

**RESPONSE to REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY
CYCLICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Kristin Norget, Acting Chair

3 April, 2013

General Remarks.

The Department of Anthropology is most grateful to Professor Madeleine Cumyn and other members of the Cyclical Review Committee, including external evaluators Dr. Peter Gose and Dr. Paul Brodwin, for their generosity and hard work in their evaluation of our Department and the carefully considered comments they offer in their report. We were very pleased to meet with the Committee during their site visit, during which Committee members asked insightful questions and clearly were working in the sincere desire to help us to determine our current weaknesses and to chart a productive course of development as a Department into the future.

In the interests of keeping this response as concise as possible we will refrain from rehearsing arguments made in the original self-study document. The following comments are therefore limited to direct responses to the points contained in the Committee's report and in the two External Reviewer reports written by Dr. Gose and Dr. Brodwin respectively. The subtitles used below have been adopted largely from the review Committee's main report.

A final section (D, page 11-12) deals exclusively with issues pertaining to the Medical Anthropology program brought up in Professor Brodwin's report.

Objectives, Priorities, and Activities.

The Committee concluded that the Department "has an outstanding reputation in research and scholarship, and continues to do work of the highest quality" and that the aspirations of the Department are largely "well aligned with the University's goals" (p.2). These statements ratify many of the claims of the Department's self-study report. Nevertheless the Committee also observed a key contradiction between these shared goals of the Department and University inhering in the fact that "the Department operates with a barely sufficient number of permanent Faculty members".

As the Committee's report suggests, the Anthropology Department benefitted only moderately from the university's aggressive academic renewal plan that increased the ranks of tenure stream faculty "during the last decade" (emphasis added). We received no new positions from 1994 until 2002 and so were already operating at a severe deficit when hiring re-commenced in the Department 2003. While since 2003, 11 full-time, tenure stream members have been joined us, over this same period 7 faculty members retired. In addition, 4 of the 11 hires just mentioned are cross-appointments with other Departments. It could be argued then that over the last ten years we have effectively gained only 2 full-time faculty members.

The Committee further determined the main factor standing in the way of the Department's capacity to realize its ambitions of being a cutting-edge setting of research and teaching innovation to be precisely this severe deficiency in faculty members which, as our self-study report explains, puts into peril crucial undergraduate and graduate programs in archaeology, medical anthropology, and the anthropology of development.

Academic Programs. Teaching and Learning**A. Quality and effectiveness of undergraduate academic teaching.**

The Committee noted some criticisms expressed by all members of the Department community: faculty, support staff and students. We address these in turn below:

1. Course listings

The Committee observed an imprecision in the Department's course listings. One confusion noted stems from the fact that honours students "are take up to 9 credits of 300- and 400-level courses in other Departments, subject to Departmental approval" (p.4). We wish to clarify, however, that this is not a requirement, but rather an option for students who have a particular interest, say, in medical anthropology or Latin America, to take courses outside the Department which (if deemed by an advisor to be in keeping with the theme of their specialization) can be credited as part of the 60 total credits needed for the honours program. It is therefore not appropriate for Anthropology to supply students with a list of courses they could take to fulfill this option since this list would be almost infinite, the possible courses being entirely dependent on the undergraduate student's chosen specialty within their honours program.

In general terms, the Department recognizes the need to do a spring cleaning of its course listings as they appear 'on the books' (including on the Department website), and ensuring that more recent courses that have been added to the list appear in appropriate categories—such as Ancient China appearing as an 'Area' course. To some extent this process was jump-started this year with the request from the Dean's office to cull from the existing list all courses that had small enrollments or that were no longer being offered. We have done this, and have made efforts to regularize our practices in regard to course numbers used for Special Topics and Honours courses, which were previously chosen in an often *ad hoc* manner.

