously the recommendation (p. 23) that the Graduate Program Committee be reduced in size and that it include a member of the graduate student body.

3. Graduate supervision and guidance

The ERC's comments and suggestions generally are well taken and we note that a preliminary version of a formal document dealing with graduate student supervision guidelines and procedures is in hand. As work on this document proceeds no doubt many of the suggestions in the report will be considered.

We do wonder, however, why it is that if at the present level of graduate student enrollments the faculty are not overloaded (p. 24), the ERC suggest that the intake of graduate students is too large. Similarly, we are not altogether convinced that coursework is the obstacle to degree completion that it is made out to be (ref. earlier data on course offerings). If this were the case, then we would expect all students to take a very long time to complete. Some of our students complete quickly, others drag things out. And, while, on average, our students do take a long time to complete degree requirements, we note that they do, in the end, produce quality work. We turn out solid, successful archaeologists. If reducing completion time means also lowering the quality of the product, we would not be in favor of this. Some of us feel that perhaps one of the most effective ways of reducing degree completion times generally, would be for the University to shorten the official time maxima contained in the Graduate Regulations (currently five and eight years for MAs and PhDs, respectively).

We are undertaking research aimed at identifying those factors most responsible for protracted time-in-program. Once some real data are in hand, we will be in a better position to consider the causes of long degree completion times. However, even at this time it is obvious that one of the most significant factors here involves students' accepting full-time, off-campus employment once their residency and course requirements have been fulfilled. Department records show that, for both MAs and Ph.D.s, students with very long or maximum completion times often are those who take up full-time positions before defending their theses. Importantly, this phenomenon signifies a demand for our graduates, even before they complete their degrees. We note also that these students generally do not

represent a drain on Department resources, and have no impact on the availability of financial support for students in residence.

Corrections and miscellaneous comments:

p. 25 - we did not reject the pattern shown in Dean Clayman's data. We questioned why these data did not agree with our own records. Also, in the absence of cohort analysis, it seems to us that to monitor effectively a phenomenon with a five or eight year "cycle" would require data covering a period at least as long as the "cycle", or longer.

p. 26 - last paragraph - we do not require fieldwork as a component of graduate degree programs. Many students undertake fieldwork, but numerous theses have been based on library research, laboratory research, or study of existing collections.

p. 27 - if the first sentence implies that graduate courses are scheduled in the summer trimester, this is not true (except for an occasional Directed Readings course).

p. 28 - first paragraph - the numbers of students used in calculations here is very small. Also, Department records show equal dropout rates for men and women: 3 out of 9 and 1 out of 3, respectively.

5. Adequacy of support for graduate students and the size of the program

We do not find the arguments about downsizing the graduate program compelling. First, we are not convinced that the impact on our allocation of graduate support would be minimal or that such a reduction would do much for the program (see comments above). A reduction in graduate student numbers that brings about a proportionate reduction in available student support simply maintains the *status quo*. Downsizing would make sense only if a disproportionate relationship existed between student support and student numbers. A reduction of student time-in-program probably would have a more desirable effect than a simple reduction in numbers. Second, there have been several recent trimesters in which the number of graduate students available and applying for TAs has been inadequate to service undergraduate course offerings. Considering the current trend of increasing enrollments along with recent changes to the TSSU agreement, probably the demand for TAs will increase in future trimesters. Finally, as noted earlier, the Committee apparently do not feel that the student/faculty ratio in the Department is too high (p. 24).

We see no real reason to seriously consider downsizing the MA program, although we do agree that more student support is desirable.

VIII The Laboratories and the Museum

1. The Radiocarbon/Archaeometry Laboratory

As noted earlier we have concerns about the Radiocarbon Laboratory and are reviewing its operation. The idea of developing a different kind of lab is being considered.

