



**Final Assessment Report
Academic Review**

Philosophy

A. Summary

1. The Department's Self Study was considered and approved by the Academic Review Committee of Senate on March 11, 2011.
2. The Review Committee originally consisted of two external reviewers: Geraldine Finn (Carleton University) and Philip Buckley (McGill University), and an internal reviewer, John Sainsbury (History). Professor Buckley participated in the site visit but did not contribute to the Reviewers' Report.
3. The site visit occurred on April 4 - 6, 2011.
4. The Reviewers' Report was received on September 27, 2011.
5. The Department's response was provided on November 3, 2011.
6. The decanal response was received from Dean Douglas Kneale on November 15, 2011.

The academic programs offered by the Department, which were examined as part of the review included the BA in Philosophy (Honours and Pass).

This is one of the first reviews conducted entirely under the terms and conditions of the IQAP approved by Senate on May 16, 2010.

B. Strengths of the Program

In the Reviewers' Report we read:

The learning objectives set out in the department's self-study are clear, precise and appropriate. They include the general objectives one would expect of any department of philosophy: to familiarize students with the major issues and texts of the history of philosophy, to think analytically, critically and creatively about them, to express philosophical ideas and defend them effectively in argument both orally and in writing; as well as specific objectives particular to Brock's undergraduate program which make it unique in Canada: an emphasis on contemporary Continental and Indian/Chinese philosophy. The four-year honours degree program as set out in the self-study is clearly designed to fulfill these objectives.

Further, they said:

There is evidence that the unit is meeting its learning objectives notwithstanding the severe personnel and staffing constraints under which it has been operating for the last several years which has meant that several professors have consistently carried an over-load of courses in order to ensure the delivery of the program and students have had little and sometimes no choice at all of courses they can take at senior levels in order to complete their degrees...

Individual statements by **faculty** in the department's self-study, for example, as well as in the campus interviews about their own teaching methods, commitments, and goals were not only consistent with but enthusiastic about the department's learning objectives as outlined above, both in general and in their particular emphasis on Contemporary Continental and Chinese/Indian philosophy. Likewise the **students** we met over lunch were also very enthusiastic about, as well as committed to, the particularities of the program at Brock and eager to share their experiences and opinions of it with the reviewers.

While the Reviewers assigned an outcome category of "C" (Good Quality With Concerns), they noted that "the program is moving encouragingly close to category B: 'The program shows academic vigour and continuing student demand. The program is progressive and produces good quality graduates.' The program shows continuing vitality and there is confidence that implementation of the action plan will move the program to category B and maintain its place as a standard program of the University."

C. Opportunities for Improvement and Enhancement

The Reviewers provided 20 discrete recommendations which have been grouped into four categories.

1. CURRICULUM REVIEW

“The department is finally in a position to undertake a complete review of its undergraduate program following the resolution of the long standing debilitating, divisive, and distracting internal conflict which has for too many years seriously compromised both the delivery and the design of its program. All the professors we spoke to in the campus interviews were aware of this and eager and enthusiastic to embark on a process of renewal.”

“Changes **to be considered** in the curriculum/program review should include:”

*1. reducing the number of **first year (introductory) courses** offered each year from 4 to 2 full-courses to free up professors for teaching at the senior levels*

The Departmental response stated that:

In the past, the Department offered PHIL 1F90, 1F91, 1F93..., and two sections of 1F94, one of which was offered in the evening. In the future, we plan to offer PHIL 1F90 and 2 sections of PHIL 1F91, one of which will be in the evening... Both PHIL 1F90 and 1F91 day would hopefully be offered in D. Howes which holds the largest number of students since maintaining enrolment is of vital concern to the Department. The viability of this change will also depend very heavily on the vagaries of the timetable which is out of our hands.

The Dean agreed that PHIL could perhaps do with fewer Year 1 course/section offerings and that “[s]erious thought should be given to this recommendation.”

Thus, ARC considers that this recommendation has been accepted and implemented.

Implementation Plan

ARC notes that the Department has implemented the recommendation and no further action is required at this time.

2. assigning first-year courses to part-time or contract teachers for the same reason

The Department indicated that this was “something which the department is loath to do much preferring instead to find other ways to ‘free up professors,’ especially since “the bulk of our majors come from our Introductory courses.”

