




California State University, Sacramento
Humanities & Religious Studies
6000 J Street • Mendocino Hall 2011 • Sacramento, CA 95819-6083
T (916) 278-6444 • F (916) 278-7213 • www.csus.edu/hum



MEMORANDUM

February 28, 2011

TO: Katherine Pinch, Chair
Curriculum Policies Committee

FROM: Jeffrey Brodd, Chair 
Program Review Oversight Committee

SUBJECT: Department of Philosophy Program Review

The Program Review Oversight Committee has reviewed the Department of Philosophy Program Review report prepared by Tom Krabacher and the Review Team, and agrees that it is ready for final approval. The Committee commends those involved in the review for their collegial and effective approach to the process.

The Review is ready for action by the Faculty Senate.

cc: Thomas Pyne, Chair, Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Nancy Tooker, Interim Dean, College of Arts & Letters
Thomas Krabacher, Chair, Program Review Team
Donald S. Taylor, Director, Academic Programs and Academic Engagement
Joseph F. Sheley, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW REPORT

FOR THE

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

College of Arts & Letters

April 2010
(revised Fall 2010)

Review Team:

Thomas Krabacher (Geography), Chair
Sheree Meyer (English)
Louis Downs (Education)

Individuals Interviewed

Thomas Pyne, Chair, Department of Philosophy
Donna Helgeson, Administrative Support Coordinator, Department of Philosophy
Jeffrey Mason, Dean, College of Arts and Letters
Terry Underwood, University Assessment Coordinator
Michael Epperson, Director, Center for Philosophy and the Natural Sciences
Jill Buroker (California State University, San Bernardino) External Consultant
Tenured Faculty, Department of Philosophy
Probationary Faculty, Department of Philosophy
Lecturers, Department of Philosophy
Undergraduate Students in PHIL 141 (Spring 2009)

Documents Consulted

2009 Department of Philosophy Self-Study
2002 Philosophy Academic Program Review Report
2009 Department of Philosophy Fact Book (OIR)
Department of Philosophy Assessment Plan
Department of Philosophy Assessment Reports, 2006-07 through 2008-09
External Consultant's Report by Jill Buroker
CSUS University Catalog
Department of Philosophy Website
Department ARTP Policies and Procedures
Department Summary of Responses to 2002 Program Review Recommendations
Faculty Vitae
Department of Philosophy Advising Packet

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations

1. The academic programs offered in the Department of Philosophy (undergraduate major, major concentrations and minor) are clear, well-designed, and of high quality.
2. The Department is to be congratulated on increasing the number of majors to achieve the critical mass of students needed to support a healthy Philosophy program.
3. The full-time faculty is a dedicated group of professionals who value their students, take pride in their academic programs, and demonstrate a commitment to the department's mission.
4. The lecturer pool is experienced, hard working, and demonstrates a strong commitment to both their teaching and to scholarly and professional activities.
5. There exists strong sense of collegiality in the Department shared by faculty, staff, and students alike.
6. The Department has recently introduced an Honors Option with the stated purpose of attracting more 'UC-eligible' students and to prepare students to be able to take advantage of a wider range of post graduate opportunities.
7. The Department, recognizing that because of its size "it cannot be all things to all people," has made the strategic decision to focus on applied ethics.
8. The Department is working with other programs on campus to provide instruction in professional ethics appropriate to their fields of study.
9. The creation and support of features such as the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics, the Regional Philosophy Consortium, and Center for Philosophy and the Natural Sciences, and Nammour symposia gives a public face to the field of philosophy in the greater community.
10. With its emphasis on applied ethics, the Department is well on its way to reaching its goal of becoming a regional center of philosophy, which in turn furthers the goals and mission of the University.
11. The Department chair has established himself as a strong leader and has undertaken many of the initiatives identified above.
12. The Department Administrative Support Coordinator is hard working and efficient, and is highly respected by faculty and students alike.

Recommendations to the Department

1. The Department should institute a stronger mentoring system for junior faculty, particularly in the areas of RTP expectations and course evaluations.
2. To the extent possible, the Department should look for ways of meaningfully including lecturers in program and Department activities.
3. The Philosophy Department should review advising practices, with the goal of bringing majors (and minors) into the advising process earlier in their academic program.
4. The Philosophy Department should address the tension between major and service course goals (esp. in G.E.) for those course offerings that fulfill both functions.
5. The Philosophy Department should give serious consideration to developing upper-division counterparts to PHIL 25 and PHIL 27, that will be intended primarily for majors, to ensure that major preparation in these areas is of sufficient rigor.
6. The Philosophy Department should seek to clarify and strengthen links between activities undertaken by the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics and its curriculum for the Philosophy major and minor. The Department should specifically seek out way by which the Center's activities may be used to enrich the major curriculum.
7. The Philosophy Department should explore the possibility of establishing an internship program for undergraduate majors, possibly in connection with
8. The Philosophy Department should not pursue the possibility of establishing a M.A. degree program in Philosophy at this time.
9. It is imperative that the Philosophy Department work with the university assessment coordinator to develop and implement a workable student learning outcomes assessment plan that satisfies both University and WASC requirements, which include:
 1. Identification of a measurable set of student learning outcomes;
 2. Methods (including direct measures) for assessing those outcomes;
 3. Demonstrated mechanism for using the assessment results in programmatic planning.
10. The Department should seek permission to hire a full-time faculty member in the area of applied ethics as soon as circumstances permit.

11. The Department and the Dean of the College should work together to find a way by which support for the Center for Practical and Applied Ethics can be made available in the form of additional assigned time.

