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I. THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
SELF-STUDY

A. Mission Statement and Student Learning Outcomes

Mission Statement

Philosophical education seeks to cultivate the intellectual and ethical virtues of our students. By its focus on analysis, comprehension and communication, philosophy develops qualities that are essential to personal fulfillment and civic responsibility. In developing the capacity for a thoughtful private and public life, philosophy teaches and encourages students to critically assess and integrate the different claims and values produced under disparate perspectives and methodologies, with an eye to constructing frameworks of understanding within which action can take on meaning.

Philosophy is a communal practice. As participants in an ongoing inquiry, our shared reflection connects us to the wealth of ideas and arguments furnished by other thinkers in the present as well as the past. Here philosophical education stresses dialogical honesty, as well as respect for both the views of others and the forceless force of the better argument.

Philosophical education aims at making us more complete human beings. It opens the intellect and the heart to the power of questioning and inquiry. It nourishes the faculties that guide us while, together with our friends, we construct frameworks of understanding and the good life.

Student Learning Goals/Outcomes

1) Students should be able to read and comprehend complex philosophical texts.

2) Students should be able to offer good philosophical criticism to the positions presented by others.

3) Students should be able to construct their own philosophical positions and present them persuasively to others in dialogue and/or writing.

4) Students should be able to take in and fruitfully utilize criticisms of their own philosophical positions.

5) Students should show an openness to giving careful and serious consideration to different philosophical views and the reasons offered in support of them.

6) Students should be able to present arguments from various philosophical perspectives, traditions, and cultures—including those very different from their own.
7) Students should be able to empathize with the experiences of others insofar as those experiences are relevant to the resolution of philosophical issues.

8) Students should have competence in the history of philosophy and the major subject areas in philosophy.

9) Students should develop the ability to do philosophical research and to engage with secondary sources.

10) Students should be able to utilize their philosophical training in their public and personal lives.

B. Profile of the Major and Minor Program

The Department of Philosophy at California State University, East Bay offers a BA degree program in philosophy in four different areas, Classical Philosophy, Religious Studies, Law/ Human Rights & Social Justice, and Science/ Technology & Values. The department currently offers three minor options: one in philosophy, one in religious studies, and an interdisciplinary minor in cognitive studies.

These major options reflect the newly designed major that was developed out of the last Five-Year Review Process, and effective in the Fall 2005 catalogue. The goal of the department was to offer a traditional philosophy major for those pursuing a liberal education or considering graduate study in Philosophy and Religious Studies, while also allowing students to pursue interests in contemporary issues related to the studies of politics, law, and science.

All options of the Philosophy major consist of 60 units, for a B.A. degree that totals 180 quarter units. Each major takes 24 units in a core set of required courses, including the touchstone course PHIL 3305 Fundamental Questions: Self, Nature, and God and the capstone course PHIL 4606 Philosophical Seminar, as well as courses in the central areas of ethics, metaphysics, and the history of philosophy. Majors in every option also take an Epistemology Elective and a Social/ Political Diversity Elective of their choice. Then each option has a set of required option core courses and electives tailored to the option area of study.

The Philosophy Minor consists of three areas; most minors follow the standard minor in philosophy.

For details, please see the catalogue description of the Major and Minor Program in Attachment C.
A Note on the Philosophy Department's Role in General Education

The Department of Philosophy is actively engaged in General Education in a wide variety of ways. The department currently offers courses in three freshman clusters, and two sophomore level courses to help native students fulfill their lower division humanities GE requirements. The department offers multiple sections of critical thinking courses in clear thinking and logic every quarter; both fulfill the Critical Thinking General Education requirement. Also, the Philosophy Department offers two upper division courses that fulfill the Critical Thinking General Education requirement, Critical Legal Reasoning and Modern Logic.

The department routinely offers multiple sections of the course Human Rights and Social Justice: Cultural Groups and Women in the US. This course satisfies both the Upper Division Humanities GE requirement and the Cultural Groups and Women GE requirement. Additionally, the department offers two other courses that satisfy both the Upper Division Humanities GE and the Cultural Groups and Women GE requirement, Feminist Philosophy and Race and Social Justice.

The department offers forty courses that satisfy the upper division humanities requirement.

The philosophy department participates in three different freshman clusters, each of which is comprised of courses from three different departments. The department plans to be a part of at least one new Freshman cluster proposal in conjunction with the Departments of Music and Physics. After the demise of the sophomore clusters, the Philosophy Department developed two new stand alone courses to fulfill the need for sophomore level General Education requirements, PHIL 2000 Introduction to Philosophy and PHIL 2001 Introduction to Ethics. Due to enrollment, budget, and staffing concerns, the Philosophy Department no longer offers the two upper-division team taught courses that it had previously offered in conjunction with the College of Business and Economic and with the College of Science.

C. Profile of the Faculty

The Philosophy Department of California State University, East Bay currently consists of five tenured and tenure-track faculty. Though the Philosophy Department has five regular faculty members, that number is sure to decrease in the near future if the department does not replace separated and retiring faculty.

Professor Emeritus Paul Bassen is completing his FERP program at the end of the 2008-2009.

Professor Marek Bielecki is regular faculty member and full professor.
Associate Jennifer Eagan is currently the chair of the department; she holds a joint appointment in the Department of Public Affairs and Administration, teaching only 2/3rds of her time in the Philosophy Department.

Assistant Professor Barbara Hall is a new tenure track hire as of Fall 2006.

Associate Professor Terrence Kelly has been on a leave of absence since Fall 2005, and has recently resigned from the University.

In Fall 2006, Associate Professor Roberta Millstein separated from the University taking a tenured position at the University of California, Davis.

The faculty also consists of many lecturers, some recurring and entitled, some rotating in on a temporary basis. The following twelve have taught courses for the Department between Summer 2006 and Spring 2007: Russ Abrams, Kit Blarney, Jürgen Braungardt, Craig Derksen, Robert Gorton, Mary Beth Lamb, Harry Manhoff, Vida Pavesich, Agha Saeed, Michael Sudduth, Wendy White, Derrick Willis.

D. Statistical Analysis of the Program

Student Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy FTES generated</td>
<td>190.40</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>203.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses offered</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections offered</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average section size</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data for majors, degrees awarded and FTES generated taken from Institutional Research and Analysis Report. Other information generated from Data Warehouse. Averages disregard Philosophy 4900 with only one student. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

Tenure-Track Faculty Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcounts of TT Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF of TT Faculty</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching FTEF of TT Faculty</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERP FTEF</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TT Teaching FTEF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Until Summer of 2006, Jennifer Eagan had a 2/3rd appointment in Philosophy and 1/3rd appointment in Public Administration. This data is taken from the IRA report and departmental records. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

Lecturer Faculty Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer headcounts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer FTEF</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of Dept FTEF</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of sections offered</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of FTES taught</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>76.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

Student-Faculty Ratios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>203.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures taken from the fall quarter.

Course and section information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # students per section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Upper Division</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of Students Enrolled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This data is taken from Data Warehouse reports. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

* These figures do not include the independent study classes with just one student.

### Ethnicity of Majors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of majors</th>
<th>Percentage of majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Known</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of majors</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from CAPR Table I for Fall 2006, CSU ERSS Statistical Extract. Percentages reflect only the known ethnicity information.

### Comparison with Other Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFR Teaching TT Faculty</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR for Lecturers</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SFR</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System SFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Capacity Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

* No data was currently available for the shaded areas.
E. Discussion of Recent Trends

Increase in Use of Lecturers and Reduction of Regular Faculty

The percentage of philosophy courses taught by lecturers has remained well above 50% for the last ten years. However, an even more disturbing trend can be seen in the past two years worth of data. Reiterating the statistics on lecturer faculty from above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of sections offered</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of FTES taught</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>76.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the past two years, the department’s percentages of sections taught by lecturers and FTES served by lecturers has risen dramatically. While we consider our lecturers to be highly effective teachers, this trend has created serious problems for the major. Part-time lecturers cannot be expected to devote the time and energy needed to develop an adequate program. Our specific hiring needs are addressed in our Hiring Plan (see Part II.C, page 20). However, tenure track hires are the department’s most vital need. An increase in the number of tenure-track positions is also vital to create an atmosphere of philosophical dialogue and ambience that attracts majors.

Since 2002, the number of tenure track faculty teaching in our program has been cut in half. In Fall 2006, the Department had only three regular faculty teaching courses. Our department has reached the inverse of the California Legislature’s target ratio of 75% regular to 25% part-time faculty.

Enrollment Trends

The department is the seventh largest in CLASS in terms of FTES as of Fall 2006. Our FTES have grown from 180.3 in Fall 2005 to 203.7 in Fall 2006, in spite of the reduction of regular faculty. The Philosophy Department has benefited from enrollments of General Education courses, including our participation in three Freshman clusters. Our participation in GE will only grow as the University increases its enrollments in general, and its native student population in particular.

In spite of pressures to increase enrollments by increasing section sizes, the Philosophy Department caps all its courses at 25, 30 or 35 students in order to facilitate Socratic dialogue in the classroom. We have been able to maintain an average number of students per section of 28.

Majors

The Philosophy Program has significantly increased our numbers of majors. According to the IRA statistics, the program currently has 29 majors. However, according to Blackboard records the number of majors is 35. This discrepancy may be due to the fact
that sometimes double majors do not show up on the IRA reports. In our last Self-Study (2001-2002), we projected that, “A realistic target [for majors] would be 30 to 35.” We have reached that goal. The Philosophy Department remains committed to increasing the number of majors. Our curricular and program revisions seemed to have worked in terms of attracting majors to the program.

There are two potential sources of philosophy majors, the lower division native students who discover their love of philosophy in cluster or critical thinking courses, and transfer students who either have discovered a love of philosophy at another institution or have stumbled onto philosophy by taking their upper division GE requirement in the Humanities.

Philosophy will continue to be active in lower division GE courses, hopefully increasing our presence in GE clusters and continuing to serve the bulk of lower division students fulfilling their A3 Critical Thinking GE requirement. If we put some of our best instructors in these roles, we should be able to attract majors through these course offerings.

The vast majority of undergraduate students at CSUEB remain transfer students. The Philosophy Department continues to reach out to nearby two-year colleges in order to attract majors. During the 2005-2006 Academic Year, we had two guest speakers from two-year colleges. Maxine Freed from DeAnza and Monterey Peninsula Colleges gave a lecture on “Key Aspects of Buddhist Ethics”, and Wayne Yuen from Ohlone College gave a lecture entitled “The Bloody Connection between Vampires and Vegetarianism”. Both of these talks were well attended and hopefully provided a favorable impression of our program to faculty who are likely to refer students to our campus. The Philosophy Department plans to continue and broaden the scope of our outreach to local two-year schools in order to attract new majors to CSUEB.

F. Summary of the Last External Reviewer’s Report

The attached External Review by Thomas McCarthy, Northwestern University from 2002 makes the following observations and recommendations about the Philosophy Department and Program:

1. McCarthy notes that the department’s extensive service to General Education and devotion to many options and inter-disciplinary areas “has stretched it as thinly as is prudent for the good of the Department and the University”

2. “First, too great a disproportion [of lecturers to tenure-track faculty] can undermine the coherence and weaken the center of the Department to a point where its internal dynamics begin to dissipate ...”
3. “Second, it seems evident that the high proportion of lecturers places an undue burden of administrative and committee responsibilities on the tenure-track members of the Department.”

4. McCarthy noted that this burden sets the stage for faculty burn out, particularly of its three junior faculty members (Kelly, Millstein, and Eagan).

5. Because of the disproportion of lecturers to tenure track faculty and the high work load, McCarthy’s reports highlights the need for new tenure track hires, particularly in the area of Religious Studies.

6. In his report, McCarthy noted the dual needs to keep the heart of the discipline strong through the major, as well as to diversity our faculty and course offerings. Philosophy is an important discipline, and key to the study of humanities. The Philosophy program should not be reduced to a service program. Therefore, the University needs to help the department enhance diversity and multicultural nature of the department, particularly through a new hire in Religious Studies.

7. McCarthy noted that due to the interdisciplinary nature of the lower division cluster system, the Department needed an upper division course that serves as an introduction to philosophy.

8. McCarthy recommended specific curricular changes, particularly a revision of our sophomore course offerings and our sequence of course in the History of Philosophy.

9. Finally, McCarthy warned the faculty of the Philosophy Department that its current assessment plan was overly cumbersome and would further drain the faculty of much needed energy and resources.

G. Implementation of Goals and Suggestions Contained in the Last Five-Year Review and External Reviewer’s Report

The Philosophy Faculty generally concurred with McCarthy’s 2002 assessment of the philosophy program. The following narrative reflects how the department responded to each suggestion.