2. Course scheduling

The statement in the report that "this year, several of the (few) archaeology courses have been offered at the same time" (p. 5) is incorrect (if desired, we would be happy to supply a copy of the schedule this year, with the archaeology courses highlighted). In the past, when the schedule of course offerings was done by the Department itself, offering two archaeology courses at the same time never occurred, other than occasionally listing an introductory (200 level) course at the same time as a seminar, because the introductory course is a prerequisite for any seminar. Since the University has taken control of course scheduling with an automated program, the chances of overlaps have increased, but no overlaps occurred this year. There has been only one problematic case that we have been able to find. In Winter 2011, History of Archaeological Theory (ANTH 359), taught by Professor Couture, and Archaeology of Japan and Korea (ANTH 399) taught by Professor Bennett were offered at the same time. The latter course is jointly offered with East Asian Studies and was a late addition to our listings that year. Because of the joint listing, it had to fit the East Asian Studies schedule and, unfortunately, that schedule dictated when the course could be given. We were aware of the problem at the time, and have taken steps to coordinate with East Asian Studies to insure that this does not occur again. We are therefore confused by this particular claim in the report, which describes a "problem" based on a single atypical case that has since been corrected, and against which we have been taking precautions for decades.

2. Approval for Exchange (Study Abroad) courses

We agree with the report that the pre-approval requirement can be problematic. The current requirements for pre-approval are dictated by the University, and we would be happy if the flexibility recommended by the report is adopted. We would prefer to designate two members of the Undergraduate Committee (one socio-cultural anthropologist and one archaeologist) to handle approval of exchanges.

As emphasized in the Department's own self-study report, the issue of advising is an important one, and we firmly believe that advising could be much improved. Undergraduate advising represents an increasingly arduous task, both time-consuming and problematic since many university wide processes are continually changing and the roster of UG advisers shifts every year. While we would like to provide advice that is consistent and as up-to-date as possible, the reality is that advisors are not always fully informed regarding new rules made at the university level. Nor do we consider our time is best spent in simple bureaucratic approval tasks rather than in mentoring our students. In short, if the student experience is a priority for the University, we request the Faculty to undertake a review of the tasks currently performed by our undergraduate Advisors in the interests of maximizing the possibilities for mentorship advising by our faculty. We believe that certain time-consuming tasks, for example, could be performed more efficiently outside of the Department.

3. Advising and Honours supervision

Contrary to the impression the Committee received during their site visit, advising had NOT undergone any restructuring this academic year. It is true however that the exact members on the undergraduate Committee changes on an annual basis. People are notified of their Committee assignments in the spring, and so there is no reason for the delay in making their advising schedule available to incoming students as of late August. We will work hard to ensure that undergraduate advising is available to incoming and returning anthropology students on a timely basis.

The Department will be happy to revisit the expectations for honors theses, which have not been formally discussed by academic staff for more than a decade. Individual theses will inevitably vary by the nature of the subject matter being addressed, and there is no "one size fits all" solution, but we will be happy to work out a set of basic length and format guidelines that can be provided to students on our website. We would also be happy to revive our information session for prospective Honors students, which in the past was held early in Fall term.

4. Teaching Assistantships

At various points in the self-study document we highlighted the TA shortage as a particular problem, affecting as it does both the quality of the delivery of the courses we teach and graduate funding. All of the comments by the Committee are accurate accounts of the problems we face with the current shortage of TAs. The Department is very pleased with our TA allotment for next academic year (2013-14), which will bring the TA to student ratio down to a reasonable 1:60 students. We sincerely hope that the University and Faculty of Arts will commit to ensuring that this ratio is maintained.

5. Department norm regarding large introductory courses.

The question of who should teach large introductory-level courses (200-level) is complex and in many cases assignment to such courses is lead by the interests and expertise of the people involved. The Department recognizes the large amount of work that introductory level courses require. We also recognize that the University expects tenure candidates to have demonstrated their ability to teach courses well at every level. Nevertheless at our Department retreat last May (2012), we arrived at the consensus that in principle, except under very unusual circumstances (e.g., sabbatical leave, sudden health leave, etc.), our large introductory courses should be taught by senior tenured faculty members—unless the

untentured faculty member is past their third-year reappointment review. Because we have so few faculty members, it is impossible to relieve any one of us, including non-tenured faculty, of administrative duties completely. It is a norm in the Department, however, that no junior faculty be allocated administrative roles of considerable burden such as Undergraduate Program Coordinator or Graduate Program Coordinator.