In his response, Dean Kneale states:

The Dean is of two minds. On the one hand, the type of contract does not necessarily predetermine the quality of instruction... On the other hand, the Dean agrees with the Department's conviction that it needs to ensure a lively and engaging experience for Year 1 students; further, it is the practice of almost every academic unit in the Humanities to deploy only or mainly tenure-track faculty in Year 1 courses to help ensure a rigorous introduction to the discipline... In brief, the impetus behind the recommendation, that the Department should free up resources for more substantial and varied upper-year instruction, is a good one; however, this recommendation would not guarantee that outcome, and should not be accepted as a rigid principle.

ARC concludes that this recommendation has not been accepted and will not be implemented.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

3. introducing a first year course specifically for majors which could also count towards their Philosophy degree (requested by students)

The Department suggested that “this recommendation is simply not viable. Apart from being rather elitist, said course would, at best, be open to 20-30 persons since that is, for the most part, the number of incoming declared majors in Philosophy.” The Dean agreed, noting that: “There are ways to form a community for Year 1 majors and the Department might explore them; few would cost the \$12,000 or more that this strategy would entail. Further, Year 1 is a recruitment ground for Philosophy; treating its Year 1 non-majors as mere bit players in the Department's narrative would likely be counterproductive.”

ARC concludes that this recommendation has not been accepted and will not be implemented.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

*4. reducing the number of **seminars** offered to non-majors (also requested by students who felt that seminars were often wasted on these students who were not really interested and did not do the reading)*

The Departmental response was negative:

This recommendation is also not viable. Apart from our Intro courses, PHIL 2P12: Hinduism, and PHIL 2P25: Logic ...the Department no longer offers courses with seminars. Simply put, we cannot afford to offer them with seminars... The Department suggests that serious students of Philosophy will always take exception to the non-serious ergo non-philosophical students who happen to be sharing the same course with them. However, non-philosophy students cannot and certainly will not be excluded. It is our job to turn them into serious Philosophy students. Nor will the department voluntarily sacrifice offering Intro classes without seminars as it has been obliged to do, against our pedagogical grain, in upper level classes.

In his response, Dean Kneale agrees: “The Dean supports the position of the Department. The concern of the students that they are not a community, noted in the NSSE results, can be heard in their complaint, and should be addressed; however, this is not a good way to do it.”

ARC concludes that this recommendation has not been accepted and will not be implemented.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

5. introducing a required course in Logic for Majors (it should be noted that many graduate programs routinely reject applications from Brock philosophy students because they have not completed a course in Logic)

In its response, the Department reports that “In our current UPC submission, the Department has made PHIL 2P25: Logic a required course for all Honours and Combined Honours students though still only strongly recommended for others.” The Dean notes that “it would be preferable, however, were the course to be required of all majors rather than merely Honours students.”

ARC is prepared to accept the Department’s position at this time but would ask that the matter be reviewed during the next academic year (2012-13).

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department and Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Department Chair
Timeline:	Chair to report by end of 2012-13 academic year.

6. introducing a required course in Ethics for Majors (may not be necessary)

The Department reported that “PHIL 2P09: Ethics is offered every year with an enrolment of 80. It is a popular course but, the department thinks, it should not be a required course.”

However, the Dean reports:

[Enrolment numbers], which reveal that apparently only half of PHIL majors take Ethics, do not support the Department's position and the reviewer's assumption that because it is a very well-populated course, most PHIL majors are already taking it. The reviewer points out that all of the comparator programs which the Department has chosen require Ethics, as does McGill ... There is behind this fact an apparent standard broadly held in the discipline, that Ethics is a requirement for a Philosophy degree. It is the Dean's recommendation that the Department pursue this further. If it cannot assure itself that a substantial majority of its majors take Ethics voluntarily and if it cannot produce compelling academic reasons why it should not be required, it should consider requiring it.

In this matter, ARC supports the Dean's position. Consequently, it is requested that the Department review the recommendation on the basis of the Dean's suggested criteria (“If it cannot assure itself that a substantial majority of its majors take Ethics voluntarily and if it cannot produce compelling academic reasons why it should not be required, it should consider requiring it.”).

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department Chair
Timeline:	Chair to report by end of 2012-13 academic year.

