Dear All,

My feedback on the RSHA restructure. The key issue from the recommendation is the proposed name change for the school of Arch and Anth (to add Heritage and Museum studies) and the rationale for it, which is:

‘...emerged a significant mass of scholars in heritage and museums studies, School be amended to include Heritage and Museum Studies so that this emerging strength is clearly visible to undergraduate and postgraduate students’. The key issues emerging are:

   i)  The proposed name is cumbersome and hard to sell as a pithy name, especially with important disciplines, such as development studies, being lost;

   ii) The logic in terms of strength is hard to see when Development Studies is the largest P/G course program in the College (and half of Anth’s teaching income, if it is put in there which it often is) but does not get a mention in the report. On this logic the name could well be Archaeology, Anthropology, and Development. Likewise Bio-anthropology is the largest U/G teaching group and similarly is over looked.

   iii) I think names should reflect the major program in terms of staff, research, and teaching, rather than seem to be picking winners which we know seldom works.

   iv) The idea of having centres within the School might be a solution.

The report in drops in numbers is not correct for P/G coursework students; in the MAAPD program (80% of the total) numbers from the second semester enrolments will be about the same or a very slight drop for this year from last year but not 12.4%.

Patrick