2. The Museum and the 'Laboratories of Archaeology'

Reactions within the Department to this section of the Report are mixed. Some, particularly the founders of the Museum, find absurd the suggestion that the 'Laboratories of Archaeology' and Museum be combined, and that a radically altered museum policy be formulated (i.e., establishment of a "Museum of Archaeological Science"). In the view of the Curator, this kind of re-orientation probably would not serve the Museum's primary audience (archaeology and physical anthropology students) very well, and would do little to integrate the Museum into the functions of the Department. Others view this proposal as an attractive alternative to the present status of the Museum. Probably this is all immaterial, because such a proposal must be regarded as impractical in the absence of a substantial influx of funding.

Probably most would agree that over the last few years the Museum has been operating at a less-than-optimal level. This state of affairs primarily is a result of a period of severe financial restraint, that saw cut-backs not only in operating budget, but also in losses of personnel attached to the Museum. The Committee seem unaware that subsequent to hiring of the present Curator, some programs have been revived on a cost-recovery basis (and have been successful), and that the Curator has been steadily correcting conservation and collections management deficiencies.

Regardless of deficiencies, the Museum is an asset to the Department in that it is one of our best means of making ourselves visible to the University community and beyond. It therefore plays a critical role in advertising the Department's presence. While some may wish to fault the Department for not using the Museum to its fullest capacity in this regard, given the severe financial constraints of the last decade it is difficult to imagine any other outcome.

To be sure, the ERC probably do engage in some over statement in this part of the report, and it is clear that they did not ascertain the original purposes that the founders of the Museum had in mind when the museum was established. (Neither can the "Alice in Wonderland"

characterization be considered a positive contribution). Regardless of one's feelings about such matters, it is clear that development of a clear written statement of the Museum's mandate along with a set of policies to govern its operation are essential, whatever the ultimate configuration. This process was begun before the external review was initiated.

IX Administration and Governance

1. Internal

Here again, the ERC impose ideas associated with their own administrative systems (The Chair of the ERC is a Department Head, not a Chair) and several of their proposals are at odds with the SFU system. However, as noted earlier, downsizing of some of our internal committees is being considered. We already have student representatives on many of these committees.

Correction:

p. 33 - paragraph 3 - it was explained on page 14 of our internal report that the composition of the DTC and salary reviews are governed by University policy. Copies of University Policies AC 2 and AC 22 were included as Appendices to our report. Apparently the ERC missed these.

2. University relations - no comment necessary.

3. Beyond the University

We appreciate the favorable comments.

X. Conclusion - comments noted.

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Department of Archaeology
Burnaby, British Columbia
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. J. Munro
Vice President, Academic

FROM: J. Nance
Chair, Archaeology

RE: Archaeology External Review

DATE: January 22, 1992



As directed, I have solicited student comment on the report of the Archaeology External Review Committee. Attached are copies of responses from the Archaeology Graduate Caucus and the Archaeology Student Society.

The only remark I shall make relates to comments (by undergraduates) about fieldschool guidelines. A draft document has been prepared and has been submitted to the Department Undergraduate Curriculum Chair. Because proposed changes to fieldschool contained in the document (e.g., changes to course structure, prerequisites, etc.) require approval at higher levels, they could not be implemented as quickly as recommended by the ERC. In the interim fieldschool staff were made aware of the provisions of the proposed guidelines. I have communicated this to the Student Society.

Copy: Dr. R.C. Brown, Dean of Arts



**Archaeology Graduate Student Caucus
Simon Fraser University**

Response to the Report of the External Review Committee

January 15, 1992

Introduction

The graduate students in the Department of Archaeology have examined the report of the External Review Committee and we offer the following comments on the document. We feel the external review committee has offered a constructive evaluation of the Department and its programs and, in general, the assessment is favorable. We note, in particular, the reviewer's comments on the quality of graduate student research in the Department and their observations that graduates from the program at Simon Fraser University are successful and well regarded in the discipline.

Both the internal and the external reviews identified a number of problems in the Department pertaining to space, staffing levels and faculty complement. We agree that the source of many of these problems are attributable to the level of support the Department has received from the University and offer no further comment, except to note that these problems have a negative impact on our studies at Simon Fraser University.