*7. introducing prerequisites for **fourth year courses** (another student request. Apparently some 400 level courses are open to non-philosophers and students felt this can compromise both the philosophical method and the content of these courses)*

The Departmental response argues:

Generally speaking, the lack of very specific prerequisites for 400 level courses has not been problematic. It is exceptional for non-philosophy majors to register in them. The department finds that the better criterion for determining suitability for taking 400 level PHIL courses isn't the number of previous PHIL credits the student has but the number of overall university credits they have. A Psychology major or a Political Science major, for example, with 15 credits behind them will fare as well as a Philosophy major.

In his response, the Dean examines enrolment experiences for the past six years and concludes as follows:

These [experiences] would appear to militate against the complaint of the PHIL majors that the courses are unduly influenced by the presence of non-majors, as there have been so few. However, on the basis of this brief investigation it would seem that it is not a favour to non-PHIL students to admit them into the course, and further investigation fails to show that an equivalent number of credits in other disciplines does not translate into equivalent performance in PHIL. The restricting of these courses to PHIL majors and minors with, say, more than 13 credits, would ensure that the courses are fully focused on the interests and needs of the PHIL students, and would prohibit ill-advised registrants. A provision for others to enrol with the permission of the instructor or of the Department would assure that the occasional interested and competent student would not be barred from the courses. Consequently, the Dean supports the recommendation of the Review.

ARC supports the Dean's position. Consequently, it is requested that the Department review the recommendation over the course of the next academic year.

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department Chair
Timeline:	Chair to report by end of 2012-13 academic year.

8. cross-listing (i.e. teaching as one) as many 400 and 500 level courses as possible

The Department indicated that: “This is a very important recommendation and the Department is returning to offering two 400-500 cross-listed courses every year (we are permitted only two according of OCGS which is one third of our graduate course offerings).” The Dean states that he “is in support of this initiative in that it will increase the range of senior courses open to PHIL undergraduates.”

ARC concludes that the recommendation has been accepted and will be implemented.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Chair to report by end of 2013-14 academic year

9. reviewing the graduate program at the same time as the undergraduate program (especially since we understand that external reviews of graduate and undergraduate programs in Ontario universities will in future be undertaken together)

The Dean's Response states: "The Department and the Dean both understand that this will be normal practice in the future."

This is also ARC's understanding and currently a requirement of Brock's IQAP.

ARC concludes that the recommendation has been accepted and implemented.

Implementation Plan (Implemented)

This recommendation has been implemented.

10. reducing the number of credits required for majors from 10 to 9 (again to free up professors to teach more senior level courses)

The Department believes that the reviewers “were under the mistaken impression that our Introduction to PHIL courses do not count as credit towards the degree for majors and therefore believe that our students are taking one PHIL course too many in order to compensate.”

The decanal response states:

The Dean is at a loss to understand how or why requiring fewer courses for the major frees up professors to teach more courses. The Dean thinks that perhaps seventeen Year 2 courses, with an average enrolment of 55 (as differing from 88 in English or 77 in History) may be more offerings than are necessary, although an argument for the “service” aspect of many of these courses could reasonably be made. The review also makes the point under B) Delivery/Curriculum that there seems to be an excess of Year 2 courses vis-à-vis Year 3 and 4: ‘In contrast with the recognized shortage of courses aimed at majors at the 3rd and 4th year levels the philosophy program seems to offer an **excess of courses at the 1st and 2nd year level** absorbing significant amounts of professorial resources which might otherwise be better directed to majors at the senior levels.’(p. 5).

ARC concludes that this recommendation has not been accepted and will not be implemented.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

II. rethinking the design and delivery of the required courses on Modern philosophy (Kant, Hegel)

The Department argues:

While the reviewers are correct when they say that our students are required to take *either* a course on Hegel *or* a course on Kant, they are incorrect when they say that these courses are scheduled in such a way that they cannot possibly take both. Indeed, PHIL 4P20: Kant is offered in D2 and PHIL 4P21: Hegel is offered in D3 every academic year and they are always offered in such a way as to make them both available for all majors. The reviewers' report also suggests that students "...*should* take both [PHIL 4P20: Kant and PHIL 4P21: Hegel] to satisfy the minimum requirements for those majoring in Philosophy". Since this suggestion was predicated on a misunderstanding, thinking that Kant and Hegel were mutually exclusive courses, we do not believe making them both required for the honours degree is necessary. Indeed, given the dearth of 390 and above courses, it would be very difficult for an honours student to avoid taking them both as a matter of course. And annually cross-listing two 500 level graduate courses with 400 level undergraduate courses will essentially double the number of 400 level offerings. While the Department as a whole feels rather strongly that Honours and Combined Honours students ought to know Kant's First Critique by the time they graduate, the reviewers were not of the same opinion... Without the addition of a new colleague with expertise in the area of early Modern Philosophy (Descartes through Kant and Hegel), the Department will leave the 400 level Kant and Hegel courses as they are at present.

