

Anthro Writ SMALL

BULLETIN OF THE FEDERATION OF SMALL ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAMS SPRING 2017

CHAIR'S REPORT

Our **2017 business meeting** at the **Washington, DC AAA meetings** will be **Saturday, 2 December, 12:00-1:30**, room TBA (watch for online as well as print programs).

Agenda: please send me items you'd like to see us tackle at this meeting. For starters:

- 1) I would like us to step up our discussion about whether and how best to serve our members, for example by providing FOSAP assessment teams, creating a bank of online resources linked from our website regarding teaching, workload, tenure and promotion, student recruitment and retention, retirement and other issues.
- 2) We also will need to discuss ideas for a FOSAP-sponsored panel and/or workshop for the 2018 AAAs in San Jose, CA (14-18 Nov.).

FOSAP Listserve. You should have recently received an email welcoming you to our new FOSAP listserv, followed by an email from me welcoming you again and letting you know that the list has a new name and address, so that you'll need to update your address books and spam filters, etc. We are now housed at the AAA site, since the system at my college became dysfunctional a short time ago and the IT person who set it up had retired. ***Now anyone can post to the list directly***, though additions and deletions from the list will have to be made through me as list administrator. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions. If you do not wish to remain on the list, let me know and I'll remove you. Similarly, if you have colleagues who you think would be interested in joining our group and efforts, have them email me and I'll add them.

There's a bit more to the story of the migration of our listserv to the AAA, however. Vernon Horn, IT wizard at the AAA -- who graciously helped us make this successful transition -- wrote me an e-mail message saying that the "AAA is working on a project to replace these lists in 6-18 months, and as part of the conversation surrounding that, AAA is asking the question 'Should AAA membership be a requirement for future participation?' To that end, I've been trying to gather as much information about the makeup of the lists, so, as part of the list creation process, I took the addresses that you sent and passed them through our membership database and added names and membership status, and put that back in the spreadsheet that I'm returning to you. I want to reiterate that at this point, no AAA membership is required to be part of the list, and I have added all the addresses that you sent. I would, however, value any feedback that you want to send me regarding that question, and also what features you might find desirable in whatever we offer next."

I hope we can get a discussion going on the listserv about this matter; we'll certainly discuss it at this November's business meeting.

Other items to note:

- Starting with this issue, our Newsletter will be named **Anthro-Writ-Small** to better reflect our mission and to honor (however subtly) Margaret Mead as one of our founding ancestors. Please post to the listserve any ideas you have about the name or its font.
- As our new (though perhaps interim) webmaster, Megan McCullen (Alma C.) will be updating our **FOSAP website** (www.fosap.org) over the coming months. THANK YOU!
- We continue to think that FOSAP can help colleagues at small programs deal with **assessment and program evaluation**. Jason Pribilsky (Whitman C.) has worked in this area for several years and has some insights in this newsletter.
- At the Minneapolis AAA meetings, last November, we had a productive FOSAP **business meeting** (see Teresa Winstead's minutes, next) and **workshop** on Thriving at Liberal Arts Institutions: Expectations, Challenges, and Opportunities organized and led by Jennifer Heung and David McCurdy (see Jennifer's note, below)
- Finally, I'd like to reiterate our thanks to Connie DeRoche who, though retired from teaching, continues to ably put together and digitally publish our annual newsletter.
- Please don't hesitate to contact me or anyone else mentioned in the newsletter with your ideas about how to make FOSAP as useful as possible, including ideas for future newsletter issues. And please consider submitting an article!

I hope your academic year has gone well, and productive summer plans are coming into focus.

All best to you,

Tom Love

tlove@linfield.edu

<http://www.linfield.edu/soan/faculty-detail.html?id=83>

503-883-2504

2016 FOSAP BUSINESS MEETING

Saturday Nov 19th 2016 | 12:15 – 1:30 pm | Minneapolis, MN

Meeting called by	Tom Love (In absentia)	Attendees: David McCurdy (Macalester College), Teresa Winstead (Saint Martin's University), Anton Daughters (Truman State), Jennifer Heung (Saint Mary's College), Douglas Dalton (Longwood U) Guests: Russ Bernard (U of FL)
Facilitator	Teresa Winstead (Secty)	
Note taker	Anton Daughters	

12:15 Called meeting to order. Teresa Winstead (St. Martins U) is stepping-in for Tom Love (Linfield). Anton Daughters (Truman U) offered to take minutes.