1. McCarthy notes that the department’s extensive service to General Education and devotion to many options and inter-disciplinary areas “has stretched it as thinly as is prudent for the good of the Department and the University”

The department’s situation has actually worsened with respect to being stretched too thin. This is mainly due to faculty separations. Bill Langan retired at the end of the 2004 academic year. Terrence Kelly has been on a leave of absence since Fall 2005, and his return is uncertain. Roberta Millstein left the department in Summer 2006 to take a
position at the University of California, Davis. The good news is that the department did hire a new tenure faculty member, Barbara Hall, who joined the department in Fall 2006. However, on the whole, the Department has lost more ground than it has gained in terms of tenure and tenure track faculty since our last Five Year Review.

2. “First, too great a disproportion [of lecturers to tenure-track faculty] can undermine the coherence and weaken the center of the Department to a point where its internal dynamics begin to dissipate . . .”

This disproportion between lecturers and tenure-track faculty has grown greater rather than smaller in recent years, as is shown in this reiteration of our department’s statistical data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer % of Dept FTEF</th>
<th>61.2%</th>
<th>62.5%</th>
<th>53.1%</th>
<th>50.0%</th>
<th>64.5%</th>
<th>66.6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of sections offered</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of FTES taught</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>76.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The share of FTEF, sections, and students taught by lecturers has increased, predictably, as our tenure-track faculty has diminished. This remains true as our commitment to serve General Education has remained constant and our numbers of majors has increased. Even though the department is fortunate to recruit, hire, and maintain an excellent cadre of lecturers, this takes a predictable toll on both the faculty and students in the department. Our ratio is the inverse of the CSU system-wide ideal of the 75% tenure and tenure-track faculty to 25% lecturers.

3. “Second, it seems evident that the high proportion of lecturers places an undue burden of administrative and committee responsibilities on the tenure-track members of the Department.”

The small number of tenured and tenure stream faculty makes running the department and serving the University more broadly very difficult. Two of the three then junior faculty members from the last Five Year Review Report are not currently teaching in the department. Roberta Millstein cited workload issues in her decision to take the position at UC Davis.

4. McCarthy noted that this burden sets the stage for faculty burn out, particularly of its three junior faculty members (Kelly, Millstein, and Eagan).

Due to the small number of department faculty, practically every faculty member serves on every department level committee. Additionally, the faculty of the Philosophy Department has a long standing tradition of hefty service to the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Science as well as to the University, serving in the Academic Senate, and committing to multiple positions on College and University Committees. However, the separations may tell the real story of the cost of this extensive service.
5. Because of the disproportion of lecturers to tenure track faculty and the high work load, McCarthy's reports highlights the need for new tenure track hires, particularly in the area of Religious Studies.

The need for new tenure-track hires is greater now than when McCarthy wrote his report in 2002. The Department has requested a tenure-track position in Religious Studies repeatedly without success. The Department's current hiring plan seeks positions in both Religious Studies and a replacement for Roberta Millstein in the area of Philosophy of Science.

6. In his report, McCarthy noted the dual needs to keep the heart of the discipline strong through the major, as well as to diversity of our faculty and course offerings. Philosophy is an important discipline, and key to the study of humanities. The Philosophy program should not be reduced to a service program. Therefore, the University needs to help the department enhance diversity and multicultural nature of the department, particularly through a new hire in Religious Studies.

The Philosophy department revised its major program to appeal to new majors, which seems to have had the desired effect, since the numbers of majors has risen in recent years. However, we need resources in the form of tenure-track hires to maintain this momentum.

7. McCarthy noted that due to the interdisciplinary nature of the lower division cluster system, the Department needed an upper division course that serves as an introduction to philosophy.

The new major now requires a course, PHIL 3305 Self, Nature, and God: Fundamental Questions, which serves as a touchstone course for incoming majors and as an upper division introduction to philosophy for any student at the University.

8. McCarthy recommended specific curricular changes, particularly a revision of our sophomore course offerings and our sequence of course in the History of Philosophy.

In response to both McCarthy's suggestion and to changes in the lower division GE program, the Philosophy program introduced two new Sophomore level courses for lower division GE in the humanities, PHIL 2001 Introduction to Philosophy and PHIL 2002 Introduction to Ethics to provide two broad and traditional surveys of philosophy for lower division students. Within the revision of the major program, the faculty decided to trim the number of required history sequence courses depending on the option area.

9. Finally, McCarthy warned the faculty of the Philosophy Department that its current assessment plan was overly cumbersome and would further drain the faculty of much needed energy and resources.
In response to McCarthy’s suggestions, the department’s assessment plan has been revised to be more focused and less ambitious than it was five years ago. The new assessment plan focuses on the touchstone and capstone courses in the major, seeking regularly feedback from majors and minors, and surveying alumni.

H. Goals and Suggestions Yet to Be Accomplished

1. Revitalization of the Tenure-Track Faculty
We have yet to receive approval of our repeated request for a position in Religious Studies. The Religious Studies option in the new major is one of the most popular, in spite of the fact that do not have a regular faculty member to coordinate the program. The vast majority of courses in this option area are taught by lecturers. This hire would help us both to serve our majors well and to diversify our faculty and course offerings, thus satisfying the University’s mission of creating a “multicultural learning environment”. A hire in Religious Studies would serve the whole University by providing much need curricular content on religions around the world.

2. A Revision of the Minor.
The faculty will tackle this task within the next year. This effort will be coupled with an effort to attract new minors to the program.

3. A Continued Increase in Number of Majors.
The department has made great strides in attracting majors since the last five-year review. The department plans to extend its outreach to area two-year colleges as well as to native CSUEB freshmen.

I. Current Assessment Plan

Assessment Plan
CSUEB Department of Philosophy

Aim of the Assessment Plan

The department has always utilized assessment in the form of student evaluations and peer reviews. This data has been used to improve pedagogy and received rigorous examination in retention, tenure, salary increase and promotion reviews. However, the demands for educational accountability have made it necessary for the department to create a more comprehensive assessment plan. This plan will evaluate the program as a whole as well as in its parts and make it easier for the department to evaluate its effectiveness, pinpoint shortcomings and propose meaningful pedagogical reform.

Qualitative Data and Objectivity
In its assessment plan, the department will rely heavily on qualitative rather than quantitative data. While quantitative data is an appropriate evaluation tool in certain contexts, the department believes that qualitative evaluations are better suited for the pedagogical activities of the department. As evidenced by the GRE’s discontinuation of the philosophy subject exam, quantitative data does not measure particularly well the impact (cognitively, ethically or aesthetically) of philosophical studies on a student. This is in part because philosophical training centers on developing a number of formal skills while transforming the substance of the person—neither of which are evaluated well by quantitative data. However, relying on qualitative data in no way sacrifices the objectivity of evaluation. As will be seen in the following, the department proposes a number of procedures to produce unbiased interpretive evaluations of the program’s effectiveness.

The Construction of Learning Goals

In the construction of learning goals, the department, recognizing the fact of academic pluralism and freedom, begins with the actual myriad practices of the faculty and attempts to find/construct broad agreements on the purpose of the particular courses offered by the department. From this broad agreement, learning goals for the program and particular courses are constructed. The constructing of learning goals immediately raises pedagogical issues (i.e. curriculum issues). These questions may be answered by transforming pedagogy or by modifying the learning goals depending on the considered judgments of the faculty. Only when an equilibrium between constructed learning goals and pedagogical issues is achieved does the assessment plan formally appeal to learning goals to evaluate the program or specific courses. This approach has the value of recognizing academic pluralism and freedom, while producing meaningful pedagogical debate within the process of constructing learning goals.

Students Learning Goals/Outcomes

In assessing the department as a degree granting program, the department evaluates itself in terms of its ability to provide major/minor students with a coherent and comprehensive learning experience in philosophy. Specifically, the department’s overall goal is to produce a certain kind of student (if not a certain kind of person), one who exhibits the skills and knowledge that one would reasonably expect a competent philosopher to possess. This overall expectation can be broken down into a series of particular learning goals that we want our graduating majors and minors to achieve.

Student Learning Goals/Outcomes

1) Students should be able to read and comprehend complex philosophical texts.

2) Students should be able to offer good philosophical criticism to the positions presented by others.
3) Students should be able to construct their own philosophical positions and present them persuasively to others in dialogue and/or writing.

4) Students should be able to take in and fruitfully utilize criticisms of their own philosophical positions.

5) Students should show an openness to giving careful and serious consideration to different philosophical views and the reasons offered in support of them.

6) Students should be able to present arguments from various philosophical perspectives, traditions, and cultures—including those very different from their own.

7) Students should be able to empathize with the experiences of others insofar as those experiences are relevant to the resolution of philosophical issues.

8) Students should have competence in the history of philosophy and the major subject areas in philosophy.

9) Students should develop the ability to do philosophical research and to engage with secondary sources.

10) Students should be able to utilize their philosophical training in their public and personal lives.

**Assessment Methodology**

The department assesses itself *vis a vis* its major and minor students by way of a touchstone experiences, capstone experience, focused discussion groups, and surveys of alumni.

1) **Touchstone course:**

In the Fall of their first year as majors (usually their junior year) majors and minors will take a philosophical writing and methods course. The nature of philosophical reflection, the scope of philosophical questioning, and the hermeneutics of philosophical dialogue will constitute the core subject matter of the course. The faculty member teaching the course will construct a narrative evaluation of the students’ abilities in the course and provide a report to the faculty on what skill sets this cohort of students needs to work on the most. This communication between faculty members is key to helping students develop as they go through the major. The narrative report serves as a point of reflection on who our majors and minors are and where they need to go. It provides a snapshot of our majors as they enter the program.
PHIL 3305 | **Fundamental Questions: Self, Nature, and God (4)**

Topics such as the mind-body problem, freedom versus determinism, and the nature of truth, faith, and reason.

See Attachment H.1 for the latest Faculty Narrative Evaluation of PHIL 3305.

2) **Capstone course:**

The use of a capstone experience has the advantage of making assessment itself a part of a valuable learning experience for the student. The department has constructed a unique capstone course that is meant to test the student's philosophical abilities within a learning context. In the capstone course, majors are prepared for graduate work in seminar setting that requires the students to engage in scholarly work in philosophy. The faculty member teaching the course will construct a narrative evaluation of the students' abilities in the course and provide a report to the faculty on what skill sets this cohort of students has achieved and what skills and content we may need to work on for the next cohort of majors. Communication between faculty members remains key to helping students develop as they go through the major. The narrative report serves as a point of reflection on where our majors stand at the end of their years of study in philosophy. It provides a snapshot of our majors as they exit the program.

PHIL Seminar in Philosophy (4)

4606 Intensive study of an individual philosopher, school, movement or problem in philosophy. May be repeated for credit when content varies.

See Attachment H.2 for the latest Faculty Narrative Evaluation of PHIL 4606.

3) **Focused Discussion Groups:**

The touchstone and capstone experiences can only serve as barometers of the department's success at meeting its learning goals. It cannot offer an explanatory account of the department's successes or failures. This is the role of focus discussion group. The group will meet yearly and the discussion will be guided by the assessment results of the touchstone and capstone courses. Particular failures in meeting learning goals will be discussed with the students in an effort to pinpoint what elements of the program failed to provide them with the skills and knowledge areas that the department expects from them. Likewise, the department's successes in meeting learning goals will also be analyzed. This will give both majors and minors an opportunity to discuss their experience in the program in relation to the Student Learning Goals/Outcomes, and to provide guidance to the faculty on how to improve the program.

See Attachment H.3 for Student Feedback from Winter 2007.

4) **Alumni Surveys:**
The department will also periodically survey program alumni in an effort to determine the long range impact that the program has had on their lives. These surveys are meant to test for Student Learning Goal/Outcome #7, that is they test to see if the philosophical training the student received at CSUEB is actualized in the student’s life.

Due to changes in chair, faculty, and office staff, the Philosophy Department has not recently conducted alumni surveys. Next year, the first round of student from our new major will have graduated and we will track their progress through an alumni survey.

**Summary**

By use of the touchstone and capstone experiences, focus groups, and alumni surveys, the department will construct a self-assessment that is objective in the sense that it is free from bias and is based on the agreement of both faculty and students. This is because the evaluation of the program utilizes the judgment of multiple members of the faculty in conjunction with the actual experience and judgments of students. In this sense, the students of the program dialogically engage the faculty as co-participants in the assessment procedure.
II. DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY  
DRAFT PLAN  

A. Curriculum and Program Revisions  

Since our last Five-Year Review in 2001-2002, the major task of the Philosophy Department has been to revise and implement the redesigned major with the new option areas. Students began entering the new major in Fall 2005, so we are looking forward to our first graduates of the new major in the Spring of 2007. Overall, student response to the new major has been favorable. We have increased the numbers of majors in the past two years, and students broadly report that they like the new option areas because of their emphasis on contemporary issues and practical foci.  