The Dean's response states:

It appears that there is no one ... in the Department capable of and willing to teach Kant's *First Critique*, a work the Department thinks is necessary for the curriculum to be wholly defensible. If the only remedy for the situation is a new hire in the area, then the Dean will have to content himself for now with the Department's preference, to leave things as they are in the Kant course; he does think it unfortunate that no Department member seems willing or able to get up the *First Critique*, however, as it is a foundational work in Philosophy...

It is the Dean's position that both Kant and Hegel should be mandatory and that while waiting for additional staffing help, currently not available, the Department should take steps to teach the *First Critique*.

The Department's self-study did have a series of changes suggested for Year 2 of the program, but unfortunately these are not commented on by the Review. The Dean encourages the Department to continue to discuss these changes.

ARC supports the Dean's position. Consequently, it is requested that the Department review the recommendation over the course of the next academic year.

Implementation Plan (First Priority)

Responsible for approving: Department

Responsible for resources: Department

Responsible for implementation: Department Chair

Timeline: Chair to report by end of 2012-13 academic year.

12. exploring the possibility of offering students opportunities to go to Europe (maybe even India or China) to satisfy part of their degree requirements (for example, the College of the Humanities at Carleton [not the department of Philosophy] has an arrangement with Leuven in Belgium which is both very popular with and productive for their students)

The Department notes that “Brock offers numerous opportunities to study abroad and the Department strongly encourages its students to take full advantage of them.”

The Dean, on the other hand, suggests:

The Dean understands that the Department is understaffed and hard pressed and that seeking discipline-specific international exchanges may be far down on its to-do list; however, a Department which specializes in modern Continental and Eastern philosophy could have its programs and its appeal significantly enhanced were it able to locate, arrange, and advertise exchanges with continental and eastern universities.

ARC concludes that it cannot require the Department to be proactive in this matter and concludes that the recommendation has not been accepted.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

13. taking seriously the possibility of offering courses in a 3-year rotation which is published ahead of time so students know what they need to take and when, as is done at Trent (or, if not published, as a guide for year-by- year scheduling as is done at Carleton)

The Department states that it “has little choice, given its complement, but to determine precisely which courses must be offered annually, which courses must be offered every other year, and which courses can be offered once every three years or so. Unlike Trent, however, we are not in a healthy position to publish a three year timeline in advance. What courses we are able to offer each year, even with a priority list in hand, will depend on the teaching and research interests of available colleagues.”

The Dean’s response states:

The desirability of a regular rotation of courses seems to be motivated by two problems. The first and more serious is the following, from the Review: ‘The difficulty of fulfilling course requirements in a timely fashion was identified as a major problem by both students and faculty in the program at Brock during the campus visit.’ In this regard the Department’s self-study had commented, ‘Given that we are short-staffed, there is a real dearth of courses that we are able to offer at this level so much so that our students commonly cannot meet the requirements of the program in philosophy without having to take honour tutorials or even appealing to have some course at a lower level count as a higher level course so university level requirements can be satisfied.’ The second problem is simply the lack of choice, the constraints on what the senior students in the program can take.

While the rotation solution has some merit, the Department believes--and it is the experience of the Dean that this is so--that a small department in particular just cannot commit to a published schedule of rotation. This does not mean that the difficulties cannot be addressed, and to some extent the Department has undertaken to do so, by limiting the Year 1 offerings and adding two 400/500 level courses. There may remain a problem, however, with a departmental offering of 4 Year 1 sections, 17 Year 2 courses, 3 Year 3 and 2 Year 4 courses (there is the possibility of independent study in Year 4 as well).