12:25 We discussed the possibility of moving the FOSAP listserve to the AAA managed server. Teresa Winstead agreed to get the ball rolling on this.

12:30 We heard a brief report from Jennifer Heung (St Mary's C) and Dave McCurdy (Macalaster C)

on this year's FOSAP-sponsored workshop "3-0705 THRIVING AT LIBERAL ARTS INSTITUTIONS: EXPECTATIONS, CHALLENGES, AND OPPORTUNITIES" –

12:35 We were treated to remarks from **Dave McCurdy and Russ Bernard** about the origins of FOSAP, its relationship to GAD, and finding balance among teaching, research and service in a small college setting.



12:50 Russ Bernard encouraged attendees to explore the UFL/ASU Qual Quant Methods courses for both faculty and students. Information can be found at <http://distance.ufl.edu/rma/>

1:00 We discussed the upcoming Spring Newsletter, and decided to change newsletter name from ANTHRO-AT-LARGE to ANTHRO-WRIT-SMALL.

- Teresa Winstead volunteered to ask David Price (Saint Martin's U) to contribute an article about the continued importance of small anthropology programs.
- We discussed having a short piece on assessment in the newsletter, by Jason Pribilsky (Whitman C).

1:10 We discussed the need for a session on collaborative and community based research with students in small programs. We hope to assemble a panel on this subject at the 2017 AAA meetings.

1:20 Other issues:

- We discussed developing a mentorship program like that being initiated by CASTAC. Members present thought this would be useful and provide support for faculty and students in small anthropology programs.
- Related to threatened programs: We discussed the way that anthropology programs are coming under fire from administration focused on professionalization of curriculum, especially in a small college context.
- One way FOSAP can help in this regard is by developing resources to help argue for the importance of anthropology programs in a rigorous liberal arts curriculum.
- Attendees were in favor of developing a resource bank of useful materials on our website
- Attendees discussed recruitment strategies to make FOSAP stronger, including building a stronger web presence, and recruiting new members from anthropologists in our regional and extended networks.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
AAA – FOSAP Listserv	Teresa Winstead and Tom Love	January 2017
1:15 Meeting Adjourned		

FOSAP SPONSORED WORKSHOP AT THE 2016 AAA

Jennifer Heung

Saint Mary's College of California

jheung@stmarys-ca.edu

In Minneapolis, FOSAP sponsored an important workshop entitled “Thriving at Liberal Arts Institutions: Expectations, Challenges, and Opportunities” and organized by Drs. Jennifer Heung and David McCurdy. The workshop was motivated by a discussion among FOSAP members, at the 2015 meetings in Denver, that revolved around how to better prepare job candidates who were interested in careers at Liberal Arts Institutions. Often, important issues -- such as the work conditions in small or joint departments, as well as different expectations for scholarship, teaching, and service -- are not addressed in conventional job workshops. The event garnered a modest attendance with four participants. But this allowed organizers to provide an overview of issues *and* individual consultations to each participant. Two of the participants were just entering the job market, while the remaining two had been on the market for several years. Topics included how to prepare successful job applications tailored to Liberal Arts Institutions, the benefits of working at a Liberal Arts institution, and strategies for dealing with the challenges of scholarship and teaching in small departments. There were some positive reviews of the workshop, but also a request for even more structured information. If the workshop is offered again, we would like to request specific information from participants in advance as well as to restructure parts of the presentation.

REMINISCENCES OF FOSAP'S BEGINNINGS

Patricia Rice (with Conrad Kottak)

At the 2015 General Anthropology Division's Board Meeting, Tom Love, current chair of FOSAP, asked if I would write an "unofficial" history of FOSAP for the upcoming Newsletter. As one of the founders of that committee, I agreed to try to recollect happenings from some 25 years ago. In the meantime, I decided my *vita* was the best bet for timing questions, but in the eight years since my retirement, I have apparently not only tossed out tons of paper and computer disks, but also any indication of my past academic life, including my FOSAP activities. In other words, I can't find my *vita*! So, what follows is accordingly sketchy in terms of dates.