Several issues discussed in the section on the graduate program we feel deserve emphasis and with others, we are not in agreement. It is toward these issues that we direct our comments.

1. Faculty Gender Imbalance

The reviewers noted and commented on the gender imbalance among the members of the Department's faculty. We agree with the reviewers that this imbalance is cause for serious concern and strongly endorse their recommendation that this issue be addressed through new appointments over the next few years. We feel the appointment of female faculty members must be made a Departmental priority and anticipate the Department will address this imbalance starting with the recently created faculty position.

2. Graduate Program Committee

The reviewers have recommended a reduction in the size of the Graduate Program Committee with the inclusion of a graduate student representative. We support this proposal and note that communication between faculty and graduate students would only benefit from this proposed change.

3. Degree Completion Time

The issue of degree completion times was raised by the reviewers who observed that "the pressure in all universities today is for graduate students to complete their studies in a shorter time than they have tended to do in the past" (p. 28). We strongly agree with the reviewers' conclusion that inadequate financial support is the major impediment to timely degree completion. Supervision, course structure and the MA colloquium were also singled out as contributing factors.

We note that in departments with lower graduate student completion times, the graduate programs focus on development and completion of a program of research. We contend that restructuring the Archaeology graduate program to emphasize and promote thesis research during the first two semesters of enrollment could significantly accelerate degree completion time.

(a) The Initial Meeting

We are in agreement with the reviewers that the initial meeting with the faculty is intimidating and unproductive. We support their suggestion of a more informal introduction to the Department.

(b) Courses and Colloquium

We agree "the coursework portion is a major stumbling block because there is no defined structure" (p. 26) but we do not agree that this is because courses are not offered

regularly. We locate the problem in the fact that coursework is currently regarded as an addendum to the undergraduate degree rather than as the base from which the graduate research will develop. We believe that coursework should be primarily focused on developing the thesis research and for this reason we also feel that the MA colloquium should be integrated into the coursework rather than discarded, as suggested in the external review. In its present form, as a "mini" thesis defense, the MA colloquium is indeed a stumbling block to timely degree completion.

(c) Supervision

Although responses to the graduate student questionnaire indicated a generally high level of satisfaction with the supervision received in the later stages of the program, it was felt to be inadequate during the crucial first two years of enrollment when the thesis research must be developed. We feel that closer supervision during the first two semesters, and earlier assistance in framing a research topic could significantly decrease degree completion time.

(d) Graduate Student Support

The reviewers identified graduate student financial support as a major impediment to timely degree completion, a situation that has existed since the first external review in 1975. We strongly agree. We are puzzled, however, by their subsequent comments on the distribution of Graduate Fellowships in the Department. They state that it would be "highly desirable to distribute any increase in the number of fellowship units on the basis of scholarship. Otherwise how can superior performance be stimulated and rewarded" (pp. 29-30)? We find this suggestion elitist and offensive.

To complete the program in a timely manner an uninterrupted period of at least two semesters is required to write the thesis or dissertation. This is not possible when a student is working as a teaching assistant, the major source of "support" available in the Archaeology Department. PhD students have access to the President's PhD Research Stipend which provides one semester support during the thesis writing stage, but MA students do not have access to similar funding. We feel that all students deserve the opportunity to enjoy quality

writing time and therefore priority for Graduate Fellowship funding should be given to those students who are in the process of writing their thesis.

4. Graduate Student Morale

The reviewers comment on the "low morale" and "lack of cohesion" of the student body and illustrate this with reference to the response to the graduate student questionnaire. We do not agree with this assessment. The fact that the graduate students independently initiated the questionnaire and prepared a chapter of the internal review document would seem rather to suggest the opposite. The fact that only 14 of 33 graduate students responded to the questionnaire was a result of its timing, at the end of the spring semester, and the fact that many of the students in the program were not resident on campus, nor even in the province. This situation we had no control over. We would also like to point out that our submission to the internal review document was not solely based on the results of the questionnaire, but was also informed by a series of meetings organized by the Archaeology Graduate Student Caucus which is a duly constituted body that speaks for graduate students in the Department. Our internal submission was not written by a minority of dissatisfied students as implied by the reviewers.

