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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **DEGREE PROGRAMS BEING REVIEWED** | **MA in Anthropology** |
| **EXTERNAL REVIEWERS** | * **Dr. Andre Costopoulos, McGill University** * **Dr. Gerald Schaus, Wilfrid Laurier University** |
| **INTERNAL REPRESENTATIVE** | * **Dr. Feyzi Baban, International Development Studies** |
| **YEAR OF REVIEW** | **2015-2016** |
| **DATE OF SITE VISIT** | **February 8-9 2016** |
| **DUE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTATION REPORT BY ANTHROPOLOGY** | **February 1, 2017** |
| **DATE OF NEXT CYCLICAL REVIEW** | **2023-2024** |
| **NEXT STEPS** | * **For Approval by the Provost & VP Academic** * **For Information to Senate** |
| **DATE PREPARED BY CPRC** | **November 16, 2016** |
| **DATE APPROVED BY PROVOST & VP ACADEMIC** | **November 25, 2016** |

The Anthropology Graduate Program is one of Trent’s long-standing graduate programs (first established in 1974) and continues to be of excellent quality. In addition to providing a thorough grounding in anthropological theory and research methods in preparation for professional careers and/or continuing studies at the PhD level, the Program produces graduates with sufficient depth and breadth of outlook to meet the need for resourcefulness, versatility and adaptability in modern society. The program accepts students with an honours undergraduate degree in Anthropology (or equivalent). The faculty involved in the program are dedicated to providing an excellent graduate experience for the students, as clearly documented by the external reviewers.

Reviewers commented that, ‘The quality of research projects to which the students have access is very high, the facilities available are excellent, and there is obvious care on the part of Faculty to involve students in research in a very significant way.’

The Cyclical Program Review Committee (CPR) concluded that the MA in Anthropology is of Good Quality.

**SUMMARY OF PROCESS**

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the MA in Anthropology underwent a review. Two arm’s-length external reviewers (Dr. Andre Costopoulos, McGill University and Dr. Gerald Schaus, Wilfrid Laurier University) and one internal member (Dr. Feyzi Baban, Trent University) were invited to review the self-study documentation and then conducted a site visit to the university on February 8th and 9th, 2016.

This Final Assessment Report (FAR), in accordance with Trent University’s Institutional Quality Assurance Policy (IQAP), provides a synthesis of the cyclical review of the undergraduate degree programs. The report considers four evaluation documents: the Program’s Self-Study, the External Reviewers’ Report, the Program Response, and the Decanal Response.

A summary of the review process is as follows: the academic unit(s) completed a self-study which addressed all components of the evaluation criteria as outlined in Trent’s IQAP. Appendices included: Course Syllabi, Curriculum Vitae, Learning Outcomes, University Calendar Copy, University Degree Requirements, and Enrolment, Retention & Student data tables. Qualified external reviewers were invited to conduct a review of the program which involved a review of all relevant documentation (self-study, appendices, IQAP) in advance of the site visit. A two-day site visit took place where reviewers met with senior administration, faculty and students.

Once the external reviewers’ report was received both the program and dean provided responses to the report. The Cyclical Program Review Committee (CPRC) reviewed and assessed the quality of the degree programs based on the four review documents and reports on significant program strengths, opportunities for improvement and enhancement, and the implementation of recommendations.

The Implementation Plan identifies those recommendations selected for implementation, and specifies: proposed follow-up, who is responsible for leading the follow-up, and the specific timeline for addressing the recommendation, if applicable. Academic units, in consultation with the respective Dean(s), will submit an Implementation Report in response to the recommendations identified for follow-up. The Report is due February 1, 2017.

**SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM STRENGTHS**

* Most notably the reviewers remarked that this Program ‘is a high-quality graduate program that brings together high performing Faculty and benefits its Students, University and the Community’.
* It was noted by the Reviewers that the Program is ‘very well aligned with the overall vision and mission of Trent University’. They felt that this Program plays a leading role in ‘fostering an environment where Indigenous knowledges are respected and recognized.’
* It was also noted that ‘the high quality of research output of the Faculty involved shows a definite commitment to excellence. The fact that Both Faculty and graduate students involved in the program carry out research and applied work locally and internationally is in line with the University’s goals’.
* The Graduate Program and its students have access to high-quality laboratory research opportunities for a program of this size. Physical resources available to the programs in terms of labs and graduate work space were noted by the reviewers as being impressive.

**OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT**

* The Reviewers commented on an opportunity or initiative for the Program to provide practical training for archaeology students aimed specifically at the Cultural Resource Management industry in Ontario.