ARC concludes that the recommendation has not been accepted.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

2. INTERDISCIPLINARY INITIATIVES

*14 The Philosophy department already has a record of participation in interdisciplinary programs at Brock. Professor Berman has taught courses in Popular Culture Studies and Professor Daigle in Women's Studies of which she is the current Director. And there may be more examples of which I am unaware. There is certainly expertise as well as interest in the department for interdisciplinary teaching, and possibilities for **interdisciplinary collaborations and appointments** which the department should consider in the course of its review.*

Dean Kneale's response notes:

The Department seems not to have addressed this as a recommendation, although the vagueness may not have left it with much place to go. While interdisciplinarity can be said to be on the whole a good thing and there are several current faculty members who have taught and might teach in interdisciplinary programs, there seems not to be a critical mass in any area sufficient to recommend a particular interdisciplinary direction, and the Review suggests none. The Dean is not convinced that interdisciplinary appointments are desirable at this point, and certainly the Department's priorities for a new position do not include such an appointment.

ARC concludes that the recommendation has not been accepted.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

*15 Since Philosophy is now a recognized subject in Ontario High Schools we particularly urge the program at Brock (together with the University Administration) to pursue the possibility of collaborating with the **Faculty of Education** in the introduction of Philosophy into their Bachelor of Arts and/or Bachelor of Education degrees. My own experience at Carleton has been that many students are keen to pursue philosophy at university once they have been exposed to it in high school and that those students are in turn enthusiastic, articulate, informed, and hard-working setting a higher standard in introductory classes than was previously the case (which is a win-win situation all around).*

The Department agrees, stating that: “Although Philosophy is recognized as a ‘teachable subject’ by the Ministry in the Province of Ontario, it is NOT recognized as a teachable here at Brock. We feel very strongly that it ought to be and, following in the footsteps of other departments with ‘teachables’, we ought to have a concurrent degree available in which students can do a BA in Philosophy along with their BEd.”

The Dean’s response, after consultation with the Faculty of Education, reports that:

The information we have been given from Roger Beatty, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Education, is that there are far too few offerings of Philosophy in the secondary schools in our area for the Faculty [of Education] to be able to arrange appropriate placements and supervision. He did mention the possibility of an AQ course which would presumably increase secondary-teacher competency in the subject and lead in the long run to an increase in Philosophy courses, with the possibility of placements and of increased interest and recruitment down the line, but there are financial implications and market questions which would have to be addressed.

ARC notes that the issue is not recognition of Philosophy as a “teachable” (which Brock does recognize) but, rather, the lack of available placements. Thus, ARC concludes that the recommendation has not been accepted until such time as that situation changes.

Implementation Plan

The recommendation has not been accepted and will not be acted upon.

3. HIRING

We therefore recommend:

16 *that the department be allowed to replace the position vacated by [Professor A] as soon as possible*

17 *that if [Professor B] continues to be on or returns to long-term disability assurances are given that the resources will be returned to the department so they can hire a full-time temporary replacement for her*

18 *that a new tenure-track position be made available to the department as soon as possible to make up for previous withholding of hiring opportunities due to internal conflicts as well as the reduced service of [Professor C], to enable the program to fulfill its project of renewal and offer its full range of required and elective courses in future in a regular and timely fashion*

The Department is clear on its position:

The reviewers' report states, ***unequivocally***, that 'the department has been seriously compromised in the delivery of its program ... by a chronic shortage of teaching personnel which has no doubt been a consequence of it.' While the department, in theory, is operating with ten full-time professors, "**the department has been operating with only seven of the eleven full-time faculty** which the design and delivery of its program assumes. This cannot be allowed to continue.' Consequently, the reviewers' report asks for 'some permanent resolution' of the department's chronic resource problems: **minimally** [i] a replacement for [Professor A] and [ii] to make up for the three faculty positions effectively lost. In effect, this means the department needs, **minimally**, 4 new full time appointments. We'd settle for 2, the same two which were identified as required by the Graduate Review done under the auspices of OCGS.

The Dean responds: "On 16-18, the Dean wishes he were able to provide more permanent faculty for this and other Departments, but currently the funds just are not there."

While understanding the Dean's position ("the money is simply not there"), ARC believes that principles of effective management would suggest that plans be put in place for the time when resources will become available and that the Department should be given some hope. In other, similar, situations, this Committee has asked that Deans provide some indication as to the Faculty's hiring priorities and this seems to be desirable in this instance as well.