My part in FOSAP started in the early 1990s when I began going to AAA meetings. Since my research interests were in paleoanthropology (both archaeology/prehistory and human evolution), I was disappointed to find there were no AAA units that fit my interests. (There are now.) But given my interests in teaching, I drifted into the open business meeting of the Council on Anthropology and Education. I discovered, however, that CAE appeared to be more interested in education per se than in the specifics of *teaching* anthropology, i.e., the result rather than the method. They did have a teaching committee, but it was small and seemingly unimportant. I went to several of their meetings and decided that that committee was "in the wrong place."

Knowing a little about the General Anthropology Division, I checked on the whereabouts of the current chair (later to be president) Conrad Kottak at that AAA meeting. He was to speak on cultural anthropology at the "Four Fields Update," sponsored by the Community College unit. After introducing myself to Conrad, I broached the subject of moving the CAE Committee on Teaching Anthropology to GAD. He encouraged me to write up a proposal, which I did, and the GAD board approved the shift of what is now called the Committee on Teaching Anthropology. After being involved in COTA for several years, it occurred to me that most of the members, and their interests, differed from mine. I was a full-time Assistant Professor in what I considered a small anthropology program, while most COTA members were in far larger departments with different goals and interests. And yes, that sparked the idea for a committee devoted to the interests and problems faced by small programs of anthropology.

I then got in touch with AAA and found that it regarded "small programs" as those having five or fewer full-time instructors. Back then, there was a printed AAA Guide that listed all anthropology or anthropology related departments in the US, and many in Canada and England as I recall. I wrote a form letter and made many copies, which sent off to whomever seemed to be the senior member of each small program listed in the AAA Guide. I invited them to join me at the next AAA meeting to discuss organizing a committee devoted specifically to the problems, issues, and goals of small programs. At that meeting we agreed there was a need for such a committee and that it belonged in GAD, and we began to discuss the commonalities of small programs. One of the discussants suggested the name Federation of Small Anthropology Programs, and the name stuck.

We identified, at our first meeting, the problems, issues, and challenges of small programs (which seem to have endured). Most small programs are in departments titled Sociology and Anthropology, and that usually means anthropology takes on secondary status. In most cases, such departments have either no graduate programs or graduate programs only in sociology. Additionally, though anthropology is still regarded as a four-field academic discipline, instructors who teach in small programs often find themselves teaching courses in sub-disciplines other than their own. In a

department with only three anthropologists, for example, over the years, I ended up teaching everything but linguistics. Despite having to spend additional time preparing courses outside our specific specialties, we have the same requirements as people teaching only their specialties in large departments. That is, we are still evaluated in the three main categories of research, teaching, and service.

The good news is that this does make us GENERALISTS out of necessity.

I then became involved in GAD as secretary-treasurer, then as president, and -- the most time-consuming role of all -- cofounder with Dave McCurdy of *General Anthropology*, which I coedited for 22 years. So, my knowledge of FOSAP pretty much ends here except for hearing annual reports from the committee chairs at the GAD Board Meetings in November.

WHY SMALL ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAMS MATTER

David Price

Saint Martin's University

dprice@stmartin.edu

For over two decades I have taught anthropology in a small department situated within a small college, and while small programs have some obvious limits, I continue to support them because of the unique interactions that we instructors have with students, and the ways we can easily interact with other disciplines. There are significant variations in small anthropology programs' budgets, class sizes, teaching loads, ratios of tenure-track and contingent faculty, or students' academic preparation; but there are many features of small anthropology programs that unite all of us who teach in these programs.

Small programs don't mint anthropology doctorates, though we sometimes plant the seeds of those who later earn these degrees. But because we tend to focus on teaching over research, we have unique opportunities to open students' minds to new ways of thinking about the world. We often spend significant amounts of classroom and office hours engaging with students who are not anthropology majors. While this can sometimes limit the depth of analysis we can delve into in class instruction and discussions, we can engage non-majors who would otherwise have no contact with anthropological perspectives on the human condition. It also means that some of our students later become pioneers, bringing anthropological ideas to workplaces outside of academia, as they use their anthropological training in the private sector or governmental agencies where they build their careers.