6. Other issues.

Laboratory space for archaeology and credit for archaeology field schools:

The Department underlines the Committee's observation that lab space for archaeologists is sorely insufficient. Such dedicated space is used for analysis of materials but also for storage. This issue is pressing especially in view of the fact that these needs will certainly increase with the arrival of our visiting (3-year appointment) archaeology professor this September, and then when another archaeologist is hired to replace Professor Michael Bisson, who intends to retire in 2014. We will expect that new faculty member to have an active field program, which implies the necessity of additional archaeology lab space.

The Department agrees with the Committee that participation in fieldwork is an important part of undergraduate training in archaeology. In the past five years formal credit for a "field class" (under the generic ANTH 380) has been given to students involved in Prof. Costopoulos' research at James Bay and "Parc Safari" (Hemmingford). Because those projects had finite durations we did not create a specific "Field School" course number, since that could not be offered on a regular basis. The Department encourages undergraduates to enroll in field schools offered by other universities, and routinely approves the transfer of either 3 or 6 credits depending on the duration of the school. Students participating in excavations that are not field schools are more difficult to assess, because of the tremendous variation in the kinds and quality of volunteer archaeological work that are available. Nevertheless, for decades we have had an informal mechanism to grant credit in these cases. As long as the student can produce documentation on the nature of the excavation, their duties in the field, and the duration of their participation, they are permitted to enroll in a "Directed Research" course (ANTH 380) the term after they return from the field. They are asked to supply a letter from the supervisor on the excavation attesting to their performance, and write a paper describing the project and the results. This is evaluated by an appropriate staff member, and a grade is assigned. We know of no cases where a student who has contacted us with the appropriate information and documents has been denied credit for fieldwork.

B. Quality and effectiveness of graduate programs

1. The Archaeology Program

The Committee reiterates our emphasis in the self-study report of the serious deficiency of archaeology faculty. This "crisis" (as the report refers to it) has significantly limited our undergraduate and graduate course offerings and capacity to provide adequate supervision to undergraduates writing honours theses on archaeological topics. Graduate courses in archaeology have virtually all been converted to '500' level courses so that undergraduates can register for them as well, but this is only a temporary 'band-aid' measure to address the situation, which stems from the simple vexing fact of the insufficient number of archaeologists to sustain our programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

The Committee further recommends that the Department launch a planning process as the first step in a badly needed renewal of the program. Archaeologists have met to discuss

informally the future direction of the Department's archaeology program, but there is no universal agreement on this at this point. There is no easy way to resolve the critical question of how to balance depth and breadth in the program as represented by course offerings and the research specializations of faculty members. While in 2014 the Department will lose Professor Michael Bisson to retirement, it is not reasonable at this point to expect, as the Committee suggests, that a future archaeology "replacement" hire should bear the load of teaching human evolution (which represents a wing of archaeology more akin to physical anthropology than to the current specializations of other Department archaeologists), unless that is part of that person's research specialization, which might not be the case. We will note that the archaeology sub-unit is still in the midst of finding its feet again after losing faculty to administrative appointments, a health leave, and other circumstances. We will welcome a new 3-year visiting professor in the fall (2014), who will help us shore up the program for little while. But without question the entire program (and to some extent the legacy of Professor Bruce Trigger, one of the McGill's most renowned former faculty members) hangs in jeopardy if we do not expand the archaeology sub-unit through future growth positions, rather than just temporary or replacement hires.

While the Department strongly endorses the Committee's recommendation that an endowed Chair in First Nations/Indigenous Studies be housed in the Department of Anthropology, we believe it would be more impactful if this person were not tied to the archaeology but rather the sociocultural sub-unit.

2. The Doctoral Program: Tutorial vs Coursework in PhD

The Committee raises as a concern tied to their observation that "there is no longer a consensus" regarding what the first two years of the PhD program should involve" (p. 8). The Committee further observes that a "hybrid" system that now exists (i.e., somewhere between British, tutorial-based and US course-based doctoral program models) that is currently causing problems regarding i] registration and ii] in the context of supervision. We address these sub-points in turn:

i] First, the Committee has observed there is too much confusion among doctoral students regarding what courses count as part of their program. It is true that the arrival of new faculty members, new graduate students differentially prepared for graduate studies, the imposition of the new time limit restrictions in 2009—not to mention a more competitive employment market—have all put new pressures on our graduate programs, motivating us to maximize focus and 'efficiency' in our graduate programs without sacrificing the recognized need for solid, more comprehensive theoretical training—and the flexibility that has always distinguished our program. This has involved the introduction of the Theory sequence (602-603) as an option for PhD students (i.e., a replacement of one of the three Bibliographic essays) and a resulting diminishment of registered or auditing participants in graduate seminars. While we continue to make adjustments to streamline doctoral program components in an effort to make the program more coherent, we agree there is still work to be done to mitigate ambiguity and communicate clearly program requirements (and accompanying exceptions and contingencies depending on individual program specificities) especially to incoming doctoral students. This issue has become more glaring over the past couple of years as the university has become more stringent about charging doctoral students for courses taken that are not on our official list of courses for our PhD program.

To address these interrelated issues the Department has made redefining our doctoral program one of our main priorities for the coming year. This will include bringing into

alignment the program requirements as stated in the [Anthropology Program Guidelines](#) and on the website. We plan to work directly in consultation with GPSO in the interests of balancing the University system with the needs of our graduate students to have access to the courses they require for sufficient training.

ii] Second, it appears that while some students are feeling pushed by their supervisors to take courses they feel impede them getting to the field in a timely fashion, others feel that their supervisors are concertedly steering them away from courses they wish to take, such as the Theory Sequence (602-603). In short, much of the difficulty seems to stem from a current absence of consensus among faculty members as to what customary practice should be in regard to the doctoral program. (This includes archaeology supervisors who have felt that the Theory Sequence may not be relevant to the research concerns of their graduate students.) We agree that this is a problem, and the graduate Committee has resolved to address this precise issue—as well as others related to divergent models of graduate supervision—with all faculty members at our Departmental retreat in May.

3. Museum Studies

The Department appreciates the Committee's suggestion that it add a museum studies component to the archaeology graduate studies program. This is indeed an interesting possibility—in theory at least. In the past Barbara Lawson, Curator of World Cultures at the Redpath Museum has offered courses related to Museum studies to graduate students and has been extremely helpful whenever museum-related issues have been a part of a graduate student's research project. Committing ourselves, however, to creating from scratch a focused program in Museum Studies would require expertise we do not currently have, including technical knowledge related to curation and preservation of materials. In addition, an MSt program in Museology is currently offered at the UQAM; our Department has always operated on a loose principle of not offering certain exceptional programs (e.g., biological anthropology; physical anthropology) already available at our sister universities (UQAM, Université de Montréal and Concordia). In short, adding Museum Studies to our limited program repertoire would require additional resources when the Department currently has other more pressing priorities.

4. Guidelines for graduate students

We were surprised to learn that the Committee found some confusion among graduate students regarding guidelines and ideal milestones. For the past four years—and especially since the imposition of the new time limitation deadline in 2009—all incoming graduate students have been given a hard copy of the Graduate Student Guidelines (which includes ideal Timelines for both MA and PhD programs) at the new graduate student orientation meeting in late August. All students—including those graduate students who arrive late and miss the orientation—can also access the Guidelines on-line on the Department's webpage.

The confusion may be related to the uneven awareness of the guidelines among all anthropology graduate students since those who began their program before 2009 would not have been thoroughly briefed on program requirements as were the students who began their program after 2009. Yet another source of ambiguity may be uneven degrees of familiarity with the guidelines among faculty members. As mentioned above, the Department is committed to work on the effective communication of graduate program requirements and timelines to graduate students such as by bringing into correspondence all written and on-line sources of information. We acknowledge we must also work harder

to ensure that all faculty members are fully aware of the guideline details, especially as rules and expectations have changed considerably even over the last five years.

C. Graduate student recruitment and funding

The Committee endorses the Department's goal of raising the caliber of its graduate students. Members also suggests three interrelated strategies toward achieving this goal: 1] attracting a greater applicant pool from which to choose; 2] strengthening and streamlining the program to make it more appealing to prospective candidates, and, 3] offering more competitive funding packages.