**ARCHAEOLOGY STUDENT SOCIETY
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**UNDERGRADUATE RESPONSE TO THE
REPORT OF THE
EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

JANUARY 17, 1992

Introduction

The Archaeology Student Society, a duly constituted body that speaks for undergraduate students in the Department, offers the following critique of the report of the External Review Committee. The report is evaluated in relation to the Society's written submission to the External Review Committee. This submission consisted of six topics: a Questionnaire; Field School; Gender Bias; Course Structure and Content; Sessionals and Teaching Assistants; and Grade Appeal Procedures. Regarding these issues, the Society is generally in agreement with the recommendations set forth in the report. However, there are some instances where we disagree and some issues are insufficiently emphasized. The Society's concerns are addressed below.

1. Questionnaire

A section of the Archaeology Undergraduate submission to the External Review Committee consisted of a questionnaire. Of a population of 77 declared majors (S.F.U. Fact Book, 11th Edition, December 1990), 43% responded.

(A) Field School - Lack of departmental policy guidelines outlining the conduct of and grading criteria for the field school emerged as the number one concern of students. While in general agreement with the recommendations for the Field School, we do not accept the Reviewer's criticism that students "have not sufficiently understood the differences between the classroom. . . and the field" (page 18). Students are well aware of the differences and, as a result, recognize the need for a specialized approach to teaching in the field as opposed to classroom instruction.

(B) Limited world prehistory courses, particularly Old World; Additional faculty needed; Too great a reliance on sessionals; Insufficient physical anthropology - These concerns are interrelated. The addition of two more faculty members, one specialist in physical anthropology, and one specialist in the archaeology of complex societies, as recommended by the External Reviewers,

would solve all four issues. The Society concurs with this recommendation.

(C) Gender Bias - This issue was identified by questionnaire respondents as related to the lack of female faculty and to an unfriendly atmosphere experienced by women students. We agree with the Reviewer's comments on these issues.

(D) Space and Equipment - The Society agrees in general with the Reviewers' recommendations regarding space and equipment. We agree that the single archaeological teaching lab is insufficient for the numbers of students taking lab courses (p. 15), meaning that it may take several semesters before a student has a high enough registration priority to obtain the lab classes they desire. We also concur with the need for an additional lab/technical person. What is not mentioned is space for students. Common room space for students must be included in the Department's regular requests for more space. As well, graduate students need more office space. The little "pen" that all of them are herded into is unsafe and uncomfortable.

(E) Unprofessional Conduct - Comments, some relating to sexual harassment, were made about one professor by several questionnaire respondents. Comments on unprofessional conduct of Field School instructors were also made. The Reviewers comment (p. 6,17,18,19 and 26) about such issues. We agree that the Department needs to take action to address these problems.

2. Field School

The Society concurs with the External Review committee that the field school is a vital element in the credibility of SFU's archaeology program. It is a given that both the faculty and the students together share the responsibility for maintaining the academic standards and the reputation of the University. However, we reject the statement that the undergraduates have insufficient understanding of the differences between classroom and field situations. It is clear that unique and unexpected problems can occur in any given field situation, and any student with experience in archaeology is certainly cognizant of some of these problems. It is our explicit understanding that problems in the field do not occur in a vacuum, for the problems experienced by the archaeologist in charge also become the problems experienced by the students. These problems, if tactfully and carefully communicated, can become an invaluable component of the critical problem-solving process, as students then have the opportunity to become partners in a possible solution. These critical thinking skills are vital to

any successful learning atmosphere, and field school students are indeed at unique liberty to benefit from the professor's experience and expertise, as they are involved in a dynamic interactive process between professor and student.