Our contacts with these non-anthropology majors may be one of the most significant ways that our small programs matter. Our primary roles as teachers gives us unique opportunities to help students rethink a lot of what they were taught before entering college. Sometimes this means we use classroom time to patiently counter widespread fallacies about race, heredity, social Darwinism, meritocracy, ethnicity, UFOs, cryptozoology, evolution, or the many other social beliefs that shape our non-majors' world.

Small programs tend to be less research driven, and focus primarily on teaching undergraduate students; these circumstances increasingly mean we use our discipline as a medium for teaching the vital skills of writing, rewriting, critical reading, and the development of argument. Anthropology professors sometimes resent these tasks as intrusions on classroom activities, but I see them as the best rationalization for all we do. Small programs provide opportunities to work on student writing in ways

that large programs can't, and because our subject matter can capture student interest in unique ways, we have opportunities to add to their understanding of the world *and* make them stronger writers.

Small programs sometimes mean small budgets, which require us to play multiple roles. We often become generalists; we need to keep abreast of broad anthropological knowledge about all kinds of things: kinship systems, color typologies, exchange systems, primatology, social theory, quantitative and qualitative methods, the history of the discipline. Because we have to become generalists in ways our colleagues in larger institutions don't, many of us, over time, also inevitably broaden our own theoretical perspectives, simply by trying to accurately represent perspectives that we aren't personally drawn to or perhaps were trained to dismiss in graduate school. In this way, I have come to read theoretical work that I would otherwise have ignored but that I have come to appreciate.

The possibilities of doing research at smaller colleges has been revolutionized in the last dozen years due to the rapid spread of accessible online library resources; this shift now opens incredible research opportunities for anthropologists in small departments. An academic generation ago, anthropologists in small programs faced significant disadvantages in access to library resources needed for research. The transformation in online library consortiums, e-texts, and electronic journals have eliminated the need for proximity and access to large university libraries to be able to do cutting edge research. While many have been slow to recognize the potential of this technological transformation, small anthropology programs no longer face meaningful library resource disadvantages.

All these reasons argue that small anthropology programs matter. But fundamentally it is pedagogical interactions we have with our students that connects all of us working in these programs and that gives meaning to our daily work. We have unique opportunities to teach students about cultural worlds that exist beyond their life experience, and, in some sense, the small scale of our programs shapes our relationships with students in ways that reflect the discipline of anthropology itself.

WITHER THE PEDAGOGICAL ETHNOGRAPHY

Constance deRoche

cderoche@eastlink.ca

Decades of using ethnographic case studies (aka ethnographies), as a professor, editor, and reviewer, have led me to raise some questions and concerns. Given market forces, it is no surprise that commercial presses have been slow to publish new pedagogically useful ethnographies. Academic presses are mandated to produce scholarly works rather than resources for undergraduates and, especially, non-majors. These and other, realities – such as the escalating costs of high education – make me wonder if it makes sense to ask students to read ethnographies for undergraduate courses. But ethnographies speak from the heart of the discipline: their holism underpins methodological relativism and, in turn, humanistic, in-depth problem solving. How can we be effectively deal with such circumstances? While I can hardly answer such questions here, I hope to share some observations and reflections with colleagues whose careers concentrate on undergraduate teaching.

I was first introduced to ethnography case studies in a comparative sociology class in the 1960s. My class was assigned Alan Beals' *Gopalpur: A South Indian Village* and John Beattie's *Bunyoro: An African Kingdom*, two volumes in the Case Studies in Cultural Anthropology series, edited by George and Louise Spindler and published by Holt, Rinehart and Winston (HRW). In those days, the roster of titles in the series was printed on the back cover of each book. The eleven listings, in 1964, grew to fill, in compacted form, those back panels. The series was explicitly produced for students: the volumes ran to about one-hundred pages (deceptively brief, though, given page and print size). They were readable,

primarily descriptive -- ethnographic realism being the order of the day -- and theoretically unchallenging. Later, Waveland Press entered the niche with its own series of rhetorically and theoretically appropriate ethnographies for undergraduates. Both series continue, though HRW series is now published by Wadsworth Cengage -- a company spawned from corporate divorces and group remarriages that are characteristic of market economies. (Readers who are sorry to be spared this family history, can consult Google for further information.)