Because the new major is just getting started, the Philosophy Department has no plans to significantly alter the major program at this time. However, the department has four future tasks on the horizon.  

1. Revising the Minor  

Since we have revised the major, we now need to revise our minor program. Philosophy as a discipline area is well suited as a minor for majors in various fields, such as English, Political Science, Biology, etc. Particularly with our emphasis on applied ethics and contemporary issues, our Philosophy minor is complimentary to many majors. Our three tiered minor is probably too tailored and unnecessary. For example, the department has not had a student minor in the Cognitive Science option in some time. A minor with a simple core set of courses and many elective choices would allow students to pursue chosen areas of interest, and would likely attract students due to its flexibility.  

2. New Courses  

Our new tenure-track faculty member, Barbara Hall, is developing a new course in African American Philosophy, one of her areas of specialization. This course will serve both the Social and Political Diversity component of the major in all options. This course will enhance the diversity of the content in the Philosophy Department, and will likely serve non-majors as a General Education course. The department hopes that Professor Hall will develop other courses, and joined by new tenure-track faculty who will further develop curriculum areas.  

3. Streamlining Course Offerings  

At the present time, the Philosophy Department has many courses listed in the University Catalogue that we do not have the staffing or the budget to offer. Some courses listed in the catalogue do not fit neatly into the new major and tend not to attract General Education students either. Reviewing our course listings will help us focus on what works both in our new major and for General Education.
4. Freshman Clusters
The Philosophy Department is currently in the process of developing proposals in response to the call for Freshman Clusters coming from the Office of General Education. We hope that these proposals will be accepted and that the Department will increase its offering in the Freshman Cluster Program to serve these students in the beginnings of their liberal educations, and to potentially attract native students to the major.

Given the diminished size of the regular faculty in the Philosophy Department, our ability to offer new courses, revise our minor, and serve the needs of the student in general education courses depends in large part on the department’s future tenure track hires.

B. Future Assessment Plans

Upon the recommendation of our last Outside Program Reviewer, The Philosophy Department has scaled down its previous assessment plan because it was overly ambitious.

The Department plans to continue with its current assessment plan (see page 14). So far, it is serving us well in terms of gathering data and opening up lines of communication between faculty members and students. In this ongoing conversation, we are continually improving our courses, pedagogy, and relationships to majors and minors. We are satisfied that we have created a workable, useful, and flexible mode of assessment that is not overly burdensome.

The final piece that we need to implement is the alumni survey. Developing this survey, keeping better track of our alumni, and collecting data will be a primary project of the department in the 2007-2008 AY.

C. Faculty Hiring Plans

Immediate Needs
The Philosophy Department is in critical need of tenure-track hires. In our last Five-Year Review document, we described the structuring of the new major around the four content areas, envisioning at least one regular faculty member being in charge of each option. Many courses in the Classical Option are covered by Professors Bassen and Bielecki. Professors Eagan and Hall cover the area of Law, Human Rights, and Social Justice.

In light of the changes in our major curriculum and recent faculty separations, the Philosophy Department would like to request the following two tenure-track searches for the 2007-2008 academic year.
1. Religious Studies

This critical need was addressed in our last Five Year Review, and we remain in need of a faculty member to head up the Religious Studies option in the major. These courses are almost exclusively taught by lecturers, even though this is one of the two most popular major options.

2. Philosophy of Science

Due to the separation of Roberta Millstein from the department, we need a faculty member who specializes in the area of Philosophy of Science, with an emphasis in applied ethics. This is a socially relevant area that is in high demand, and is specific in its focus. In the past, the department has had difficulty staffing these courses with lecturers with the relevant expertise.

Future Needs
In the Summer of 2008, Professor Bassen will complete his FERP program. Associate Professors Kelly and Millstein have recently separately from the University. Due to these separations, if the department does not receive additional lines for regular faculty, the department will be down to 2.67 regular faculty members. The two tenure track requests in our current hiring plan represent what the department needs immediately. We will need to replace these future separations within the next five years with at least two more tenure track positions.

If the department were to achieve the California Legislature’s target ratio of 75% regular faculty to 25% lecturer faculty in terms of courses taught, this would require hiring five new faculty members within the next five years.

See Attachments F and G for the 2007-2008 tenure track requests.
Attachment A

External Review of the Department of Philosophy at CSUH, dated May 28, 2002

May 28, 2002

External Review of the Philosophy Department
At the California State University, Hayward

The Hayward Philosophy Department is a small, well-run department, with a high-quality faculty, which makes an outsized contribution to the University. Its high total enrollments and average section sizes are indicators of the large role it plays in meeting the needs for the general education “clusters” and the critical thinking requirement. The diverse content of the clusters in which it is involved, as well as the religious studies option and the cognitive science minor, attest to the broadly interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary nature of its offerings. All of this has gone to make it a predominantly service-oriented department and, in my view, has stretched it as thinly as is prudent for the good of the Department and the University. In fact, there is only one sort of general service expansion that seems to me feasible in its present configuration: if the School of Business and Economics should choose to build a business ethics component into its degree programs, the Philosophy Department could provide the necessary courses largely by expanding its staff of lecturers.

Now that the professional situation of its company of lecturers has been appreciably improved, the problems I see with the continuing disproportion between courses staffed by lecturers (more than 60% of the sections offered) and those staffed by tenure-track faculty are the following. First, too great a disproportion can undermine the coherence and weaken the center of the Department to a point where its internal dynamics begin to dissipate, to the detriment of everyone concerned. Fortunately, that has not yet happened; the level of energy and initiative remains high. But further increasing that disproportion could seriously endanger the integrity of the program. And I assume that no one reading this report has to be persuaded of the importance of a healthy, vibrant philosophy program to the life of an institution of higher education. Second, it seems evident that the high proportion of lecturers places an undue burden of administrative and committee responsibilities on the tenure-track members of the Department. This is particularly the case with the three, untenured, junior members. At this early stage of their teaching and scholarly careers, the amount and kind of administrative/committee work they do strikes me as unduly burdensome. This is one reason, I think, for adding an additional tenure-track line to the Department. There are others.

Because the Department’s resources are so strained by fulfilling its general-service functions, the majors suffer. The University Administration, whose resources are no doubt also strained, could take the view that this is as it should be. But it would be a serious error, I think, to allow the Department to degenerate into a service department with a handful of majors. The number of majors will no doubt remain smaller than in disciplines with more secure career paths; but it should be large enough to sustain the
professional vitality of the faculty and enable them properly to carry out the Department’s educational mission. Philosophy has for centuries been regarded as the heart of the liberal arts and is still viewed by the best educators as an essential component of higher education. Put simply, the Department cannot play that role if its program is reduced to a loose collection of service-related courses and its faculty to lower-level teaching. To keep the heart strong, the major has to be kept strong; for that is what nourishes the professional development of the faculty and enhances the quality of instruction as a whole. Given that roughly half of the majors in philosophy come to it through an interest in religious studies and do in fact choose that option, the most glaring weakness in the present make-up of the department is the absence of a tenure-track appointment in this area. I would strongly recommend adding a line in religious studies; and my clear impression from talking to about 1/3 of the existing majors is that, whatever else the person hired does, s/he should cover in depth the Christian tradition of religious-philosophical thought. Of course, given the diverse nature of your student body, knowledge of other traditions, especially Asian, would also be important.

As to the present constitution and proposed revisions of the philosophy major: I think the idea of areas of concentration makes good sense – up to a point. In specific, it seems to me that the areas of (1) science, technology, and values, (2) philosophy, law, and economics, and (3) human rights and social justice are effectively staffed (by Professors Millstein, Kelly, and Eagan, respectively) and appropriately conceived as inherently interdisciplinary undertakings. However, it also seems to me that history of philosophy and metaphysics/epistemology (as well as ethical theory) are best conceived not as separate special areas but as the core of the program as a whole. And they are in any case well covered in the general requirements for the major. About the seventh proposed area, cultural studies and Asian philosophy, it seems to me that adding a religious studies line to the already considerable offerings in this area would be sufficient. The danger with too many separate areas is, of course, a dispersion effect that might threaten the overall integration of the program, especially if the tendency for them to split-off into self-contained units is not resisted. At present, adding proper staffing for a fourth special area – religious studies – to the existing staffing for the areas mentioned above seems to me to strike the right balance between differentiation and integration.

In addition to an additional appointment in religious studies, preserving the vitality of the department will require replacing in a timely fashion any retirements that might occur in the interim till the next review. In the meantime, however, there are some structural changes in the program that might enhance that vitality without requiring additional resources. The students I talked with were unanimously and emphatically of the opinion that neither the critical thinking course nor the philosophy courses offered in theme-specific clusters provide an adequate disciplinary background to the upper-level offerings in philosophy. Moreover, since many prospective and actual philosophy majors transfer to Hayward in their third year, they typically lack even that insufficient background. The result, all concurred, is a good deal of initial floundering and frustration in upper-level courses by a significant number of both majors and non-majors. I would strongly recommend that the department institute a 3000-level advanced introduction to “Problems of Philosophy”, in which central issues are dealt with through classical texts
(e.g. mind/body through Descartes, knowledge/skepticism through Hume, faith/knowledge through Augustine and Aquinas, moral theory through Aristotle and Kant, etc.). If it were offered each fall by the Department’s most gifted teachers, and required (or at least strongly recommended) as a prerequisite for most other upper-level courses, it could serve as a valuable bridge for transfer-students and an inviting entrée for prospective majors and minors generally. I would further recommend that the Department give serious consideration to reducing the number of history requirements from five to three and adding two electives. Specifically, the presently required Roots of Contemporary Philosophy and Contemporary Philosophy could be offered as electives. Ancient/Medieval and Rationalism/Empiricism could remain as requirements. If the Kant and Idealism course were also to remain as a requirement, I would strongly recommend making Rationalism/Empiricism as prerequisite, for that seems to be the course with which under prepared students have the greatest difficulty. If that is not feasible owing to likely enrollment effects, or for other reasons, the Department might consider designating the Kant course as an elective and making the third history requirement a course in the classics of ethical theory from the Greeks to Kant. The aim of these curricular recommendations is to increase the flexibility of the program by providing a standard entrée at the start and more electives along the way. Together with stronger offerings in religious studies, they would respond to the principle obstacles presently encountered by prospective and actual majors and could, I think, appreciably raise their number.

Finally, in my view the Department would not be well served by adopting in its present form the assessment plan it has proposed. However attractive it might prove to be to administrators looking for the thoroughness in evaluation procedures, it would, I think, put too much additional stress on resources already stretched too thinly. The (wo)manpower invested in teaching the proposed courses (Touchstone, Dialogue, Capstone), in evaluating students’ Assessment Files, and in monitoring assessment procedures in Departmental meetings – not to mention the time already busy students would have to put into this – is, to my mind excessive and can be ill-afforded by the Department in its present, already over-committed condition.

In sum, the Hayward Philosophy Department does an admirable job of meeting its over-extended commitments with its too-limited resources. But this situation is especially hard on its junior faculty, which struck me as talented, committed, and energetic. If the Administration hopes to avoid burning them out early in their careers, and wants to sustain the integrity and vitality of the Department as a whole, it should start reversing the decidedly suboptimal ratio of tenure-track to non-tenure-track appointments. The first step in this direction should be the appointment of someone in religious studies with a specialization in the Christian tradition and broad competence in other, especially Asian, religious traditions. My recommendations to the Department concern (1) the structure of the major: the number of majors (and minors) might be appreciably increased by offering each fall a standard entrée to upper-level courses, and by reducing the history requirements and increasing the electives in the manner described above; (2) the structure of the program: the coherence of the program might be best served at this time by adding only one additional area to the three already staffed by existing faculty;
and the process of assessment: whatever procedures are adopted, they should minimize the added burdens to already overburdened faculty and students.

Submitted by

Thomas McCarthy
Professor of Philosophy and
John Shaffer Distinguished Professor
In the Humanities
Northwestern University
Attachment B
Quantitative Evidence
Prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis

Student Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees awarded</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy FTES generated</td>
<td>190.40</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>203.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of courses offered</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sections offered</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average section size</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>27.64</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>29.91</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>27.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data for majors, degrees awarded and FTES generated taken from Institutional Research and Analysis Report. Other information generated from Data Warehouse. Averages disregard Philosophy 4900 with only one student. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

Tenure-Track Faculty Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcounts of TT Faculty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF of TT Faculty</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching FTEF of TT Faculty</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FERP FTEF</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total TT Teaching FTEF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Until Summer of 2006, Jennifer Eagan had a 2/3rd appointment in Philosophy and 1/3rd appointment in Public Administration. This data is taken from the IRA report and departmental records. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

Lecturer Faculty Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer headcounts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer FTEF</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of Dept FTEF</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of sections offered</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer % of FTES taught</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>76.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures for the fall quarter.
Student-Faculty Ratios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lower Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>111.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTES</td>
<td>190.4</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>196.5</td>
<td>184.0</td>
<td>180.3</td>
<td>203.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTEF</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures taken from the fall quarter.