The Department agrees with the Committee's observation of a tension between pressures by the university to increase our graduate student cohort and Department desires to ensure adequate funding for our graduate students, especially in light of the strict time-to-completion deadlines we have been dealing with since 2009. From the Department's perspective, this tension stems from our awareness that adequate funding has been a key factor in helping graduate students complete their programs on time since in the past underfunded students were forced to divide their time between study and work as either teaching assistants, course instructors or even outside of the Department, often slowing down their progress considerably. Contrary to the Committee's suggestion, the Faculty's latest funding formula to determine the amount of funding for particular Departments (which has been in place for the last 3 years) has been shared with the Department, and is a version of the formula used by the university. We are thus very aware that the more graduate students we accept, the more funds we receive from the University. And yet these funds in themselves are still insufficient in terms of the extent they offset the total funding needed for graduate students. The remainder of students' funding package must come largely from teaching assistantships, and because these funds have declined in the last couple of years, we have been reluctant to increase our graduate student intake. Yet our policies are not written in stone, and we have felt we have been in a constant state of responding to circumstances as they have shifted over the past few years. Despite our commitment to a minimal funding package, we are committed to the principle of admitting as many students as possible to our graduate programs. With this in mind, we plan to consult directly with members of the administration from both the Faculty and the GPSO to see how our respective goals can be better reconciled.

The Committee was of the opinion that having a clearer picture of the funding we provide to students would aid us in being competitive in attracting graduate students internationally. The Department in fact does have an awareness of the funding received by particular graduate students, though the complete record is not continually updated. Funding tracking begins with the preparation of a letter tailored specifically for each incoming student, in which the exact dollar amounts of the (3-year) package are detailed, including the sources (e.g., teaching assistantships, research assistantships, and so on). In a few cases, students come in with full funding from external sources (e.g., SSHRC, FQRSC, etc.), and hence are promised no initial funding from the Department. Yet the majority of those who receive such awards do so in the first or second year of their programs. In such cases, the amount of their grant cancels out that portion of what was promised by the Department, and those monies get returned to the general purse, to benefit other, ongoing graduate students. We do keep track of significant alterations in the general funding pattern for each student (such as if the student wins a Tomlinson, SSHRC, or a Vanier fellowship). We do not, however, always keep tabs on more modest amounts the student may gain on a more *ad hoc* basis through, for example, an RA-ship opportunity, a small external fellowship, and so on. We

agree that for a variety of reasons (evidence of funding success, etc.) it would be beneficial for us to keep a more exact record of funding tracks of each student, and are currently exploring with our administrative officer ways a tracking system might be enabled that would be accessible to both administrative staff and faculty supervisors.

Judging from the comments in the report, the Committee appears to be under the impression that that the amount of the funding packages used for recruitment are based on calculated averages of what our graduate are already receiving—that is, averaged amounts based on the total internal and external funding. This is not the case. We do not operate according to averages but to the minimum funding amounts that we can *guarantee* to incoming graduate students, calculated on the basis of the basic funding envelopes we are given by the Faculty in the form of Graduate Excellence Fellowships (GEFs), Wyng Trust Fellowships, etc., AND our teaching assistantship allotment. The exact amount of these funding envelopes changes every year in line with factors which are largely beyond our control. Since we offer 3-year packages, and due to the stipulations of the TA Union regarding priority pool entitlements, on-going students are entitled to a portion of these annual allotments, including TA-ships. Thus, if in a given year we offer admission to a certain number of students based on the funding envelope received that year, and if in the subsequent year the funding envelope is reduced (as happened this year, 2013), we are still bound by our existing agreement to each student to provide the funding promised; the end result is that we can offer places to fewer incoming students. We recognize that the calculation of funding recruitment packages is not a perfect art and over the past few years that we have been working on the premise of funding equity (i.e., in terms of the minimal funding package), we have made adjustments to our practices as new circumstances have arisen. Without doubt funding is one of the greatest sources of stress in our graduate program, largely due to the fact the funding landscape seems to be constantly changing; we are hence constantly also addressing funding problems in our Department meetings and more informally.