Over more than three decades of teaching in a small anthropology program, I used these student-oriented ethnographies in different ways. (My favorite assignment was a role-reversal term- paper exercise.) When I took charge of *General Anthropology's* "Useful Ethnographies" column in 2002, I looked to both series for new notable ethnographies, while also setting my sights further afield, to qualitative sociology and also to in-depth relativistic, experientially based studies by non-academics (such as Ehrenreich's *Nicked and Dimed*.) As time went on, I found myself paying increasing attention to university press listings (a salubrious event, were it driven by escalating standards of undergraduate education, although a case could more easily be made that course requirements have been heading in a decidedly different direction). The student-oriented series were simply not producing fast enough to offer options, although GAD publishes only semi-annually. This situation warrants some commentary on our discipline's market power.

Note that half of the (64) titles in Waveland's ethnographic series were published before 2000. Over the last decade, 2007-2016, 20 have been published. But seven of them were re-editions; and two others are novels. One new title has appeared thus far this year; the next most recent was released in 2011). Waveland's website is easy to navigate; quoted prices are list prices (cost to students not sellers); and the publisher's examination copy policy is liberal. But its ethnographic publication program is limiting, especially given anthropology's geographic and topical diversity.

The Wadsworth-Cengage resources are no more encouraging; but the company's presentation-of-self is very informative. (Its website is anything but user friendly. Readers who want to save surfing time and frustration should go to <http://www.cengage.com/s/anthropology> and link to the Case Studies in Anthropology.) The series consists of 56 titles, the last of which was released in 2013. Only eight of them carry publication dates between 2007 and 2016. Four of these are marked as first editions. The other four include Chagnon's 6th on the Yanomamo and Lee's 4th on the Dobe Ju/'Hoansi, leaving us to wonder about the significance of such updating. My survey produced more curious results. Imagine my surprise when I found Gopalpur dated as a 1980 publication, albeit in a "fieldwork edition." I went on to find Beattie's *Bunyoro: An African Kingdom* listed as a 1st edition, dated to 2002. Indeed, 2002 was manifestly a banner year for the series: 16 titles carry the date, 13 of which are presented as 1st editions. But the 2002 roster contained some number very familiar old titles, which left me suspicious and led me to Google. I discovered, for example, that Lincoln Keiser's *Vice Lords* was originally published in 1969 by HRW, as was Bruce Trigger's historical ethnography of the Huron. Indeed, virtually all the so-called 1st editions from 2002 were originally HRW publications. (Two were first published after Harcourt Brace took over HRW, and one was published by Wadsworth in 1996). The Wadsworth-Cengage site provides *no* indication of the original publication dates.

These temporal attributions may be mere business conveniences. Motives aside, the dating practice is *functional for the publisher*: it creates an illusion of activity but at little cost. Limited options channel professors into ordering relative profitable products. The system also helps to mitigate against student complaints about being taught outdated materials. (Imagine how a twenty-year-old perceives even 1996, much less 1969!) The dating system is less useful for professors and students. As a living discipline, anthropology has, of course, changed over the years. It has become more historically and geo-politically sophisticated, while small communities themselves have become increasingly integrated

into world systems. Using older materials reflects poorly on the discipline, even when professors provide sociohistorical contextualization.

Societal forces impinge on us in many ways. The academic job market has been contracting. Youth employment has become increasingly problematic. The market value of arts and science degrees has declined. And, so, anthropology has become much more oriented to real-world issues and practical applications. Thus, it was encouraging to find Wadsworth-Cengage launching, circa 2003, a new ethnographic series, *Case Studies on Contemporary Social Issues*, under the editorship of Oregon State professor John A. Young (1996-68 president of the Society for Applied Anthropology). As of 2009, nine ethnographies had been published, though, unfortunately, only five remain in print.