Course and section information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # students per section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Upper Division</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>28.35</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Students Enrolled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This data is taken from Data Warehouse reports. It represents figures for the fall quarter.
* this does not include the independent study classes with just one student.
### Ethnicity of Majors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of majors</th>
<th>Percentage of majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander/Filipino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Known</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of majors</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from CAPR Table I for Fall 2006, CSU ERSS Statistical Extract. Percentages reflect only the known ethnicity information.

### Comparison with Other Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SFR Teaching TT Faculty</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR for Lecturers</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SFR</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System SFR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Capacity Utilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data taken from IRA report. It represents figures for the fall quarter.

* No data was currently available for the shaded areas.
Attachment C
The Major and Minor from The Current University Catalogue

The Philosophy major consists of 60 units; the B.A. degree requires a total of 180 units.

Major Requirements

I. Core Courses (32 units)

Required Courses (24 units)
- PHIL 3100 Ethics (4)
- PHIL 3305 Fundamental Questions: Self, Nature, and God (4)
- PHIL 3311 Metaphysics (4)
- PHIL 3602 Modern Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 3604 Roots of Contemporary Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 4606 Seminar in Philosophy (4)

Epistemology Elective (4 units)
- Select one course from the following:
  - PHIL 3301 Theory of Knowledge (4)
  - PHIL 3321 Philosophy of the Human Sciences (4)
  - PHIL 3332 Philosophy of Science (4) (required for students pursuing the Science, Technology and Values option.)

Social and Political Diversity Elective (4 units)
- Select one course from the following:
  - PHIL 3150 Contemporary Ethics (4)
  - PHIL 3403 Philosophies of the East (4)
  - PHIL 3502 Social and Political Philosophy (4) (required for students pursuing the Law, Human Rights, and Social Justice option.)
  - PHIL 3720 Feminist Philosophy (4)

II. Options (20-28 units)

Students must complete the requirements for at least one option and may choose to complete additional options if they wish.

A. Classical Philosophy Option (20-28 units)
- PHIL 3601 Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 3603 Kant and Idealism (4)
- PHIL 3605 Studies in Contemporary Philosophy (4)

Epistemology and Metaphysics (0-4 units)
- PHIL 3301 Theory of Knowledge (4) (may also count as an Epistemology elective in the Core)

Value Inquiry (8 units)
- PHIL 3201 Aesthetics (4)
- PHIL 3925 Moral Values in the Modern World (4)
Asian Philosophy (0-4 units)
Select one of the following:

PHIL 3403 Philosophies of the East (4) (may also count as a Social and Political Diversity elective in the Core)

PHIL 3410 Comparative Themes in Eastern and Western Philosophy (4)

B. Law, Human Rights and Social Justice Option (24-28 units)
PHIL 3503 Philosophy of Law (4)
PHIL 3510 Human Rights and Social Justice: Cultural Groups and Women in the U.S. (4)
PHIL 3511 Philosophy of Human Rights and Global Justice (4)

Applied Ethics (8 units)
Select two courses from the following:

PHIL 3151 Environmental Ethics (4)
PHIL 3152 Biomedical Ethics (4)
PHIL 3153 Biology and Ethics (4)
PHIL/MGMT 3560 Business and Professional Ethics (4)

Social and Political Philosophy (4-8 units)
Select two courses from the following:

PHIL 3321 Philosophy of the Human Sciences (4) (may also count as an Epistemology elective in the Core)
PHIL 3325 Cultural Studies (4)
PHIL 3335 Science, Technology and Values (4)
PHIL 3536 Economic Justice (4)
PHIL 3720 Feminist Philosophy (4)
PHIL 3925 Moral Values in the Modern World (4)

One of the following lower division courses may be counted towards fulfillment of this requirement:

PHIL 1101 Contemporary Social and Ethical Issues (4)
PHIL 2020 Self, Family, Culture (4)
PHIL 2027 Law, Economics and Justice (4)
PHIL 2028 Philosophy, Technology, and Culture (4)
PHIL 2029 Philosophical Perspectives on the Problem of Evil (4)

C. Religious Studies Option (24-28 units)
PHIL 3400 Philosophy of Religion (4)
PHIL 3401 Contemporary Religious Thinkers (4)
PHIL 3601 Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (4)

Select four courses from the following (12-16 units):

PHIL 3214 Philosophy and Myth in Latin American Literature (4)
PHIL 3403 Philosophies of the East (4) (may also count as a Social and Political Diversity elective in the Core)
PHIL 3410 Comparative Themes in Eastern and Western Philosophy (4)
PHIL 3411 Jewish Philosophy (4)
PHIL 3417 The Philosophy of Islam (4)

One of the following lower division courses may be counted towards fulfillment of this requirement:

PHIL 1401 Religions of the World (4)
PHIL 2029 Philosophical Perspectives on the Problem of Evil (4)

D. Science, Technology and Values Option (24 units)
PHIL 3331 History of Science (4)
PHIL 3335 Science, Technology and Values (4)

Nature of Knowledge (8 units)
Select two courses from the following:

PHIL 3301 Theory of Knowledge (4)
PHIL 3321 Philosophy of the Human Sciences (4)
PHIL 3341 Philosophy of Cognition and Artificial Intelligence (4)

Applied Ethics (8 units)
Select two courses from the following:

PHIL 3151 Environmental Ethics (4)
PHIL 3152 Biomedical Ethics (4)
PHIL 3153 Biology and Ethics (4)

One of the following lower division courses may be counted towards fulfillment of this requirement:

PHIL 1103 Science, Ethics, and Technology (4)
PHIL 2028 Philosophy, Technology and Culture (4)

E. Special Option (20-28 units)
An option designed by the student and his or her advisor, consisting of a coherent selection of courses with an identifiable theme substantially different from those offered above. Must be approved by the department chair.

III. Electives (0-12 units)
Upper division Philosophy courses including those not chosen from the above lists to bring total units in the major to 60 units.

Other Degree Requirements
In addition to major requirements, every student must also complete the University requirements for graduation which are described in the Baccalaureate Degree Requirements chapter in the front of this catalog. These include the General Education-Breadth requirements; the U.S. history, U.S. Constitution, and California state and local government requirement; the University Writing Skills requirement; and the residence, unit, and grade point average requirements.
Minor Requirements

I. Cognitive Science Minor (28 units)
The cognitive science minor consists of 28 units, with at least 20 units from two or more departments other than the student’s major. The 28 units must include at least 12 units of the core courses. The remaining units must be selected from the listed electives.

A. Core (12 units)
At least 12 units selected from the following courses:
- ANTH 1800 Introduction to Anthropological Linguistics (4)
- One lower division programming course: CS 1020, or 1160 (4)
- CS 4810 Artificial Intelligence (4)
- PHIL 3341 Philosophy of Cognition and Artificial Intelligence (4)
- PSYC 4740 Psycholinguistics (4)

B. Electives (16 units)
- ANTH 3800 Language and Culture (4)
- BIOL 4510 Neurobiology (4)
- CS 3120 Programming Language Concepts (4)
- 4110 Compiler Design (4)
- 4170 Theory of Automata (4)
- ENGL 3005 Study of Language (4)
- HDEV 4510 Cognitive Development (4)
- 4520 Language Acquisition and the Symbolic Function (4)
- PHIL 3002 Modern Logic (4)
- 3301 Theory of Knowledge (4)
- 3305 Fundamental Questions: Self, Nature, and God (4)
- 3332 Philosophy of Science (4)
- PSYC 4210 Theories of Learning (4)
- 4220 Cognitive Processes (4)
- 4320 Physiological Psychology (4)
- 4345 Sensation and Perception (4)

II. Philosophy Minor (28 units)
One of the following (4 units):
- PHIL 3100 Ethics (4)
- PHIL 3305 Fundamental Questions: Self, Nature, and God (4)

Two courses in the history of Western philosophy, from the following (8 units):
- PHIL 3601 Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 3602 Modern Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 3603 Kant and Idealism (4)
- PHIL 3604 Roots of Contemporary Philosophy (4)
- PHIL 3605 Studies in Contemporary Philosophy (4)

Four additional philosophy courses, of which at least three must be upper division (16 units)

III. Religious Studies Minor (36 units)

A. Core (12 units)
- PHIL 1401 Religions of the World (4)
- PHIL 3400 Philosophy of Religion (4)
- PHIL 3401 Contemporary Religious Thinkers (4)

B. Electives in Philosophy (12 units)
Two courses in the history of western philosophy, chosen from the following (8 units):
- PHIL 3151 Environmental Ethics (4)
- 3601 Ancient and Medieval Philosophy (4)
- 3602 Modern Philosophy (4)
- 3603 Kant and Idealism (4)
- 3604 Roots of Contemporary Philosophy (4)
- 3605 Studies of Contemporary Philosophy (4)

One additional course relevant to religious studies (4 units)
C. Electives in Supporting Fields (12 units)

*Three courses, chosen from the following:*

- ANTH 3840 Magic, Witchcraft and Religion (4)
- ENGL 4720 Mythology (4)
- ES 3310 Native American World View (4)
- HIST 3114 History of Early Christianity (4)
- 3123 History of Medieval Christianity (4)
- HDEV 3600 Development of Religious and Secular World Views (4)
- SOC 3610 Sociology of Religion (4)
- WOST 3510 Women in Myth and Prehistory (4)

**Philosophy Option: Liberal Studies**

*Note:* The requirements for this option may have changed. Contact the Department of Philosophy for information.

**Required (4 units)**

- One lower division Philosophy (PHIL) course with consent of advisor (4)

**Area IX, Depth of Study (24 units)**

*One course from the following (4 units):*

- PHIL 3605 Studies in Contemporary Philosophy (4)
- 3701 Philosophy of Education (4)
- 4606 Seminar in Philosophy (4)

*Five additional Philosophy courses (excluding PHIL 1000, 1001, and 3002) at least four of which must be upper division (20 units).*
Attachment D
Advertisement for 2005-2006 Tenure Track Search, American Philosophy

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY

FACULTY EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
FULL-TIME TENURE-TRACK
OAA Position No. 06-07 PHIL-AMERICAN-TT

THE UNIVERSITY: California State University, East Bay occupies 342 acres in the Hayward hills, affording a panoramic view of nearly the entire San Francisco Bay Area. Cal State East Bay's proximity to the major Bay Area cities provides unique cultural opportunities including museums, art galleries, aquariums, planetariums, plays, musicals, sports events, and concerts. Its nearness to the Pacific Ocean and Sierra Nevada Mountains offers recreational diversion as well as excellent laboratories for educational studies. The nine major buildings contain 150 classrooms and teaching laboratories, 177 specialized instructional rooms, numerous student oriented computer labs and a library which contains a collection of over one million items accessible through HAYSTAC, its on-line catalog. The University has an enrollment of approximately 13,000 students with 600 faculty. CSUEB is organized into four colleges: Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences; Business and Economics; Education and Allied Studies; and Science. The University offers bachelor's degrees in 41 fields, minors in 66 fields, and master's degrees in 28 (in addition to Special Majors). Other programs lead to teaching, specialist, pupil personnel services, and administrative services credentials. CSUEB also operates the Concord Campus, a branch center in Concord, which provides full instructional support for over 1,600 upper division and graduate students. To learn more about CSUEB visit http://www.csueastbay.edu/

THE DEPARTMENT: The Department of Philosophy has four full-time faculty members, approximately 40 majors and serves approximately 3000 students per academic year. The major features options in Classical Philosophy; Law, Human Rights and Social Justice; Science, Technology and Values; and Religious Studies. Students may also design their own option in consultation with an advisor.

DUTIES OF THE POSITION: The new faculty member will teach courses within the existing programs and spearhead the development of new curriculum in the areas of Latin American, African American or Native American philosophy. In addition to teaching, all faculty have advising responsibilities, assist the department with administrative and/or committee work, and are expected to assume campus-wide committee responsibilities. Please note that teaching assignments at California State University, East Bay include courses at both the Hayward and Concord campuses.

RANK AND SALARY: Assistant Professor. Salary is dependent upon educational preparation and experience. Subject to budgetary authorization.
DATE OF APPOINTMENT: Fall 2006

QUALIFICATIONS: Ph.D. by date of appointment in Philosophy or closely related field, with a specialization in American Philosophy (particularly African American, Latin American or Native American Philosophy), is required. Candidates with successful teaching experience at the university level and demonstrated ability to teach, advise, and mentor students from diverse educational and cultural backgrounds are preferred.