We are open to guidance from the university administration (either at the Faculty or GPSO level) regarding how we might organize our funding differently, such as by not offering funding at all to MA students. That said however, we wish to impress upon the University the fact that available funding allotments for recruitment of the best graduate students are simply too small, especially considering the cost of funding international students, whom the university says it is eager to recruit. Following some of the recommendations of the Committee's report (p. 10-11), the Department therefore requests of the university the following:

1. That the GPSO works with the Department to establish more reliable benchmark institutions with which we can compare ourselves for the purposes of recruitment evaluation and effective planning;
2. That the GPSO works with the Department to obtain comparative data from these benchmark institutions;
3. That the GPSO or the Faculty work with the Department (represented by our Chair *and* members of the graduate committee such as GPD and Fellowships Officer) to evaluate the effects of our current admissions policy AND to discuss alternative funding strategies whereby our graduate student intake could be increased (especially of international students) without sacrificing our Department commitment to adequate base funding.

D. Diversity and Related Issues.

1. Diversity Guidelines

We are pleased that the university is becoming more proactive in enabling discussion of the importance of increasing diversity among faculty and student body more broadly, such as by the creation of the Social Equity and Diversity Education (SEDE) Office, and including the theme in certain important venues such as the Academic Leadership Forums. We have begun to speak more openly within the department about the importance of diversity (a small but positive move), and plan to incorporate 'outreach' strategies in our hiring plans for the next faculty recruitment to ensure the pool of applicants is as wide as possible.

2. Parental Leave

The Committee's report states that faculty members are paid at 60% of their salary for the duration of a parental leave (20 weeks). This is factually incorrect. The policy as it stands states that McGill 'tops up' the salary of its employees from 60% (the Québec provincial entitlement) to 100% for the duration of 20 weeks. That is, this "top up" is considered an indemnity for lost salary. The difference between McGill and other universities is that after these 20 weeks, while McGill continues to pay full benefits, it no longer contributes to the salary of an employee on parental leave. This means that if the employee chooses, as is their right in Quebec, to extend their leave beyond 20 weeks (up to maximum 52 weeks) they are paid solely by the Quebec Parental Insurance Plan (QPIP) at a rate of approximately 70% of salary (the exact percentage depends on the plan chosen) of their salary. Nevertheless the Department endorses the Committee's point that the University should consider improving the terms of its parental leave policy to make it as generous as other Québec universities such as Concordia and the Université de Montréal.

The Department has no reason not to explain in full the terms of parental leave rights to faculty members; that is, after all, every employee's entitlement. The Department fully recognizes that the stress of balancing new parenting with one's responsibilities as especially a non-tenured faculty member are considerable; if this burden can be lessened by means of sufficient time to devote to adjusting to new parenthood, the more productive the faculty member will be in the long run. Confusion might arise however from the inconsistent or incomplete information that faculty members have received in the past on the exact terms of parental leave from the Human Resources Office.

3. Tenure expectations memorandum

The Department complies fully with the university rule that new tenure-track faculty members have a meeting with the Department Chair at the start of employment to be briefed on the expectations for achieving tenure. Nevertheless this information has always been conveyed orally, and there has never been any discussion in the Department for the purposes of formalizing in detail what are the exact Department criteria. The Department fully agrees that, especially in light of stricter standards for the granting of tenure at the university level, it should move immediately to create a document listing the exact expectations for tenure, as exists in other Departments in the Faculty of Arts or at the University.

D. Response to Professor Paul Brodwin's review of the Medical Anthropology sub-unit.

The Department definitely agrees that we need more faculty and resources for the medical anthropology program, especially now that currently Professor Allan Young is spending more time on his own research as he winds down to retirement. This means that currently the medical anthropology program is sustained by one full-time faculty member in the Faculty of Medicine (Tobias Rees), and two part-time faculty members in Medical Anthropology (Lisa Stevenson and Sandra Hyde)—who also share their time in our Sociocultural Anthropology Program. We hope in the near future to add another faculty member whose primary affiliation would be in the Faculty of Medicine, thereby bringing into balance the number of faculty members representing both of the units that are involved in the program.