This is not the end of the story. Anthropology's slant on education may have become more market-focused, but it has been outpaced. The established neoliberal ideology of our era has come to discount not only our discipline (little sister to sociology, for example) but the arts and sciences relative to more utilitarian programs, i.e., those that offer technical and business skills. This larger shift is reflected in how the *Contemporary Social Issues* series is being remade: the website makes no reference to the series editor, and the five case studies in anthropology have been joined by two in criminal justice and one in management. In short, it is no longer a series in ethnography. The overlap in publication by discipline underscore this re-orientation: The latest anthropological contribution is the second (2013) edition of Barker's 2004 case study. Clearly the corporation has redirected its energies: The next newest additions to the series are the 10th edition of a criminal justice textbook (2017) and a forthcoming (2018) 16th edition of a similar text by the same co-authors.

Again, anthropology is not alone. It makes good business sense to focus on canonical textbooks that are often issued with minor changes, to publish readers rather than full case studies, to devise modes of just-in-time production (e.g., build your own reader). But, despite the world-view of many administrators, academia is not a business. This means that (pre-retired) colleagues will need to be creative and strategic in effectively incorporating ethnographies in their undergraduate courses. Some academic press publications do "fill the bill" in terms of price, readability, length, and interest-value. Still others will suit, if supplemented with carefully presented guides to the theoretical issues they detail.

EXTERNAL REVIEWS AND THE SMALL ANTHROPOLOGY PROGRAM

Jason Pribilsky

Whitman College

Within the discipline that helped define the critical study of "audit cultures" (Strathern 2000), to talk of assessment and its alphabet soup of acronyms (e.g., SLO, student learning outcomes) is a delicate proposition. While anthropologists have celebrated global resistance to "audit creep," in our own professional lives that train has already left the station. No institution of higher education can function for very long without accepting the reality of higher education's fixation on assessment and the pursuit of evidence demonstrating student learning. However, as anthropologists – committed, as we are, to ethnography and sophisticated critiques of the metrification of daily life – we are well positioned to advocate for *meaningful* assessments of student learning that complement numerical assessments and the indirect measures that too frequently stand as proxies of learning (e.g., graduation rates, student evaluations, and alumni surveys).

The AAA, unlike its peer professional organizations (especially the ASA) has come late to the assessment table. Only three years ago, the Association established the “Resource Panel for External Tenure and Promotion Review and External Program Review,” an assembly of anthropologists from varied institutions who are available to assist with assessment and evaluation. As one of only a couple of Panel members from liberal arts or other small programs, I have concentrated my energies on the External Review process, primarily in the service of small departments, including combined anthropology/sociology programs.

In my experience, departments and programs usually undertake external reviews for a couple of reasons: reviews are either part of cyclical, routine evaluation, or they become required in moments of program crisis and/or transition. In both cases, the reviewer typically swoops in for a couple of days (hopefully, but not always, as a part of a team) and, in 36 to 48 hours, is expected to sleuth out a program’s strengths and weaknesses – aspects which may only be hinted at in the self-study prepared in advance of a reviewer’s visit. Almost invariably, distinct stakeholders (department members vs. Deans of Faculty) anticipate different results: expanding programs and adding new faculty versus trimming resources and doing more with less. Conflicting desires aside, my goal as a reviewer is to listen to the needs and hopes of the department (faculty, students and support staff) and other campus actors that serve the program (librarians, lab techs, off-campus study abroad personnel, teaching-center staff and faculty in cognate programs). Then I aim to provide a macro view of the program that would facilitate making constructive choices.

While all reviews share common aspects, external reviews for small programs present some unique challenges. From my experience, here are three key considerations that any department should think about as they embark on the process:

Work backwards. Efficient program review incorporates assessment design into the mix, rather than making it secondary. Doing so requires going beyond the standard measures of effectiveness (e.g., course evaluations) to probe, more holistically, what students are, in fact, learning. Small anthropology programs face the added challenge of often having their energies and resources pulled in numerous directions, raising the risk of easily losing sight of overall pedagogical goals. Even if they are lucky enough to offer a major concentration, small programs often find that their courses are pressed into service to other larger institutional curricular goals and to the needs of cognate programs. To see beyond these short-run needs, small programs can benefit by first identifying what they hope students will have learned at the terminus of their program. This task can be done for majors, minors, as well as students who only dabble in anthropology as part of the general curriculum. Working backwards from that place, what is the evidence for these claims?