APPLICATION DEADLINE: Review of applications will begin on November 1, 2005. Open until filled. Please submit a letter of application; a complete and current vita; graduate transcripts; writing sample; and three letters of recommendation to:

Professor Roberta Millstein, Interim Chair
Department of Philosophy
California State University, East Bay
25800 Carlos Bee Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94542
Office Phone No.: 510-885-3225
Office Fax No.: 510-885-2123
E-Mail Address: roberta.millstein@csueastbay.edu

NOTE: California State University, East Bay hires only individuals lawfully authorized to work in the United States. All offers of employment are contingent upon presentation of documents demonstrating the appointee's identity and eligibility to work, in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act.

As an Equal Opportunity Employer, CSUEB does not discriminate on the basis of any protected categories: age, ancestry, citizenship, color, disability, gender, immigration status, marital status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran's status. The University is committed to the principles of diversity in employment and to creating a stimulating learning environment for its diverse student body.
Attachment E
2006-2007 Tenure Track Request, Religious Studies

CLASS 2006-07 TENURE TRACK REQUEST—April 24, 2006

Name of Department: Philosophy

Type of Position Desired: Assistant Professor

Position Description: Philosophy of Religion with a competency in Comparative Religions

Profile:
The Philosophy Department offers approximately 90 sections per academic year, serving roughly 2,400 students and 28 majors; in 2005-6, Philosophy ranked 7th within CLASS in terms of FTES. Philosophy is heavily involved in the General Education program, teaching courses in critical thinking, humanities, and cultural groups and women. The Department has 3.67 full-time regular faculty members. Since its most recently completed search in 1999, Philosophy has had three retirements.

For the 2005-6 AY, lecturers accounted for 74% of the sections offered by the Department—the inverse of the ratio called for by the California Legislature. Even if Philosophy’s current tenure-track search succeeds (replacing a faculty member who retired in 1998), lecturers will still teach 64% of its sections. Philosophy’s Five Year Plan, submitted on February 17, 2003 to CAPR, identified this position as one of five needed over the next five years, and as part of the CLASS strategic plan, Philosophy identified as one of its goals this position in particular and increasing the number and diversity of faculty in general. Clearly, a new hire would help achieve this goal and bring the Philosophy Department closer to the desired 75%-25% full-time/part-time ratio.

Programmatic Need:
For many years, the Philosophy Department has housed the discipline of religious studies in the form of a Religious Studies Option and a Religious Studies Minor, and when Philosophy revised its program in 2005-6 to include more options, the option and minor in Religious Studies were retained. Religious studies, like philosophy itself, explores fundamental questions about the nature and meaning of existence. Nonetheless, Philosophy has no specialist in this area, as it does for the other option areas. This means that it has no one to develop new courses, no one to maintain and promote the option and minor, and no one to advise students about graduate work in this area. Lecturers currently teach many of our religious studies courses. Thus, not only is a tenure-track hire in this area a critical need for Philosophy’s program, but also, it would reduce Philosophy’s reliance on lecturers and improve the quality of instruction.

A position in religious studies is also a critical need for the University. Whereas most universities have a Department of Religion, on our campus there is no such department. The Philosophy Department is the only department with a focus in this area, and it lacks a specialist. There are a handful of courses in other departments relating to religious studies; however, most of these are offered infrequently. In short, the University lacks a specialist devoted to religious studies, a core area of the humanities. However, religious studies can, and should be, a vibrant part of campus life. Religion has shaped individuals in every major culture; the study of religion helps us to
understand those cultures. Conversely, neglecting religious studies creates a serious gap in a liberal arts education. And given our current global situation, an understanding of differing religious traditions seems more important than ever. Courses exploring Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism should be offered on a regular basis. In addition, a specialist in religious studies could coordinate campus-wide events such as the Jewish Culture and History Series. Thus, a position in religious studies would provide a core competency for our campus.

Finally, this could be an area of growth for the Philosophy Department that could draw new students to campus. In an informal survey of students who are currently enrolled in its classes, out of 258 students polled, 186 said that they were “interested” or “very interested” in PHIL 1401, World Religions, and 151 were “interested” or “very interested” in PHIL 3400, Philosophy of Religion. Yet, 197 were unaware of Philosophy’s offerings in religious studies, and 205 were unaware of the Religious Studies Option. A new hire in religious studies could promote the option and the minor and give the area the stature it deserves.
Attachment F
2007-2008 Tenure Track Request, Religious Studies

CLASS 2007-08 TENURE TRACK REQUEST—February 19, 2007

Name of Department: Philosophy

Type of Position Desired: Assistant Professor

Position Description: Philosophy of Religion with a competency in Comparative Religions

Profile:
The Philosophy Department offers approximately 90 sections per academic year, serving roughly 2,400 students and 30 majors. In Fall 2006, Philosophy ranked 8th out of 19 departments in CLASS in terms of FTES, and experienced the second highest raw increase in FTES of all CLASS departments from Fall 2005-Fall 2006. Philosophy is heavily involved in the General Education program, teaching courses in critical thinking, humanities, and cultural groups and women. The Department has 3.17 full-time regular faculty members. Since Fall 1999, the Philosophy Department has had three retirements and one separation, and only one new hire.

In the Fall of 2006, lecturers accounted for 78.6% of the sections offered by the Department—the inverse of the ratio called for by the California Legislature. Even if Philosophy's current tenure-track search succeeds (replacing a faculty member who retired in 1998), lecturers will still teach 68% of its sections. The current Five Year Plan to be submitted to CAPR in February 2007 identifies this position as one of five needed over the next five years, and as part of the CLASS strategic plan, Philosophy identified as one of its goals this position in particular and increasing the number and diversity of faculty in general. Clearly, a new hire would help achieve this goal and bring the Philosophy Department closer to the desired 75%-25% full-time/part-time ratio.

Programmatic Need:
For many years, the Philosophy Department has housed the discipline of religious studies in the form of a Religious Studies Option and a Religious Studies Minor, and when Philosophy revised its program in 2005-6 to include more options, the option and minor in Religious Studies were retained. Religious studies, like philosophy itself, explores fundamental questions about the nature and meaning of existence. Nonetheless, Philosophy has no specialist in this area. This means that it has no one to develop new courses, no one to maintain and promote the option and minor, and no one to advise students about graduate work in this area. Lecturers currently teach many of our religious studies courses. Thus, not only is a tenure-track hire in this area a critical need for Philosophy's program, but also, it would reduce Philosophy's reliance on lecturers and improve the quality of instruction.

A position in religious studies is also a critical need for the University. Whereas most universities have a Department of Religion, on our campus there is no such department. The Philosophy Department is the only department with a focus in this area, and it lacks a specialist. There are a handful of courses in other departments relating to religious studies; however, most of these are offered infrequently. In short, the University lacks a specialist devoted to religious studies, a core area of the humanities. However, religious studies can, and should be, a vibrant part of campus life. Religion has shaped individuals in every major culture; the study of religion helps us to understand those cultures. Conversely, neglecting religious studies creates a serious gap in a liberal arts education. And given our current global situation, an understanding of differing religious traditions seems more important than ever. Courses exploring Islam, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, and Hinduism should be offered on a regular basis. In addition, a specialist in religious studies could coordinate campus-wide events such as the Jewish Culture and History Series. Thus, a position in religious studies would provide a core competency for our campus.
Attachment G
2007-2008 Tenure Track Request, Philosophy of Science

CLASS 2007-08 TENURE TRACK REQUEST—February 19, 2007

Name of Department: Philosophy
Type of Position Desired: Assistant Professor
Position Description: Philosophy of Science with a competency in Science and Ethics
Profile:
The Philosophy Department offers approximately 90 sections per academic year, serving roughly 2,400 students and 30 majors. In Fall 2006, Philosophy ranked 8th out of 19 departments in CLASS in terms of FTES, and experienced the second highest raw increase in FTES of all CLASS departments from Fall 2005-Fall 2006. Philosophy is heavily involved in the General Education program, teaching courses in critical thinking, humanities, and cultural groups and women. The Department has 3.17 full-time regular faculty members. Since Fall 1999, the Philosophy Department has had three retirements and one separation, but only one new hire.

In the Fall of 2006, lecturers accounted for 78.6% of the sections offered by the Department—the inverse of the ratio called for by the California Legislature. Even if Philosophy’s current tenure-track search succeeds (replacing a faculty member who retired in 1998), lecturers will still teach 68% of its sections. The current Five Year Plan to be submitted to CAPR in February 2007 identifies this position as one of five needed over the next five years. Clearly, a new hire would help achieve this goal and bring the Philosophy Department closer to the desired 75%-25% full-time/part-time ratio.

Programmatic Need:
For many years, the Philosophy Department has developed courses in the Philosophy of Science, particularly in the areas of applied ethics in biology and technology. These courses developed into an option in the major when Philosophy revised its program in 2005-6 to include more options that related to contemporary areas of concern. The Science, Technology, and Values option in the Philosophy major explores fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge and truth, as well as applies philosophical analysis to critical areas in ethics. With the separation of Roberta Millstein, philosophy no longer has a specialist in this area. There is no one faculty member to develop new courses, maintain and promote the option and minor, and advise students about graduate work in this area. Lecturers are currently teaching many of these courses, and some tenure track faculty members are stretching their areas to expertise to accommodate students in this major option. Since this is a more specialized field within philosophy, it is difficult to staff these courses with part-time faculty. Thus, not only is a tenure-track hire in this area a critical need for Philosophy’s program, it would also reduce Philosophy’s reliance on lecturers and improve the quality of instruction.

Courses in this option delve into issues of bioethics, such as cloning, stem cell research, the environment, abortion, and euthanasia. These are issues of vital concern to all citizens. Courses in this option do not only serve Philosophy majors. Environmental Ethics is a core course in this option that also serves Environmental Studies majors. The course Science, Technology, and Values serves the Single-Subject Teacher Preparation in Science and Biology and Ethics serves the Blended Program in Liberal Studies.

Finally, this could be an area of growth for the Philosophy Department that could draw new students to campus who are interested in the ethics of science and technology. It could also compliment majors in the sciences with a double major or minor, giving them both a background in the humanities and a foundation for thinking about ethical issues.
(Russell Abrams)

PHIL 3305 is the Philosophy Department’s touchstone course, that is, a broad introduction to the field designed especially for students who are thinking about majoring in philosophy. It also serves as a diagnostic tool that allows the Department to get an idea of the strengths and weaknesses of those who are likely to be entering the major. As the course title indicates, it touches on a very wide range of issues (after all, there isn’t much in the universe beyond self, nature, and God). The content varies somewhat from year to year, but the areas covered in Fall 2006 are typical:

- Personal identity over time and surviving bodily death
- Determinism, free will, and moral responsibility
- Perception and our knowledge of the external world
- Science and the problem of induction
- Arguments for and against the existence of God

Within each of these areas the course makes no pretense of being systematic, but addresses a few central ideas and key arguments.

Very few students enter college with the intention of majoring in philosophy. Indeed, philosophy is a subject rarely taught in high school. And there is a reason. Philosophy addresses highly abstract issues and uses difficult methods developed specifically to deal with them. Most high school students are not prepared to think on this level of generality. Moreover, even college students often feel frustrated at first and need a few philosophy courses under their belts before they feel comfortable with the subject. For the foregoing reasons the process of becoming a philosophy major is different from the process of becoming most other majors. The first philosophy course that students take, for example, must first excite their passionate interest and then gently lead them from an appreciation of more concrete versions of a problem to a preliminary understanding of the selected issue in its full generality. In fact, I would say that the ultimate purpose of this introductory philosophy course as a whole is to pique students’ interest enough to get them to take a second course.

Most of the Philosophy Department’s Student Learning Outcomes are relevant to some degree to this first course in philosophy. Student Learning Outcome #1: (Ability to read and comprehend complex philosophical texts) is obviously not an outcome one can expect from PHIL 3305. Nevertheless, even the longest journey begins with the first step and considerable time is spent in class going through selected texts: first showing students how to skim for a general overview and then going through the text line-by-line with the aim of helping students develop a strategy for breaking down a difficult text into more easily comprehensible parts.
Student Learning Outcome #2: (Mastering the art of generating good philosophical criticism) represents a sophisticated skill which develops first by observing the criticism generated by philosophers found in the texts or by the instructor, and then attempting to emulate it. In fact, most class discussion in PHIL 3305 involves considering a philosophical argument of the text’s, another student’s, or the instructor’s and then being invited to respond with criticism or added support. (This, of course, must be preceded with a somewhat technical study of arguments and the ways that they can go right and wrong.) These class exercises also go a long way toward fostering Student Learning Outcomes #3: (Ability to construct and defend one’s own philosophical positions), #4: (Accepting and utilizing criticism), #5: (Openness to considering other views), and #7: (Empathy with other people’s philosophically-relevant experiences).