* Reviewers commented that the program is particularly strong in all areas, Archaeology, Biological Anthropology and Cultural Anthropology however, due to constraints of a small faculty, more opportunities could exist in Cultural Anthropology.
* Course syllabi be revised to include course-specific learning outcomes.

**COMPLETE LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

* *Recommendations 1 to 5 were official recommendations from the External Reviewers.*
* *Recommendations 6 to 9 were secondary issues flagged by the reviewers which the Program wished to add as formal recommendations.*

**RECOMMENDATION 1**

We very strongly recommend that the University clarify the status of graduate teaching and the way it is accounted in the overall teaching load of Faculty

Program Response

This recommendation refers to a long-standing issue at Trent. Although it would be beneficial to have a university-wide compensation model for both graduate supervision and instruction negotiated and enshrined in the TUFA Collective Agreement, the AGP is satisfied with how its own “in-house” delayed compensation model has been working in lieu of such a policy.

Decanal Response

With the introduction of Responsibility Centred Management, graduate teaching will be supported; undergraduate deans will work collaboratively with the graduate dean.

**RECOMMENDATION 2**

The department should review its practice of requiring students to complete what amounts to an individually supervised independent study as the third course in the program.

Program Response

This recommendation was specifically tied to the idea that the third course was a very significant drain on limited teaching resources. We point out that although some faculty choose to team teach the third course for multiple students, others feel best served by teaching one-on-one courses. Our feeling is that it is best to maintain this flexibility, given that it is the individual instructor’s time and energy that is in question, and they have the right to manage their time usage as they see fit. It is also true that our in-house teaching/supervisory model does compensate for the instruction involved in the third course offering.

Decanal Response

Dean agreed with Program’s response.

**RECOMMENDATION 3**

The compensation offered the program director needs to reflect the level of responsibility and the amount of labour the position represents. This is a high-quality program with clearly excellent outcomes for the students, the University, and the community.

Program Response

All Graduate Directors agree on this point, however, this is fundamentally a collective bargaining issue, and we urge TUFA and the incoming Graduate Dean to work together to reconsider the significant cuts that have been made to the compensation package.

Decanal Response

This is not a quality issue.

**RECOMMENDATION 4**

A professional Certificate or MA degree program in Cultural Resource Management should be considered by a departmental committee.

Program Response

Various iterations of this degree have been discussed by an ad hoc committee over the past two years. To date each model has been deemed untenable primarily because of the staffing issues that it would create. The AGP has no desire to create and administer a program based entirely on CUPE instruction. Should a tenure-track hire in culture-resource management be forthcoming, such a professional degree would become entirely viable.

Decanal Response

Dean agrees and supports the program’s response. Suggested that that the Chair of ANTH and the graduate program Director meet with the Deans of Graduate Studies and Social Science to discuss the possibility of the professional degree and the required faculty appointment to support such a degree.

**RECOMMENDATION 5**

A PhD program proposal has merit, and would help attract potential grad students who otherwise apply to PhD programs elsewhere from the undergrad degree, rather than get the M.A. first. On the other hand, with the current situation regarding lack of library book purchases, and in general, a climate of reduced resources, a PhD program just does not seem viable despite the excellent faculty profile.

Program Response

Due to both the library and staffing issues, an Anthropology or Archaeology PhD is not something we should consider at this point in time. Some AGP faculty members would be happy to participate in such a PhD program, and this could benefit the existing MA program.

Decanal Response

Dean recommends that faculty interested in an interdisciplinary program have a more open dialogue to test the interest of the faculty.

**RECOMMENDATION 6**

Of the thirty-eight additional spaces granted by the Province, the Department should be able to increase by 2 to 4 students its graduate program intake as long as the burden of graduate supervision is shared equitably, particularly with faculty members who currently have little supervision responsibility (pp. 3).

Program Response

The Program agrees that an increase would be possible however given the current number of affiliated faculty members, the Program would need to work to attract more suitable applicants for specific faculty members, for any growth to be achieved. The latter issue of attracting more students has already been partially addressed, beginning in the summer of 2015, and in conjunction with the Graduate Studies Office, through a review of the overall AGP advertising strategy, including both the website and mail-outs.

Decanal Response

Recruitment materials and websites are being updated in collaboration with the Office of Graduate Studies in order to attract more students.

**RECOMMENDATION 7**

One comment that can be made is that there is a specific section regarding Learning Outcomes in the syllabi of undergraduate courses offered by participating faculty members in the BA and BSc Archaeology program, but there is no similar section in most syllabi for graduate courses. It’s time that this is addressed, so that graduate students as well are aware of the Learning Outcomes being aimed for in a given course (pp. 3).