Revisit the Sacred Bundle. External reviews are opportune moments to unseal and rethink our commitments to what Segal and Yanagisako (2005) famously called anthropology’s “sacred bundle”– the hallowed devotion to the four-field approach. Few small anthropology programs can effectively provide four-field coverage, even if they are philosophically committed to the idea. Revisiting the sacred bundle at the point of external review can prompt new directions for program reorganization: Is the department successfully covering the four fields in a way that demonstrates anthropology’s holistic focus? Do students see the connections? If coverage is difficult, are there programs elsewhere on campus (biology or linguistics, for instance) that might

expose students to the subfields? Finally, this opportunity might prompt a larger discussion of the core assumptions of the four-field approach and whether the four subfields can be treated in alternative ways. (My own department recently decided to stake its entire claim in cultural anthropology and repackage our human evolution and material culture within environmental anthropology.)

Marriages of Convenience and Renewing Vows. Since external reviews so often include institutional desires to consolidate resources, they provide useful moments to take stock in our organizational configurations. Many small anthropology programs were formed in combination with sociology in what amounted to “marriages of convenience.” However, in my experience conducting reviews of joint programs, I have been surprised by the deep connections between the disciplines rather than their differences. Professional trends in each discipline are certainly at play: sociologists have broadened their global reach and deepened their interests in ethnography, while anthropologists increasingly study domestic issues with policy and applied importance. Yet despite their affinities, many joint programs continue to duplicate efforts and provide redundant course offering. (Methods and theory are standard culprits). An external review offers a moment to examine these intellectual affinities, renew vows, and explore more integrated models for programs.

REFERENCES

Segal, D. A., & Yanagisako, S. J., eds. 2005. *Unwrapping the Sacred Bundle. Reflections on the Disciplining of Anthropology.* Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Strathern, M., ed. 2000. *Audit cultures: Anthropological Studies in Accountability, Ethics, and the Academy.* London and New York: Routledge.

Jason Pribilsky is Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Social Sciences at Whitman College in Washington State. He serves on the AAA’s Resource Panel for External Tenure and Promotion Review and External Program Review. He can be reached at pribilwhitman.edu to discuss program evaluation, particularly the external review process of small anthropology programs.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Call for Papers: *The Journal for Undergraduate Ethnography*

The Journal for Undergraduate Ethnography (JUE) is an online journal for research conducted by undergraduates. We distribute original student-produced work from a variety of disciplinary areas. Our goal is to bring readers, especially other undergraduates, insights into subcultures, rituals and social institutions. The JUE encourages current undergraduates or those who have graduated within the past twelve months to submit original ethnographic manuscripts for consideration. Papers may include research on any topic. We also encourage faculty to recommend promising student work.

Submissions are welcome for our next issues. Deadlines are **January 31** and **July 31**. Please check out our website (undergraduateethnography.org) for [submission guidelines](#) and [past issues](#).

For more information contact Martha Radice at radice@undergraduateethnography.org.

**Research Methods in Anthropology
Distance Education Summer Courses
University of Florida
<http://distance.ufl.edu/rma/>**

These courses combine online lectures and exercises with live, interactive sessions – sort of online office hours. The live sessions are archived, so anyone who can't make the live sessions can log at any time, and go back over the lessons. Courses are limited to 20 participants

All the courses in this program carry three optional graduate credits at the University of Florida – that is, they may be taken for transferable university credit or as continuing education. Undergraduates can take these courses with permission of the instructor – and of course, if you send students, they will be allowed to enroll.

The tuition of \$1,200 per course makes the program self-sustaining and ensures that the courses are available to anyone who wants to get the skills these courses offer.

Four courses will be offered this summer:

May 8 - June 16: Geospatial Analysis

June 26 - August 4: Text Analysis
 Methods of Behavioral Observation
 Methods in Cognitive Anthropology (cultural domain analysis)

All these courses were developed with support from NSF in the summer short course program widely known as methods camp. That program ended in 2016, but we offer the courses online as regular, 45-contact-hour courses. You can find syllabi for these courses, registration forms, etc. [HERE](#).