Student Learning Outcomes #6: (Ability to accurately present arguments from various philosophical traditions) and #8: (Competence in the history of philosophy) are not directly addressed in PHIL 3305, though students cannot avoid absorbing material that will be helpful in eventually attaining these competencies. Student Learning Outcome #9: (Ability to utilize philosophical training in public and personal life) is an issue that is nearly always addressed, at least informally, in introductory philosophy courses. It usually arises in the form of the question “What is the relevance of this to the rest of my life?” The discussion that follows hopefully opens students’ minds to the many ways that all of the Outcomes, with the possible exceptions of #1 and #8, contribute directly to the good life.

Finally, a word about PHIL 3305 as a diagnostic tool. The first question, of course, is what exactly are we trying to diagnose. Certainly not competency in philosophy. The answer is probably just the general sorts of competencies that are prerequisites for any fruitful college education: the ability to read and comprehend fairly difficult material, the capacity to organize and write a coherent essay, the ability to critically evaluate—at least informally—various kinds of empirical claims. The difficulty in coming to a simple “diagnosis” of the students in a single class is bound up with the extreme variability among CSUEB students, including those that take PHIL 3305. Because of state-mandated admission requirements, some students have been admitted without having demonstrated any of these competencies at all. Other students are competent enough to do well at any university in the country. Under these conditions the competency of the “average” student is not terribly relevant to planning an educational program. It is true that the difficulty of even this introductory material tends to winnow out students whose skills are very poor. But among those who continue to pursue philosophy there is still a large degree of variability. And the problem of developing a program for majors that meets all of their needs constitutes a continuing challenge.
Attachment H: Assessment Documents
2. Jennifer Eagan’s Narrative Assessment of PHIL 4606 (capstone)

College of Arts, Letters, and Social Sciences
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Name of Degree Program: PHILOSOPHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmatic Improvement</th>
<th>Evidence for Need of Improvement</th>
<th>Demonstration of Educational Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional emphasis on how to conduct research in philosophy and how to integrate that research into majors’ own original philosophical writing. Suggest that the major Touchstone course, PHIL 3305 Self, Nature, &amp; God: Fundamental Questions integrate instruction on the nature of philosophical research and that this outcome be specifically added to program Student Learning Outcomes.</td>
<td>The major Capstone course, PHIL 4606, Seminar in Philosophy revealed that though majors were very good at presenting and defending their own original argumentation in papers and through discussion, they were not as well skilled on how to conduct philosophical research and how to integrate that research into their own writing. See “Evidence Narrative” by Professor Jennifer Eagan.</td>
<td>One student learning outcome is that, “Students should be able to construct their own philosophical positions and present them persuasively to others in dialogue and/or writing.” Being able to integrate and respond to outside research and the philosophical arguments of others would help majors strengthen their own philosophical positions and develop a better understanding of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Evidence Narrative
Department of Philosophy
Professor Jennifer Eagan

Evaluation of PHIL 4606, Seminar in Philosophy, Spring 2006 (Jennifer Eagan)

Effective Fall 2005, the Philosophy Department initiated its new major program, which consists of four options: the Classical Option, the Law, Human Rights, & Social Justice Option, the Religious Studies Option, and the Science, Technology & Values Option. There is one set of courses that in common to all four options that includes both a touchstone course (PHIL 3305 Self, Nature, God: Fundamental Questions) and a capstone course (PHIL 4606 Seminar in Philosophy). These two courses are designed particularly to provide some common structure to our diverse major options, as well as to
provide a window into where majors are in terms of skills and content knowledge when they enter the program and where they are when they exit the program.

Students may take philosophy courses in any order, due to the lack of prerequisites. However, the department recommends that students take PHIL 3305, *Self, Nature, God: Fundamental Questions* first in the sequence as the touchstone course for the major. Students are advised to take PHIL 4606, *Seminar in Philosophy* as the capstone course in the major during their last Spring quarter in the program. Through this design, the department can do assessment of the program by looking at what student strengths and deficiencies are in terms of skills and content as they enter the program, and measure their improvement as they exit the major program.

The Spring 2006 offering of the seminar course was the first opportunity that the Philosophy Department had to teach the seminar course with some students in the new major, though these students had not necessarily taken PHIL 3305, and they were taking the seminar course early in their major. Majors may repeat the seminar course for credit if the topic changes, so some of these majors may take the seminar again next Spring quarter. The Philosophy Department has not yet had the opportunity to close the loop in the assessment scheme for our new major, but we should when the Seminar course is offered in Spring 2007, which will serve our first cohort graduating from the new major.

In Spring 2006, I was lucky enough to teach PHIL 4606, *Seminar in Philosophy*. Since the theme of this course is the instructor’s choice, I choose to focus the course on a singular philosophical figure, the French post-structuralist philosopher Michel Foucault, particularly his works in ethics and political theory. Obviously, the readings were very difficult, and the course was not designed for philosophical novices. I noticed that one newer major who thought that he would give the seminar an early try, wisely dropped the course early on due to the difficulty level. Students were informed that their work in the course would be used for assessment of the Philosophy program as a whole. We discussed the Student Learning Outcomes in class, and had an interesting conversation about what studying philosophy is all about. I let the students know that I would be looking for evidence that they were meeting these outcomes as seasoned veterans of the Philosophy program.

I enjoyed teaching the seminar course tremendously. The twelve philosophy majors in the Spring 2006 seminar were bright, energetic and attentive. Through my evaluation of their writing and level of discussion, I found that all of the student met or exceeded expectations with respect to several of the program’s Student Learning Outcomes. All of the students were carefully readers of complex philosophical texts, Michel Foucault’s writings in this case. They could identify key ideas and engage critically with the themes. I found that the students in the seminar could read complex arguments with more ease than I expected. Therefore, this course could genuinely take on the characteristic of a seminar, where students did not need much instruction through lecture, but discussed the texts together. I found that all of the students in the seminar met or exceeded expectations for the Philosophy program’s Student Learning Outcome #1: “Students should be able to read and comprehend complex philosophical texts.”
Through their work in the seminar, I was continually impressed by the majors’ ability to deal with objections and disagreements that they had with Foucault’s texts and with each other. The students were fair and just arguers. They were good at being colleagues in their search for truth, while being philosophical adversaries in their debates. Our discussions in the seminar were always fruitful, often heated, but never degenerating into personal attacks. In planning the course, I was worried that some students might be uncomfortable with some of the content in Michel Foucault’s work. Most notably, I was concerned about how his writings on gay liberation and the importance of his work for feminist philosophy and queer theory would be received by students. To my great relief, every student in the seminar was open to the accounts of experiences and perspectives different from their own, and treated the material with sophistication and an openness to new ideas. **Students in the seminar easily met the Philosophy program’s Student Learning Outcomes #5: “Students should show an openness to giving careful and serious consideration to different philosophical views and the reasons offered in support of them”, and #6: “Students should be able to present arguments from various philosophical perspectives/traditions—including those very different from their own.”**

Lastly, students in the seminar course were very well versed in the history of philosophy, and could make connections between the ideas of the contemporary philosophy of Michel Foucault to other figures in the tradition. They not only addressed the connections to the history of philosophy that I had explicitly made a part of the course, but introduced connections to others figures and ideas from their past experiences in Philosophy courses. **I found that the seminar students met or exceeded expectations of Student Learning Outcome #8: “Students should have competence in the history of philosophy (ancient/medieval, Rationalism and Empiricism, Kant and Idealism, roots of contemporary philosophy, and contemporary philosophy) and subject areas of philosophy (ethics, epistemology or metaphysics). Students should understand the interrelations of these areas of philosophy.”**

The purposes of this incarnation of the seminar were presented to students as follows:

1) To introduce you to Michel Foucault’s thought.
2) To link Foucault’s works and themes to the history of philosophy.
3) To explore your capacity for textual exegesis and explication, and your ability to do philosophical research.
4) Most importantly, to serve as a culminating experience of the philosophy major, cementing and perfecting your capacity for sophisticated philosophical work in reading, writing, and discussion.

Most notably, purposes 3) and 4) correspond to the Student Learning Outcome #3: “Students should be able to construct their own philosophical positions and present them persuasively to others in dialogue and/or writing.”

In addition to being evaluated on in-class and on-line discussions and two shorter writing assignments, students were asked to conduct their own original and polished piece of philosophical writing addressing one issue from the work of Foucault. This assignment
was designed to produce a sophisticated piece of philosophical work that could serve as a writing sample for graduate school or for publication in a student journal. To that end, students worked on this paper in stages. Each student turned in a topic statement, an outline, an annotated bibliography, and a draft prior to their submission of the final draft. In order to share some of their outside research with the other seminar participants, students were also asked to present one piece of their outside research. Students made their articles available to the rest of the class one week in advance of their presentation, presented a summary of their piece, and lead a discussion of the issues.

Through their performance on the presentations of their secondary courses and on their terms paper, I concluded that our majors need improvement in doing philosophical research. Most of the students in the seminar could have used some additional background in how to find and evaluate secondary course material and how to dialogue with scholars in the field. This would allow majors to be closer to taking their place among these scholars. Philosophy majors should be able not to just summarize, but to dialogue with the body of literature on their subject matter. Lastly, majors should be able to integrate others’ ideas into their own work more smoothly and seamlessly. This would assist students in completely meeting the program’s Student Learning Outcome #3: “Students should be able to construct their own philosophical positions and present them persuasively to others in dialogue and/or writing.”

Based on my teaching of PHIL 4606: Seminar in Philosophy, I am making the following suggestions for improvement to the Philosophy program:

1) I recommend that there is more emphasis on how to do philosophical research in PHIL 3305: Self, Nature, & God: Fundamental Questions, so that philosophy majors can build on this skill as they move through the major, and

2) That the department consider adding “the ability to do philosophical research and engage with secondary sources” to the Philosophy Program’s Student Learning Outcomes.
**Major/Minor Meeting**

**Meeting Minutes**

January 31, 2007

**Present:**
Faculty members: Jennifer Eagan, Russell Abrams, Kit Blamey & Paul Bassen.
Major/Minor students: Nicole Ferrara, Andrew d'Entremont, Yue Kang, Nic Paolini, Lee Shinohara, Frank Alioto, Kenneth Montfort, Patti Aguiar, Carlos Rodas, Michael Wong, Duane Meehan.

**Minutes**

- Meeting called to order at 4:40 pm by Professor Eagan.
- Professor Eagan explained the process of the Five Year Review and the need for student feedback.
- Comments and feedback were requested on “What are you getting out of the major?” and “What are you missing from the major?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are you getting out of the major?</th>
<th>Makes you smarter, improves the mind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes you think, not just research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy is always interesting, never boring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaches you to place thoughts in order, develops deep thinking, critical thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develops the ability to get thoughts going. What you think/what you are going to think.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develops the ability to “think on cue”. Enhances response in the other college courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps develop the “think out of the box” reasoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes “better people” with a greater understanding of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps reduce ignorance- promotes tolerance, gives insight into deeper issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy courses offered in other societies (pre-college) produce well rounded individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy courses allow for exploration of a subject without yielding a right or wrong answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy majors transition quickly and smoothly into the workforce. Found it was easier to hire Philosophy majors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy courses develop the thought processes that make you more successful in the work environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some students report that other Bachelor programs did not yield a satisfying career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philosophy doesn’t remove sickness from the world or cure the soul, but is mentally stimulating.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| What are you missing from the major? | Parents feel Philosophy isn’t “required”, overlooking the students feeling of personal satisfaction over money. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>major?</th>
<th>Major feels if money were not an issue, he would continue to learn as much as he could. One student felt that the &quot;critical thinking&quot; process could be learned outside of Philosophy courses, however the others feel Philosophy courses certainly develops it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback on Major Options</td>
<td>Keep options. Like the set up. Options appeal to individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall feedback</td>
<td>Students like the once a week night courses. Fits into their schedules better. They are a big plus! Especially for working adults. Parking is better. Need for a Masters program. Perhaps design curriculum for a Joint Degree, Philosophy and another Masters program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line courses</td>
<td>Student reported the advantages of on-line discussions – not face to face when there are dissenting views (not confrontational), more of a debate atmosphere. Student commented on more time to read and reflect for on-line courses. Student reports not all courses well work on-line. Chats on BB server not fast enough. Problems with PC/MAC issues. Professor must be incredibly computer savvy with good BB skills. Some students are still wary of internet classes. Not everyone has access to a computer w/internet connections. Interaction in classes is better. Perhaps hybrid courses with portions on-line coupled with class meetings and field trips. Department website may work better for on-line discussions. Or perhaps a totally separate forum such as &quot;My Space&quot; might work better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Comments</td>
<td>It would be helpful if there were department guidelines to help the students conform to a writing style that all professors would accept. MLA or APA. It can be difficult when professors will not accept what last quarter’s professor accepted. A Philosophy tutor would be helpful. Haley might do it? Need help developing Philosophical writing skills. Student would like a course on Moral Philosophy – Is there &quot;Real Good&quot;? Is there “Good”? Phil 3100 is close to this. Majors would like to meet with the reviewer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Adjourned: Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Teresa Taniguchi
The following are six e-mails from majors and minors who provided feedback on the program.