Consequently, ARC would ask that the Dean of Humanities develop an appropriate plan for the future staffing needs of the Department of Philosophy.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving: Dean

Responsible for resources: Dean

Responsible for implementation: Dean

Timeline: Dean to report by end of 2013-14 academic year.

19 that future hires be in areas of expertise other than Continental and Eastern philosophy and preferably someone who is not a Brock alumni (there seems to be consensus among the professors we interviewed that the department is well resourced in its two areas of expertise and lacking in others, and that the department would benefit from the challenge of fresh faces and new ideas)

The Decanal response states: “The Department has made clear in its self-study that it agrees with this recommendation” and, one assumes, the Dean agrees as well.

ARC suggests that this recommendation would be included in the planning process noted above.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Dean
Responsible for resources:	Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Dean
Timeline:	Dean to report by end of 2013-14 academic year.

4. MORALE

20 [Suggested changes will] give the department an opportunity to work on developing a *sense of community among the students*, which was identified as a problem by both students and faculty in the self-study and in the campus interviews. Some of the initiatives that proved successful in generating a sense of community for students in Philosophy at Carleton and which Brock might consider are the following...:

- *appointing an Undergraduate Supervisor (for a term of 2 or 3 years) who, in addition to academic advising, is also responsible for promoting 'community spirit' among the students, for example by:*
- *holding a welcome-to-philosophy social and information session over a pizza lunch to which all newly registered students are individually invited at the beginning of each academic year preferably within the department's home space (to which a few senior students are invited to set the agenda and pass on their own experience and advice)*
- *arranging philosophy 'parties' in a local bar at the beginning and end of each semester to which all undergraduate and graduate students are invited (by individual emails and announcements by professors in class)*
- *organizing informal (i.e. not for credit) 'reading groups' led by enthusiastic professors (as initiations to topics and texts not covered in the curriculum)*
- *starting a Philosophy Club (run by undergraduates)*
- *instituting a departmental speaker series*
- *Inaugurating and sustaining these initiatives takes a lot of determination, effort, trial-and-error and commitment and the Undergraduate Supervisor responsible for them as well as for academic advising should be granted a half-course teaching release in recognition of that fact.*

The Department reports as follows:

The reviewers' report spent considerable time addressing the lack of a Philosophy student community and offered a host of suggestions to ameliorate the situation...The Department of Philosophy, at the Dean's suggestion, had a pizza lunch for all Philosophy majors in first and second year in the fall last year and faculty present at the lunch outnumbered Philosophy students 3 to one. Failure. The Department also feels very strongly that associating Philosophy with pub nights is irresponsible and wrong-headed...Offering Reading Groups is an excellent idea only no one has the time available to do them since faculty are already over-burdened with other responsibilities...However, undismayed, and to promote and encourage a spirit of philosophical community at Brock, the department this year has put considerable effort (manifested as time and money spent) into the newly (re)-created Philosophy Club at Brock...What is really needed, however, as per the department's own self-review, is a dedicated Philosophy lounge in the same building in which the department itself is housed. Without such a dedicated space, a genuinely philosophical community at Brock is a non-starter.

The Dean notes: “the bleak NSSE number in regard to student sense of community with other students, and encourages every reasonable effort to promote community. He also notes, however, that in the case of the Department of Classics, which has a fine student lounge, the Department found that the move to 573 Glenridge vitiated what had been a vibrant student community.”

ARC sees that the Department is in agreement with the spirit of the recommendation if not necessarily the detailed suggestions. There is obviously a willingness on the part of both Dean and Department to recognize that there is an issue here which needs to be addressed, just not in the specific ways suggested by the review.

ARC concludes that the specifics of the recommendation have not been accepted but encourages the Department to consider other possible means to develop and foster a sense of community among its students.

Implementation Plan (Second Priority)

Responsible for approving:	Department
Responsible for resources:	Department and Dean
Responsible for implementation:	Department
Timeline:	Chair to report by end of 2013-14 academic year.

D. Recommendations to be Implemented

The IQAP requires that ARC “set out and prioritize the recommendations that are selected for implementation.” Using the specific ARC proposals enunciated above, the following priorities are proposed:

First Priority:

Recommendations 5, 6, 7, and 11.

Second Priority

Recommendations 8, 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20.

Implemented Recommendations

Recommendations 1 and 9.

E. Recommendations that Will Not be Implemented

Recommendations 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

/pb