The Society is pleased that the Reviewers acknowledge the seriousness of specific allegations contained in our written presentation regarding the Field School, and we commend the recommendations made regarding the Field School. However, it should be noted that in the time since the External Review document was prepared, one Field School has taken place (summer of 1991), and another will soon be underway (summer of 1992) without the recommended formal field school guidelines of conduct having been established. It is reiterated that a code of Field School conduct be developed by a committee of faculty and students working together, producing a document agreed to by both.

The Society concurs with the Reviewers that more attention be paid to safety in field school situations, but feel the committee are remiss in specifying what "adequate" first-aid skills are to consist of. We once again reiterate that both the professor in charge and his/her teaching assistants should be certified in first-aid, and that basic first-aid be a part of the in-class portion of the field-school.

3. Gender Bias

The Society takes the position, a view which is endorsed (p. 35) by the reviewers, that any new faculty members that may be hired must be women, to redress the gender imbalance on the faculty. The usual criticism of this solution is that this would lead to unqualified women being hired. This is exceedingly unlikely as departments of anthropology have for many years been producing high calibre male and female PhD.'s. However, for years men and not women, have more frequently been hired for academic posts. To assume that the preferential hiring of women would compromise the standards of excellence in this department, is to assume that somehow, all male PhD.'s are better candidates than all female PhD.'s, even though both are coming out of the very same programs!

In addition to recognizing the gender imbalance on the faculty, we were pleased to note that our concerns about gender bias experienced by women students were not ignored by the Reviewers (p. 17,18). We agree that the Department needs to educate faculty on issues of harassment and sexism. Clearly, women and men students feel that these issues have damaged faculty-student relationships.

Any such action should be well publicized, so that it is evident to students that these very serious concerns are being addressed.

4. Undergraduate Program Structure

The following concerns were addressed by Society's submission to the External Review: the lack of a structured prerequisite system; the lack of a standard content to basic core courses; the lack of consistent marking in such courses; the need for greater coordination of professors taking sabbaticals; and the lack of sufficient faculty. In addition, the society's submission included recommendations for the following changes to the Undergraduate Program: a lower level introductory theory course; or Method and Theory to be offered over two semesters; lower level basic lab procedures course; courses on surveying and mapping; more courses in physical anthropology, regional prehistory, civilizations, historic archaeology, and other specialized courses.

In the External Review, recommendations are made which address the concerns expressed in the Society's submission. These recommendations include: the need for a patterned and structured prerequisite system and sequence of courses (p. 15); the need for Departmental standards for course outlines, exams, and grading and the explanation of these standards to sessional instructors (p. 19); that critical pieces of undergraduate work be graded by more than one professor (p. 19); that the sabbatical and research leaves of absence be better coordinated (p. 14). Further, in the areas of Physical Anthropology and Archaeology, that an additional two faculty members are needed (p.36), and that this would alleviate some of the problems regarding program structure. Although none of the changes to specific courses recommended by the Society were included in the External Review recommendations, the recommendations that are in the External Review will be of benefit to the program and satisfy some of the concerns expressed by our membership.

We welcome the recommendations put forth in the Report and hope the Department will act swiftly upon them.

5. Sessional Instructors and Teaching Assistants

The External Review recognized the need to restructure teaching loads within the Department, suggesting that sessional instructors teach less, and faculty teach more. The Report recommends that the addition of another physical anthropologist and an ancient

civilizations specialist would reduce the reliance on sessionals (p. 4,6,13,14). The Society agrees.

Another recommendation is that teaching assistants take on tutorials normally conducted by faculty, thereby freeing them to teach courses which at present are taught by sessionals. However, this brings up the issue of T.A. competence, a point not addressed by the Review. Serious consideration should be given to the development of guidelines to assist T.A.'s in fulfilling their duties.

Another concern raised by the Society but not addressed by the Review is the lack of office space for T.A.'s and sessionals to meet privately with students. Currently an office is shared by all the sessionals. T.A.'s have office hours at various locations throughout the department. Office requirements for sessionals and T.A.'s must be taken into account by the Department when making space requests of the University Administration.