Re: request for feedback on the major and minor
Phillip Jimenez [pjimenez4@horizon.csueastbay.edu]
To: Jennifer Eagan
Cc:
Sent: Wed 2/14/2007 2:17 PM

This quarter is my second quarter at CSUEB and I am a philosophy major. The only thing that comes to my mind about the philosophy program is that certain classes are only offered during certain quarters. I think that makes it a little confusing to plan out what classes you need to take. Other than that I have no complains about the department. Maybe it would be easier if all classes or most of them were offered each quarter.

Re: request for feedback on the major and minor
Roy Marzioli [roy@marzioli.com]
You replied on 2/11/2007 7:44 PM.
To: Jennifer Eagan
Cc:
Sent: Sun 2/11/2007 3:57 PM

Hi Jennifer,

I am one of your oldest and longest philosophy majors. I have been doing this since the 70's. When I started out, I thought I would be a music major. Then I thought I would be a psychology major. I changed to philosophy when I realized that a lot of what was passing for psychology was regurgitated philosophy. I decided I would rather hear it from the philosophers in its original form. My responses are beneath the questions below:

----- Original Message ----- 
From: "Jennifer Eagan" <jennifer.eagan@csueastbay.edu>
To: <PHILSTU@lists.csueastbay.edu>
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2007 6:49 PM
Subject: request for feedback on the major and minor

> Hi Philosophy Majors and Minors!
> I wanted to give everyone a chance to give us some feedback on your experience in the Philosophy Major/Minor. If you couldn't join us for the meeting on January 31, please e-mail your feedback. If you were at the meeting and would like to underscore or add anything to the conversation, please feel free to.
> Any and all feedback is welcome, but you could consider the following
> questions:

> What do you think that you have gotten out of your experience in the Philosophy major/ minor?

One of the first philosophers I encountered in an introductory philosophy class was Socrates. The Oracle of Delphi said he was the wisest of men. Why he was so wise, is in his own words, "I know that I know nothing." There is too much pretension to knowledge in all areas of academia. It is sobering, to realize that in the end it all comes down to this. As you can see this has stayed with me throughout my philosophical education.

> If you could change the major/ minor program, what would you recommend?

I have seen it change over the years. It is hard to say what changes could be made that would improve the program. I have enjoyed both the Professors and the courses I have had. I have been introduced to some of the greatest philosophers of the 20th century in this program. The ones that stand out to me are Martin Heidegger, Niklas Luhmann, Edmund Husserl Immanuel Kant; also David Hume, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Karl Popper, Carl Hempel, Willard Van Orman Quine and Winford Sellers. What I liked best about the program is that it exposed me to so many different voices and philosophers.

> What should the Philosophy Department do differently in terms of course offerings, events, etc?

I would like to see you offer (I realize that this is because of my own interests, but it might appeal to some majors from physical sciences.) an option in the philosophy of science. I realize there is an option in science, technology and values. I would have preferred an option which consisted of the philosophy of science and epistemology.

Ciao,

---

Albert Marzioli
+-------------------------------
"Nothing is so difficult as not deceiving oneself."
Ludwig Wittgenstein

"Thus a world in which [Rules of Inference] do not apply would not be an illogical world, but a world peopled by illogical men."
- Karl R. Popper

"A consistent fairy-tale is a different thing from the truth, however elaborate it may be."
- Bertrand Russell

Re: request for feedback on the major and minor
Tiffany Tran [ttran8@horizon.csueastbay.edu]  
To: Jennifer Eagan  
Cc:
Hello,

First, thank you for allowing us to provide some inputs.

Second, I believe that the PHIL schedule is catered to full-time students or students who are not working full-time. I previously dropped the major because most of the required courses were offered during the day. Night classes were rare for working students. Also, most of the required courses were only offered once a year, which means I had to wait to take or retake. This can delay graduation.

Third, perhaps this is due to funding issues, but courses offered quarterly are very limited. From my past experience at Chico State, I enjoyed the knowledge and expertise of faulties there more than here.

I am not saying that the faulties here are not good. In fact, Prof. Kelley, Milstein, White (no longer here) were great. The problem is, they only teach about 2 classes per quarter.

Last, because I work full-time and was not able to find childcare for the weekends, I am dying in my PHIL 3321 class. I just turned in my 2 week notice to resign from my job to concentrate on school, but it may be too late to catch up in my PHIL 3321.

If I drop this required course now, my graduation will be delayed. I accepted a job offer starting this September on the condition that I finish my Bus. degree. My dilemma is that I don’t want to drop the Phil. major because I am so close to completing it. If I keep the major, graduation will be delayed and no job when I am actually done with school. Now, do you have any suggestions for me?

Have a nice day!

Tiffany Tran
510-742-2106

philo major feedback

Professor Eagan,
I am in my second quarter of philo at E.B., and so far my only complaints about the program is that the classes are offered in a very spread out way, so that I MUST come to school 5 days a week. I commute from Danville, about 40 minutes, and so it is terrible. If classes were stacked a bit more so that they allowed successive enrolment over the course of either the mwf or tth schedule, that would make my experience tremendously more convenient.
Thanks,
Dan Navarra

Request for feedback.....
QweenMeg@aol.com [QweenMeg@aol.com]
To: Jennifer Eagan
Cc: 
Sent: Tue 2/6/2007 8:12 PM

Dear Prof. Eagan, As you probably remember, I was a Philosophy major a few years back and completed my course in 2002. As an older student, my perspective may be somewhat different from that of younger people. I returned to school because I really wanted to be in a learning situation, and I chose Philosophy because I wanted to swim in the thoughts of some of the great thinkers of the ages. Whether I agreed with all the thinkers or not, this was not important. Handling the thoughts of others was. I considered the study of Philosophy an invaluable tool in learning how to think critically more completely, and I cannot imagine that this discipline could do other than add to the largeness of a student's capacity to think. What greater gift to education can there be? It is not that a student be taught what to think, but how to think. This is a subtle gift and not as directly transferable as, say, learning computer skills, etc. But ultimately...how much more valuable. How can a fully-accredited institution even consider functioning without a Philosophy wing! Blessings, Margaret Stortz

The Importance of Philosophy....
owner-PHILSOC@lists.csueastbay.edu on behalf of QweenMeg@aol.com

You replied on 1/18/2007 2:52 PM.
To: PHILSOC@lists.csueastbay.edu
Cc: 
Sent: Wed 1/17/2007 3:10 PM

Dear friends in Philosophy, I received the dinner invitation from Prof. Eagan because I am still a member of PHILSOC, even thought I graduated a few years back and earned a Master's Degree since then. Nevertheless, I am always interested in how the Philosophy Dept. is doing, for this discipline is my first love. It brings me great dismay to think that there is even a question that the Philosophy Dept. may not continue. I have to wonder how important it is being viewed in the great scene of increasing enrollment to CSUEB, building new buildings for Science and Computers, etc. I wonder also if the real meaning of studying philosophy may not deeply undervalued in the academic world of "getting jobs.....making serious money, etc." Value cannot be rightly placed on the expansion of the mind, and the study of philosophy certainly does this. This is a study that teaches people how to think, not what to think, and so it creates an open door for the student to enter into any kind of gainful work, for it is a study which frees the thinker to explore constantly. Who can place a value on something that helps a person "become," not just "get?" My two cents. Blessings, Margaret Stortz
Report on Philosophy Department, California State University, East Bay

Rita Manning, PhD
San José State University

Introduction

The department is obviously struggling to fulfill its mission in spite of the very small percentage of tenure and tenure track faculty. In this report, I will comment on most of the items cited in the self-study and three additional items: the budget and enrollment process, staff, and students. In the last section, I will make some recommendations.

A. Mission, Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment

The mission statement and student learning outcomes reflect a pretty standard view of the role of Philosophy in undergraduate education, and the department is obviously committed to achieving these goals. Its assessment plan is sound.

B. Major and Minor Programs

Major

The core courses are well designed and the touchstone and capstone courses do a good job of framing the major and serving as reference points for assessing the major and the students.

The major also consists of four different programs: Classical Philosophy, Religious Studies, Law/Human Rights & Social Justice, and Science/Technology & Values. In my opinion this is not very well conceived. For every program, the department has to offer courses to facilitate reasonable progress to graduation. Even with the large number of upper division courses available for GE, in a department with only 29 majors, this doesn’t strike me as an efficient use of resources.

Minor

There are three tracks in the minor: Cognitive Science, Philosophy, and Religious Studies. All three tracks are well conceived and would provide students with a solid understanding of the three respective areas. The Philosophy and Religious Studies tracks involve courses within the department but allow enough flexibility to both appeal to a wide variety of majors and be compatible with their graduating in a reasonable amount of time. The Cognitive Science track is largely interdisciplinary and looks like it should be attractive to students.

General Education

The Philosophy Department is very involved in the GE program with a large number of courses in the lower division and upper division program. The College has some concerns about the department’s plan to be more aggressive about moving further into GE since departments end up competing for FTES, but the discipline’s central role in general education is an argument for the department to continue its active involvement.
C. The Faculty

The first thing to note is that the department is succeeding in keeping its program afloat with only three full time tenure track faculty, one of whom teaches in another department. This is simply not sustainable. The department is blessed with a very smart, effective and committed chair, but the workload created by the small number of regular faculty is clearly excessive. The chair is also not a full professor, which further limits her effectiveness. The department is very heavily dependant on its lecturers to provide coverage of the basic fields, for advising and for the day-to-day teaching of students. In large part because of its heavy reliance on lecturers, the department covers most of the major fields in philosophy. There is a very high level of scholarship and service among the faculty, and a commendable level of scholarly activity among the lecturers. While I recognize the crucial and positive role that lecturers play in the department and I applaud the department for the collegiality between the chair and the lecturers, the level of reliance on lecturers is very worrisome. It is not possible to depend on lecturers to carry such a load. The system doesn’t reward them for their efforts beyond the classroom, and they are understandably not a stable resource because they are likely to be looking for tenure track jobs elsewhere. Based on the high level of scholarship among the lecturers and thus their attractiveness to other universities, I think the department is in real danger of finding itself unable to staff even the core courses.

D. Budget and Enrollment

The budget is largely controlled from the Dean’s office. The department asks for a certain level of staffing and the Dean’s office responds, paying particular attention to the student enrollment. Since FTES drives resources on every CSU campus, it is wise to be sensitive to enrollment, but the current system provides no real incentive for the department to be efficient in its use of faculty resources. The chair faces pressure from faculty and students to maintain and even increase the number and variety of sections offered. The department does not see any incentive for reducing the number and variety of sections in order to maximize enrollment efficient. Thus the push to maximize enrollment efficiency that comes from the College is understandably not welcomed.

E. Staff

The department is blessed with an excellent staff person who is hardworking, efficient and committed to the department. She has an excellent working relationship with the chair.

F. Students

I met with students from one upper division class, all of whom were either majors or minors. The students by and large reported satisfaction with the education they were getting and felt that they were given a fair amount of personal attention. They also were largely in favor of the four track major program. One thing that I noted was that the student demographics did not match the campus demographics. In particular, the philosophy majors were much more likely to be white and male.
G. Implementation of Last Review

The last reviewer had a number of suggestions. I will comment on each in turn.

1. The reviewer worried that the department was stretched too thin. The department acknowledges that it is now stretched even thinner with the reduction in regular faculty. This is clearly a problem that must be addressed.

2. The reviewer noted that disproportion between regular and temporary faculty. The department acknowledges that this situation has worsened. Again, this is a problem that must be addressed.

3. The reviewer expressed concern that the reliance on lecturers unduly burdened the regular faculty with advising and committee responsibilities. The department notes that this has worsened. Again, this is still an urgent problem.

4. The reviewer noted the burnout caused by 2 and 3. Again, the department acknowledges that this is an ongoing problem. The burnout problem is still a major issue.

5. The reviewer recommended more tenure track hiring. The department notes that its requests for regular faculty have not generally been approved and that since another regular faculty member resigned and another is on extended leave of absence, the situation is worse now. This department is facing a real crisis. Its very survival requires that this problem be addressed immediately.

6. The reviewer recommended increasing the multicultural nature of the department and that this would be facilitated by a hire in Religious Studies. The department notes that its program changes have made it more multicultural but that it still needs to hire in Religious Studies. Again, I concur with the reviewer and urge the university to approve the department’s request to hire in this area.