Professor Brodwin had six main suggestions for improvements to the program; we will take up each of these suggestions in turn (Professor Brodwin's comments appear in bold):

i] **"The continued excellence of this program depends, in part, on improving the general funding picture for graduate students in order to attract the best applicants world-wide."**

Graduate student funding has been streamlined in the past 3 years, where equitable packages are offered to all incoming students, including our medical anthropology MA students (please refer to Section C of this Response, page 8-9, above). Of note is that our medical anthropology students are extremely competitive when it comes to receiving external and internal grants.

ii] **"As the younger cohort gains tenure, it may be appropriate to structure the medical anthropology program thematically in order to attract post-doctoral fellows."**

We have had mixed success in terms of accepting and working with Postdoctoral fellows. Recently several Postdoctoral fellows who applied to work with Medical Anthropologists did not secure the funding they needed in the Canadian system. (It should be noted that Canadian funding agencies do not have a recognized award category by which faculty are encouraged to recruit postdocs). Certainly as members of the younger cohort of medical anthropologists gain tenure, the recruitment of post-doctoral fellows will be something we will continue to explore.

iii] **"I was surprised to find no evidence of an institutional relationship between the Department of Anthropology and the Division of Social and Transcultural Psychiatry at the medical school. Its director, Laurence Kirmayer, is the third member of the established triumvirate of Montreal medical anthropologists (along with Allan Young and Margaret Lock)."**

Medical anthropologists in the Department have in the past and continue to work closely with postdoctoral fellows in other Departments. For example, Sandra Hyde worked with Eugene Raikel, a postdoctoral fellow in Transcultural Psychiatry, on a SSHRC funded workshop on the Anthropology of Addiction. On that note, many of our graduate students come from Transcultural Psychiatry, and while Allan Young forged the link, we still maintain ties to Laurence Kirmayer's program. We would also like to note that Lisa Stevenson has on average two or three students a year from Transcultural Psychiatry in her graduate course, and she is currently sitting on the Committee of two students who

previously were seminar participants.

iv] **“Without compromising the independence of the faculty, it may be possible to align its research profile with the priorities of these agencies. Establishing a stream of post-doctoral fellows, of course, could produce innovative seminars, collaborative grant-writing, and conferences to ensure the program’s international stature.”**

In terms of aligning our research priorities to match the research profiles of our funding agencies, the Medical Anthropologists are strong grant writers and have had considerable success in securing funding from external agencies. We will continue to grow and expand to gaining funding for our research initiatives, without having to mold ourselves perfectly to available funding agencies.

v]. **“The program should strategically plan how to work with the global health movement, a topic that now figures in the research portfolios of individual faculty members but is not coordinated or highlighted as a programmatic strength.”**

We do indeed need to strengthen our profile in Global Health, as we are involved in this theme in diverse ways. Tobias Rees’ main research initiative is on the global health movement, and he has attracted at five graduate students in that area. Sandra Hyde often works as a consultant and volunteer on global health projects drawing on her skills in public health. What we do need to do is provide is a better profile of the global health options we are already involved in, as these clearly didn’t come out in the cyclical review (something to add to our new website design?). The Master’s degree in Public Health at McGill is solely in the area of epidemiology, and not Global Health per se.

vi] **“Nurturing the ties between researchers inside and outside the Department of Anthropology is another way to maintain the program’s excellence.”**

Due to the nature of the split between Anthropology and Medicine, we have faculty that are integrally involved in many programs that are not solely focused on medical anthropology. This is partially due to a strategic decision made by Margaret Lock and Allan Young to hire full time Arts faculty for the Medical Anthropology Program. We hired some of the best sociocultural anthropology scholars because our Department offered a place where medical anthropology and cultural anthropology would work synergistically, rather than being part of one solo program.

The effect of this has been a broadening of our research interests and our links with many important programs at McGill: Lisa Stevenson’s links with Canadian Studies, the World Cinemas Program, and her own specialty of Sensory Ethnography. Sandra Hyde works closely with the Institute for Gender, Feminism and Sexuality, the East Asian Studies Program, and the Institute for Studies in Development. Tobias Rees is involved in the new Wolfe Chair Program in Science and Technology Studies, as well as taking a key role in training medical students.

To suggest that we now build an MD/PhD program is one idea we do not have the current resources to put in place. As mentioned in several places in the report, Department faculty members are already spread very thin. We believe that we need to focus on strengthening the programs we already have rather than adding new ones to our offerings, especially in a time of funding scarcity.