No mention was made in the review of the issue of undergraduate T.A.'s. The Society's position is that given sufficient notice, as contractually required, there are always graduate students available to T.A. courses and it should, therefore, be unnecessary for senior undergrads to T.A.

6. Grade Appeal Procedures

The reviewers addressed and agreed with our concerns that there was not enough information available to undergraduates about grade appeal procedures and that inconsistency in grading between courses and faculty needed to be remedied. It is important to note that there is an overall fear among students to put forward grade appeals which was brought to the attention of the Reviewers, yet they did not choose to comment on this.

In addition, the Society supports the recommendation (p. 19) that the Department put in place formal appeals procedures specifically applicable to Field School.

Conclusion

It is hoped that that the External Review Report and the Society's response to it are not regarded merely as exercises in rhetoric, but rather are regarded in the spirit with which they were prepared. This spirit embodies positive, constructive actions that will benefit faculty, staff and students of the Department of Archaeology.

**ARCHAEOLOGY STUDENT SOCIETY
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**UNDERGRADUATE RESPONSE TO THE
REPORT OF THE
EXTERNAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

JANUARY 17, 1992

Introduction

The Archaeology Student Society, a duly constituted body that speaks for undergraduate students in the Department, offers the following critique of the report of the External Review Committee. The report is evaluated in relation to the Society's written submission to the External Review Committee. This submission consisted of six topics: a Questionnaire; Field School; Gender Bias; Course Structure and Content; Sessionals and Teaching Assistants; and Grade Appeal Procedures. Regarding these issues, the Society is generally in agreement with the recommendations set forth in the report. However, there are some instances where we disagree and some issues are insufficiently emphasized. The Society's concerns are addressed below.

1. Questionnaire

A section of the Archaeology Undergraduate submission to the External Review Committee consisted of a questionnaire. Of a population of 77 declared majors (S.F.U. Fact Book, 11th Edition, December 1990), 43% responded.

(A) Field School - Lack of departmental policy guidelines outlining the conduct of and grading criteria for the field school emerged as the number one concern of students. While in general agreement with the recommendations for the Field School, we do not accept the Reviewer's criticism that students "have not sufficiently understood the differences between the classroom . . . and the field" (page 18). Students are well aware of the differences and, as a result, recognize the need for a specialized approach to teaching in the field as opposed to classroom instruction.

(B) Limited world prehistory courses, particularly Old World; Additional faculty needed; Too great a reliance on sessionals; Insufficient physical anthropology - These concerns are interrelated. The addition of two more faculty members, one specialist in physical anthropology, and one specialist in the archaeology of complex societies, as recommended by the External Reviewers,

would solve all four issues. The Society concurs with this recommendation.

(C) Gender Bias - This issue was identified by questionnaire respondents as related to the lack of female faculty and to an unfriendly atmosphere experienced by women students. We agree with the Reviewer's comments on these issues.

(D) Space and Equipment - The Society agrees in general with the Reviewers' recommendations regarding space and equipment. We agree that the single archaeological teaching lab is insufficient for the numbers of students taking lab courses (p. 15), meaning that it may take several semesters before a student has a high enough registration priority to obtain the lab classes they desire. We also concur with the need for an additional lab/technical person. What is not mentioned is space for students. Common room space for students must be included in the Department's regular requests for more space. As well, graduate students need more office space. The little "pen" that all of them are herded into is unsafe and uncomfortable.

(E) Unprofessional Conduct - Comments, some relating to sexual harassment, were made about one professor by several questionnaire respondents. Comments on unprofessional conduct of Field School instructors were also made. The Reviewers comment (p. 6,17,18,19 and 26) about such issues. We agree that the Department needs to take action to address these problems.

