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The principal matter I wish to comment on is that of the proposed renaming of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology.

Naming of the School

I support the proposal to establish a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies in the School.

I have concerns, however, about the proposed renaming of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology as the School of Archaeology, Anthropology, Heritage and Museum Studies. For the reasons set out below I do not believe it is in our collective interests to do and certainly not in the immediate future.

There are three concerns:

- The name ‘School of Archaeology and Anthropology’ is a brand well known nationally and with an international profile as well. It is a name that has caused some difficulty in the past in relation to development as many international students in particular have been bemused about a major internationally recognised development program being in a School of Archaeology and Anthropology. Due in very large degree to the teaching and marketing work of Dr Patrick Kilby, but also of professor Merlan and Dr Guinness, this hurdle to the profile has been overcome.

  However, to bury the significance of development in the teaching and research of the School by further extending the range of subjects in the School’s name that are not closely associated with mainstream development studies is to send a signal that the School does not really take development seriously.

- The second concern relates to the significance of development studies in the financial viability of the School. The MAAPD graduate program, and the undergraduate Development Studies program are hugely important to the financial viability of the School, indeed they have not only kept the
School in the black but also generated substantial surpluses in recent years.

- Thirdly the Group of Eight Universities are generally based on disciplines and have highlighted inter-disciplinary and other areas mainly through centres, institutes etc.

The proposal for the name change did not come about through appropriate consultation.

The discussion paper, ‘Proposal to restructure a number of the Schools of the Research School of Humanities and the Arts’ released on 30th August 2012 says, inter alia that *The name of the School [of Archaeology and Anthropology] would likely remain unchanged* (page 6).

On 6th September the Deputy Director of RSHA acting as Director set out the details of the ‘Informal Consultation Process’ and the establishment of working parties in each of three areas. The ‘Working Party on the Integration of Heritage and Museum Studies’ was set up to consider the proposed changes that included those that affected the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. The appointed members were: Dr A. Greig (sociology) Chair; Dr Kylie Message (newly appointed Head of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology), Dr Laurajane Smith, Dr Sally May, Dr Sharon Peoples.

The disciplinary composition and affiliations of the members of this working party was a cause for some concern. No longstanding member of the School of Archaeology and Anthropology with any deep knowledge of its organisation or teaching and research history was on the working party, only the newly appointed head who came from RSH and works in the area of museum studies. The other three appointed members were all from outside the School and part of heritage and museum studies themselves. No anthropologist, archaeologist, development studies or bio-anthropologist from the School was included. Concern about the lack of representation from the other disciplines in the School was raised at the time but ignored.

The Report of the Working Party made no recommendation for a change of name. It is relevant, however, that a view was expressed to the Working Party that placing heritage and museum studies in a School of Archaeology and Anthropology might lead some students to think that heritage and museum studies only relate to these two fields (page 4).

This is the same issue of visibility, which is the central to the anthropologists’ concern in relation to development. Through hard work and a very effective and high quality program we have overcome that visibility issue in relation to development. Excellent visibility can be provided to heritage and museum studies by establishing a Centre for Heritage and Museum Studies within the School with its own website (a key feature in visibility) without damage to the brand that has been established.
The proposal to change the name of the School has been inserted into the ‘Change Management Proposal: RSHA Restructure’ document issued on the 22nd July 2013, unilaterally and from a position of privilege. The Deputy Director of RSHA (on his own admission at the Staff Meeting held in the School on Friday 26th July) was responsible for the proposal to add ‘heritage’ to the name of the School. The Deputy Director works in the broad area of heritage studies.

This process of restructuring has not been well served by too casual attention being given to the broad representation of all interests at various stages in the deliberations, as was recommended by the ‘Report of the Informal Consultation Committee’ (4th December 2012). This specifically emphasised the importance of ‘broader representation from those affected’ on committees (it was speaking specifically about ‘consultation’ committees, but it surely applies to others as well).

A final concern at relates to a throwaway line by the chair of the Staff Meeting on 26th July 2013, that we will reconsider the name change in 6 months time. If a Centre is to be set up then it needs a couple of years at least to see whether or not this provides the profile desired. Further there is evidence that the views of the School on the name change issue are not being accurately reported in other meetings: ‘its only the anthropologists who don’t want change’. I have asked a number of non-anthropologists about their views and they range across the spectrum.

There seems to be undue haste to change the name.

**Recommendations**

- That any consideration of a change of name to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology be postponed till mid-2015.

- That any committee set up to look at this matter represent all disciplines within the School and involve meetings or all members of the School.

**Other matters**

**Problems with a move of the School to the Roland Wilson building**

At the end of the recent staff meeting the Head of School joked with the Deputy Director of RSHA that she was planning to take over the Roland Wilson building for the School. While this has certain attractions in relation the high quality of the facilities there, and the potential to have everybody under one roof I think that such a move needs to be thought about very carefully in connection with the School’s relationships to undergraduates in particular. **The grounds for not moving are strong.**

The AD Hope is very centrally located and it is easy for students to get to see us; we are close to the lecture theatres; and it gives the School a high profile, especially as the building is a thoroughfare. Aspects of the building may not be
ideal. If we move to the Wilson building, which is 7 minutes fast walking away and 10 minutes for most people, we are out of sight, we will spend considerable amounts of time walking back and forth to lectures and we are not easily available to students. The School may have to postpone complete co-location until such time as the new building proposed by the Dean becomes a reality.

But in any case it is vital for the whole School to be involved in any discussions about changes in location and for those who are actually doing the teaching and managing day to day relationships with the undergraduate as well as the postgraduate population to be fully involved in planning from the outset. I think there are several possibilities for dealing with space issues in the immediate future, which can be achieved within the scope of the AD Hope building as it is at present.

Loose ends
There seems to be a number of loose ends in the restructure documents and the circulation of information, especially as it relates to iHug and IPPA's proposed relationships to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology. In the interests of transparency it would also be beneficial if material on the postgraduate load being brought to the School were made available.

Recommendations
- That a committee representing all disciplines in the School should be established to discuss locational issues relating to the School of Archaeology and Anthropology, if any consideration at all is being given to relocating it.
- That the details of the postgraduate load to be brought to the School be made available to interested staff.
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