7. The reviewer suggested an upper division introduction to philosophy. The department added Philosophy 3305. I am not convinced of the importance of such a course, especially in light of my belief that the department needs to streamline its upper division offerings.

8. The reviewer suggested specific curricular changes. The department responded with two new sophomore level introductory courses. Given the small size of the department, I think the department should be very concerned about spreading itself too thin by making too many commitments to introductory level courses.

9. The reviewer suggested streamlining its assessment plan, and the department has done so. In my opinion, the assessment plan the department has adopted is sound, but its successful implementation requires an increase in the number of tenured and tenure track faculty.

Recommendations

1. The department urgently needs to hire additional tenure track faculty. I would suggest that the department hire at least 2 tenure track faculty members in the immediate future and look for another 1 or 2 in the next couple of years. I would endorse the department plan of hiring initially in the fields of philosophy of science, and religious studies. (Here, I would reiterate suggestions 1-5 of the last reviewer.) Other areas that are urgently in need of tenure track hires are history of philosophy, metaphysics and epistemology, logic, and ethics.
2. The department should consider making one of these appointments at the full professor level and appointing this person as department chair.

3. The department should drop two of the four major tracks. I would keep the classical philosophy and religious studies tracks. Students can continue to specialize in other tracks by choosing the appropriate coursework, but advising would be less complicated and the department could streamline its upper division course offerings.

4. The department should increase the visibility and course offerings in the religious studies track as soon as possible. This is a separate department at many universities and there is currently a tremendous amount of interest in this field.

5. The department should consider marketing itself more aggressively to pre-law students. Philosophy students famously have the highest LSAT scores among all majors, for example. Doing pre-law advising in the department might facilitate this. Having a tenure track faculty member with a JD should enhance the department’s ability to attract pre-law students.

6. The department should consider managing enrollment more efficiently by streamlining its upper division course offerings and increasing caps in upper division courses. The College should acknowledge that there is little incentive for the department to do so currently. There are three ways that the College could increase the department’s incentive. The first would be to provide additional tenure lines in exchange for improvements in efficiency. The second would be to give the department more control over its faculty salary budget and allow the department to divert some of these funds to student assistants for grading. The third would be to allow the department to average enrollment across sections rather than merely focusing on low enrolled sections. These suggestions would give the department both the means and an incentive to manage budget and enrollment in a way that is more efficient. Thus, I endorse all three.

7. The department should work more diligently to increase its female and nonwhite students. I commend the department for its curriculum, which includes a good number of multicultural courses that should be attractive to students from diverse perspectives, and for the diversity of its tenure track faculty. I suspect that a bit of soul searching and research might help the department figure out just why the demographics of its majors are so unrepresentative of the university as a whole.
Response to the Outside Reviewer’s Report by the Department of Philosophy

The faculty of the Philosophy Department at CSUEB concurs with many of the observations made by our outside program reviewer, Rita Manning from San Jose State, and would like to thank her for her service to our program.

We agree that our faculty is dedicated to the Philosophy program and to serving students well in both the major and minor programs as well as the General Education courses.

We agree that our faculty is doing extraordinary work in the face of the reduced numbers of regular faculty members, reduced resources, and College and University-wide budget cuts.

We agree that both faculty and students are well served by an excellent staff member, Teresa Taniguchi.

We address Professor Manning’s specific recommendations below.

The Major Program

"3. The department should drop two of the four major tracks. I would keep the classical philosophy and religious studies tracks. Students can continue to specialize in other tracks by choosing the appropriate coursework, but advising would be less complicated and the department could streamline its upper division course offerings."

After initiating our new major program in the Fall of 2005, two things have become clear. The Religious Studies and Law, Human, Rights, and Social Justice options in the major are the most popular.

We also do not have the faculty in terms of expertise or lecturer allocation to keep all of these options afloat. This leads to anxiety of the part of students and the need for the chair to make numerous substitutions to help students graduate. The faculty will have some serious conversations about whether and how to revise the major in the upcoming year. A less rigid major with more room for student choice could alleviate these problems.

"4. The department should increase the visibility and course offerings in the religious studies track as soon as possible. This is a separate department at many universities and there is currently a tremendous amount of interest in this field."

This is clearly an area for growth in the department. In order to grow this option and to provide students with more consistent course offerings, the Philosophy Department needs a tenure-track hire with this expertise.

"5. The department should consider marketing itself more aggressively to pre-law students. Philosophy students famously have the highest LSAT scores among all majors, for example. Doing pre-law advising in the department might facilitate this. Having a
tenure track faculty member with a JD should enhance the department’s ability to attract pre-law students."

The Law, Human Rights, & Social Justice option in the major was designed to appeal to student interested in law and attending law school. Since the last Five-Year Review, the department has initiated a new course designed to help students with preparation for the LSAT, PHIL 3010 Critical Legal Reasoning. The department will consider marketing itself more aggressively as a good major for pre-law students.

The Minor Program
Professor Manning notes that the three minor options are sound and should appeal to students. However, there have been very few Cognitive Science minors in the recent past, and perhaps a more open minor program would allow students to pursue interests of their choice, and continue to help the department streamline our offerings.

Contributions to General Education
The Philosophy Program will doubtless continue to make significant contributions to General Education in the areas of Critical Thinking and the Humanities (lower and upper division), as a part of a liberal arts education. However, we need tenure-track faculty to serve in this capacity as well. The cluster program is demanding and labor-intensive, and should be served by regular faculty members. General Education is an important part of the University’s mission and any university education. Philosophy, as a discipline, is an important part of that education.

Faculty
Professor Manning writes: “1. The department urgently needs to hire additional tenure track faculty. I would suggest that the department hire at least 2 tenure track faculty members in the immediate future and look for another 1 or 2 in the next couple of years.”

The Philosophy Department heartily concurs with this recommendation. The Department has submitted two requests for tenure track hires one in Religious Studies and one in Philosophy Science (in this report) Since Professor Manning has written her report, faculty member Terrence Kelly has officially resigned from the University. Revitalizing the regular faculty is absolutely necessary for several reasons. First of all, we need regular faculty to work with students in order to attract more majors. Second, we need regular faculty to replace faculty lost in areas of critical need, such as Philosophy of Science and in the History of Philosophy. As already noted, we have not had a regular faculty member whose specialty is in Religious Studies for some time. With the reduction of regular faculty comes an increased burden on the Department Chair for advising students, course scheduling, and protecting the interests of the department on College and University-wide committees. Lastly, the most important reason to hire regular faculty is to correct, at least in part, our atrocious regular to lecturer faculty ratio. The worsening and persistence of this ratio should be embarrassing to the University as a whole, as it reflects poor working conditions for both regular and lecturer faculty, as well as reduced service to students.
Professor Manning writes: “2. The department should consider making one of these appointments at the full professor level and appointing this person as department chair.”

This would be a welcome possibility. However, our need for faculty in terms of sheer number is so great, that the department would probably prefer two junior tenure-track faculty to one full professor, if given the choice. The current chair thinks that she can stick it out for a bit longer.

**Budget and Enrollment**

“6. The department should consider managing enrollment more efficiently by streamlining its upper division course offerings and increasing caps in upper division courses. The College should acknowledge that there is little incentive for the department to do so currently. There are three ways that the College could increase the department’s incentive. The first would be to provide additional tenure lines in exchange for improvements in efficiency. The second would be to give the department more control over its faculty salary budget and allow the department to divert some of these funds to student assistants for grading. The third would be to allow the department to average enrollment across sections rather than merely focusing on low enrolled sections. These suggestions would give the department both the means and an incentive to manage budget and enrollment in a way that is more efficient. Thus, I endorse all three.”

The Philosophy Department concurs in part with this recommendation.

We agree that we could probably stand to streamline our upper division offerings, while still allowing faculty to offer courses in their areas of interest and of interest to students. Keeping courses in the catalogue that are never offered confuses students and makes the department seem dysfunctional. If we commit to offering large numbers of courses primarily for 30-35 majors, then none of them may enroll very well.

Though the Philosophy Department concurs with efficient budget and enrollment management, we do not concur with raising the caps of courses. First of all, since virtually all of our courses satisfy General Education requirements, we are committed to providing labor intensive writing, oral communication, and critical thinking assignments in these courses. Higher caps unduly burden faculty members, particularly lecturers. The Philosophy Department has had the unfortunate experience in the past of having course caps “temporarily” raised by the Dean’s office, never to be return to lower level. We often take more students in our courses in order to be good citizens of the University in order to secure enrollment, but raising our caps puts us at a permanent disadvantage.

The incentives at the College level are a great idea, and we concur with this suggestion on how the College of Letters, Arts, and Social Sciences should operate. As the College funding structure exists now, there is little incentive to economize offerings or to agree to cancel low enrolled courses. Allowing the chair to manage how the lecturer allocation is spent as a dollar amount would allow for better control over our major and GE offerings.
Profile of Majors

Professor Manning writes: “7. The department should work more diligently to increase its female and nonwhite students. I commend the department for its curriculum, which includes a good number of multicultural courses that should be attractive to students from diverse perspectives, and for the diversity of its tenure track faculty. I suspect that a bit of soul searching and research might help the department figure out just why the demographics of its majors are so unrepresentative of the university as a whole.”

The department concurs with this observation, and commits to trying to diversify its major and minor population.

In our most recent revision of the major, we included a “Social and Political Diversity Elective” as required for majors in all options.

The Philosophy Department diversified its faculty in its last tenure-track search.

This is not just a problem for our program, but for the discipline of Philosophy as a whole. We need to continue diversifying our faculty as well as to continue increasing the diversity and relevance of our courses for our multicultural and diverse student body. This is something for us to have a serious conversation about, and maybe to get feedback from non-major students on how they perceive philosophy.

Philosophy remains stigmatized as the least practical of majors, though it remains one with a reputation among academics and employers as a major that really hones critical thinking and writing skills. We should capitalize on this perception.
Date: March 27, 2008
From: Michael Mahoney, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs
To: Benjamin Bowser, Interim Dean, CLASS
       Jennifer Eagan, Chair, Philosophy
Subject: MOU Meeting – B.A. in Philosophy

On March 20, 2008, I met with Benjamin Bowser, Interim Dean, CLASS; Janet Patterson, Associate Dean, CLASS; Jennifer Eagan, Chair, Philosophy; Aline Soules, Chair, CAPR; and Carl Bellone, AVP Academic Programs and Graduate Studies to discuss the Program Review for the B.A. in Philosophy and to develop an MOU as required by CAPR 9.

The Department of Philosophy has experienced several faculty changes in the last few years. Two faculty members recently left which made it difficult for the department to function. However, the department recently hired a new faculty member and in the past week hired a professor to teach religious studies (this professor will start in Fall 2008). The Department is asking for two tenure track positions during the 2008/09 recruitment cycle—one in the Philosophy of Science and Ethics and a generalist to teach the History of Philosophy. The Department uses many lecturers and could not function without the incredible job that they do.

The Department benefits greatly from an excellent office staff.

Although the Philosophy Department is small, it plays a big role in General Education. The Department is in three G.E. Clusters and takes the lead role in offering courses to fulfill the Critical Thinking requirement.

The Department has paired down the minors as recommended by the outside reviewer in order to not so thinly stretch their resources. Minors in Cognitive Philosophy and Religious Studies were dropped.

The program has four options which are popular with students. The most popular is Law, Human Rights, and Social Justice. The program is looking forward to the arrival of the new professor in Religious Studies who is expected to breathe new life into that option.

As part of its five year plan, the Department of Philosophy has revised the major, added new courses and streamlined others all actions recommended by the outside reviewer.
In the spring, the Department will do a formal alumni survey as part of its assessment plan. The other assessment activities will continue as planned.

CAPR praised the restructuring of the program to appeal to a wider range of students, encouraged the program to continue efforts to maintain and expand growth as appropriate, supported continued development of regular program assessment, encouraged efforts to diversity the students and the faculty, supported the program’s efforts in General Education, and recommended the addition of another tenure track position to help build a diverse cohort of junior faculty.

The results of the MOU meeting are as follows:

1. The Department will continue with its assessment efforts which concentrate on a touchstone course and a capstone course. Faculty members assess the learning outcomes of incoming majors in the touchstone course and later compare them with the level of learning outcomes in the capstone course.

2. The Department is encouraged to request additional tenure track positions to help build a diverse cohort of junior faculty.

AVP Carl Bellone and I sincerely appreciate the significant work that the Department of Philosophy and its chair continue to do with their four major options and with the vital general education courses and freshman clusters. We’d also like to thank the CAPR members for their time and informative report.

cc: Janet Patterson  
Carl Bellone  
Aline Soules  
Hank Reichman