2. Field School

The Society concurs with the External Review committee that the field school is a vital element in the credibility of SFU's archaeology program. It is a given that both the faculty and the students together share the responsibility for maintaining the academic standards and the reputation of the University. However, we reject the statement that the undergraduates have insufficient understanding of the differences between classroom and field situations. It is clear that unique and unexpected problems can occur in any given field situation, and any student with experience in archaeology is certainly cognizant of some of these problems. It is our explicit understanding that problems in the field do not occur in a vacuum, for the problems experienced by the archaeologist in charge also become the problems experienced by the students. These problems, if tactfully and carefully communicated, can become an invaluable component of the critical problem-solving process, as students then have the opportunity to become partners in a possible solution. These critical thinking skills are vital to

any successful learning atmosphere, and field school students are indeed at unique liberty to benefit from the professor's experience and expertise, as they are involved in a dynamic interactive process between professor and student.

The Society is pleased that the Reviewers acknowledge the seriousness of specific allegations contained in our written presentation regarding the Field School, and we commend the recommendations made regarding the Field School. However, it should be noted that in the time since the External Review document was prepared, one Field School has taken place (summer of 1991), and another will soon be underway (summer of 1992) without the recommended formal field school guidelines of conduct having been established. It is reiterated that a code of Field School conduct be developed by a committee of faculty and students working together, producing a document agreed to by both.

The Society concurs with the Reviewers that more attention be paid to safety in field school situations, but feel the committee are remiss in specifying what "adequate" first-aid skills are to consist of. We once again reiterate that both the professor in charge and his/her teaching assistants should be certified in first-aid, and that basic first-aid be a part of the in-class portion of the field-school.

3. Gender Bias

The Society takes the position, a view which is endorsed (p. 35) by the reviewers, that any new faculty members that may be hired must be women, to redress the gender imbalance on the faculty. The usual criticism of this solution is that this would lead to unqualified women being hired. This is exceedingly unlikely as departments of anthropology have for many years been producing high calibre male and female PhD.'s. However, for years men and not women, have more frequently been hired for academic posts. To assume that the preferential hiring of women would compromise the standards of excellence in this department, is to assume that somehow, all male PhD.'s are better candidates than all female PhD.'s, even though both are coming out of the very same programs!

In addition to recognizing the gender imbalance on the faculty, we were pleased to note that our concerns about gender bias experienced by women students were not ignored by the Reviewers (p. 17,18). We agree that the Department needs to educate faculty on issues of harassment and sexism. Clearly, women and men students feel that these issues have damaged faculty-student relationships.

Any such action should be well publicized, so that it is evident to students that these very serious concerns are being addressed.

4. Undergraduate Program Structure

The following concerns were addressed by Society's submission to the External Review: the lack of a structured prerequisite system; the lack of a standard content to basic core courses; the lack of consistent marking in such courses; the need for greater coordination of professors taking sabbaticals; and the lack of sufficient faculty. In addition, the society's submission included recommendations for the following changes to the Undergraduate Program: a lower level introductory theory course; or Method and Theory to be offered over two semesters; lower level basic lab procedures course, courses on surveying and mapping; more courses in physical anthropology, regional prehistory, civilizations, historic archaeology, and other specialized courses.

In the External Review, recommendations are made which address the concerns expressed in the Society's submission. These recommendations include: the need for a patterned and structured prerequisite system and sequence of courses (p. 15); the need for Departmental standards for course outlines, exams, and grading and the explanation of these standards to sessional instructors (p. 19); that critical pieces of undergraduate work be graded by more than one professor (p. 19); that the sabbatical and research leaves of absence be better coordinated (p. 14). Further, in the areas of Physical Anthropology and Archaeology, that an additional two faculty members are needed (p.36), and that this would alleviate some of the problems regarding program structure. Although none of the changes to specific courses recommended by the Society were included in the External Review recommendations, the recommendations that are in the External Review will be of benefit to the program and satisfy some of the concerns expressed by our membership.

We welcome the recommendations put forth in the Report and hope the Department will act swiftly upon them.

5. Sessional Instructors and Teaching Assistants

The External Review recognized the need to restructure teaching loads within the Department, suggesting that sessional instructors teach less, and faculty teach more. The Report recommends that the addition of another physical anthropologist and an ancient