Program Response

We note that graduate level learning outcomes have only started to come online at Trent in conjunction with the current round of cyclical reviews. For this reason, the AGP developed and approved its own overarching learning outcomes over the past summer (2015) – just prior to the cyclical review – and all individual instructors included course specific learning outcomes in their 2015-2016 course syllabuses.

Decanal Response

Action has been taken.

**RECOMMENDATION 8**

This degree, we are told, is called “Master of Arts, Anthropology”. A problem arises, however, in that some aspects of this graduate program are not normally assumed under the discipline “Anthropology”. Here, for example, we can mention Bioarchaeology, Osteology, and Classical Archaeology. For these areas to be better represented in the nomenclature of the degree, the word “Archaeology”, whether alone, or in addition to “Anthropology” should be considered. This might be given consideration in conjunction with a discussion about the name of the Department (pp. 4).

Program Response

We note that this issue has come up in previous reviews. If the purpose of this recommendation is to attract the types of students who can take advantage of the various areas of archaeological expertise exhibited by our faculty, we believe the same goal can be achieved through effective advertising, without the need to solicit formal approval for a program name and degree change.

Decanal Response

The quality of both internal and external applicants who are applying to work with faculty in each of the areas of the discipline of Anthropology are excellent. The program should further discuss a name change with the understanding that this would need to be handled through an official process.

**RECOMMENDATION 9**

The self-study notes that the 2.5 year completion rate for the MA is satisfactory and even has the advantage of giving students an extra summer of field training. Several students expressed that the delay was the result of difficulties in scheduling the defense and that the process could be improved. The defense is a valuable part of their training, but it should not unduly delay graduation.

Program Response

We wish to address this concern raised, although not a formal recommendation made by the reviewers. Students are provided with clear guidance on timelines for both the submission of the thesis and the pathway to defense in order to help them avoid delays leading up to the oral examination (AGP Handbook). The thesis examination process normally takes approximately ten weeks from the submission of the final version to your supervisory committee, possibly longer depending on what corrections are required and the availability of examiners. Although admittedly it is sometimes difficult to schedule a defense this is not the norm. We are happy to report that this is an anomaly.

Decanal Response

The Dean was pleased with the Program’s response.

**IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

* The applicable Dean, in consultation with the Department Chair/Director of the relevant Academic Unit shall be responsible for monitoring the Implementation Plan. The Reporting Date for submitting a follow-up Implementation Report is indicated below and is the responsibility of the Academic Unit in consultation with the Dean.

**DUE DATE FOR IMPLEMENTATION REPORT: FEBRUARY 1, 2017**

The Implementation Report should be submitted to the applicable Dean(s) who will then forward the Report to the Office of the Provost.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Proposed Follow-Up**  *If no follow-up is recommended, please clearly indicate ‘No follow up report is required’ and provide rationale.*  *Indicate specific timeline for completion or addressing recommendation if different than Due Date for Implementation Report* | **Position Responsible for Leading Follow-up** |
| Recommendation 1   * That graduate teaching be considered as part of faculty workload. | No follow-up is required.  The program has an existing model for allocation of teaching loads. CPRC also notes that workload is a collective bargaining issue. |  |
| Recommendation 2   * That the Program review the practice of requiring students to complete a third course in the program. | No follow-up is required.  The Program has already addressed this issue. |  |
| Recommendation 3   * That the program director’s compensation reflects the position’s level of responsibility and amount of labour. | No follow-up is required.  This is a collective bargaining issue. |  |
| Recommendation 4   * That a Professional Certificate or MA in Cultural Resource Management be developed | No follow-up is required.  CPRC agrees this is an excellent idea however this is not a program quality issue. |  |
| Recommendation 5   * That a PhD Program not be developed as it is not viable at this time | No follow-up is required.  It was agreed by all parties (Dean, Program, CPRC) that a PhD program would not be viable at this time. |  |
| Recommendation 6   * That the Program increases its intake of students by 2-4 students if the burden is shared between Faculty | Program is asked to comment on this; impact of possible declining enrolment on program quality. | Program Director |
| Recommendation 7   * That the Program creates Learning outcomes for Graduate Program in syllabi | No follow-up is required.  Course-specific learning outcomes have been added to course syllabi. |  |
| Recommendation 8   * That the degree program and Graduate department are renamed for better suitability | Program requests that the academic unit discuss and provide an update to CPRC. | Program Director |
| Recommendation 9   * That the time-to-completion rate be improved | No follow-up is required.  Guidelines are in place to address this issue. |  |