Recommendations to the College of Arts & Letters

1. While recognizing current fiscal realities, the Dean should work with the Department to find ways of managing growth in class size, particularly in upper-division courses in the major, so as to minimize any negative impact on program quality.
2. The Dean of the College should assist the Department in developing and implementing an assessment plan that complies with University and WASC expectations.
3. The Department should be given permission to hire a full time faculty member in the area of applied ethics as soon as circumstances permit.
4. The Dean of the College should work with the the Department to find a way by which support for the Center for Practical and Applied Ethics can be made available in the form of additional assigned time.

Recommendations to the Department and Academic Affairs

1. Academic Affairs should assist the Department in whatever ways are necessary to develop and implement an assessment plan that complies with University and WASC expectations.

Recommendations to the Faculty Senate

1. The Philosophy Program Review Team recommends to the Faculty Senate that (1) the Philosophy Program be granted provisional approval for three years pending development *and implementation* of a workable student learning outcomes assessment plan that satisfies both University and WASC requirements, and (2) upon successful development and approval of such a plan by Academic Affairs, the Program shall be approved for the remainder of the six years or until the next program review.

INTRODUCTION

The Philosophy Department program review took place as part of a pilot study, initiated in Spring 2007, of the university's program review process. The purpose of the pilot study is to streamline the previously existing process, which was seen by many as top-down and overly burdensome, and replace it with one that placed greater emphasis on collaboration between the department, the college, and the university review team. Under the pilot study, the program undergoing review may choose to structure its review according to one of several possible formats. The Philosophy Department selected the focused inquiry approach, in which the review directs its attention to three specific programmatic areas:

- An overview of the general state of the program;
- A review of the program's intended student learning outcomes and the methods used to assess them;
- A focused inquiry examining issues of particular interest or concern to the program itself.

For its area of selected inquiry, the Philosophy Department chose to focus on several issues centered around its decision to make applied ethics the focal point of its academic mission.

The Philosophy review took place in Spring 2009, with follow-up on specific issues in early Fall 2009. Since then, however, the university's working environment has changed dramatically as a result of the State of California's untenable fiscal situation. The CSU system, its individual campuses, and the programs that comprise them have been forced to make major changes in the way they do business, and serious questions have been raised as to whether the university and its academic departments can continue to offer the range of programs they have in the past. This, in turn, raises additional questions about the options for change that programs have available to them, at least in the short term, and what this may mean for program quality.

The program review report was written with this situation in mind. The review team recognizes that some of the observations and recommendations it contains may be overshadowed by current fiscal realities.

PART I: DEPARTMENT OVERVIEW

The Philosophy program is one of eleven academic programs or centers housed in the College of Arts & Letters. Since 2008 the Department has been housed in Mendocino Hall in space that became available following elimination the School of the Arts in 2006.

The move has provided Philosophy with sufficient faculty office space in close proximity to its new main Department office. The office, in turn, houses a conference room, which it makes available to other programs in the College. The office staff consists of one full time administrative support coordinator and student help as needed. Although both the support coordinator and department chair agree that office workload has increased in recent years, current staffing appears adequate at this time.

In its self-study the Philosophy Department identifies its mission as “represent[ing] the discipline of philosophy within the University and within the Sacramento region.” The Department has identified five specific goals in carrying out this mission:

1. Offer the Bachelor of Arts degree in Philosophy;
2. provide all students in the University access to the ideas and practice of philosophy through General Education and by elective credit;
3. Offer a minor in Philosophy;
4. Provide service courses in Philosophy for other disciplines;
5. Serve as a center for Philosophy, in particular applied and professional ethics, within the Sacramento region.

The first two goals are given primary importance; others are considered secondary goals and are ranked equally.

Given its relatively small size, the Department has acknowledged that it “cannot be all things to all people.” In 2005, therefore, it made the strategic decision to focus on applied ethics. The focus is thought to provide a means by which the program can engage more directly with other programs in the University and with the greater Sacramento region. To this end the Department has undertaken a number of major initiatives designed to promote greater engagement between the Philosophy Department and the wider community. These include establishment of the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics, the Regional Philosophy Consortium, and Center for Philosophy and the Natural Sciences, all created since the last program review. It should be noted that the Center for Philosophy and the Natural Sciences was founded and overseen by Michael Epperson, a lecturer in the Department.

In addition, the Department (and the University) has entered into a 3-year partnership with the Sacramento Region Community Foundation (RCA) to form the RCA Program in Ethics for the purpose of promoting ethical practices and behavior within the University and broader community. To this end the Program in Ethics focuses on a different theme each academic year. The Department also continues to offer its annual Nammour Symposium every spring. All of these activities contribute to the Department’s goal of making its Philosophy program the public face of philosophy in the Sacramento region. This, in turn, is consistent with the goals and mission of the University and the Destination 2010 initiative.

It is also worth noting, particularly in these times of budgetary constraint, that the department has undertaken these initiatives without the need for significant additional financial support from the University.

Faculty, in general, appear satisfied with the Department leadership and its committee-based governance structure and there was unanimous praise for Tom Pyne, as chair. Given the faculty turn-over in recent years, the Department should be on the alert for younger faculty who may wish to move up into leadership roles and take advantage of their willingness to do so wherever possible.

Response to Previous Program Review Recommendations

The Department's most recent previous program review took place in 2001-2002, at the end of which the report of the review team contained 19 recommendations either to the Department alone, or jointly to the Department and other University units, including the Career Center and the Office for Institutional Studies (now Institutional Research). Recommendations fell in the areas of: curriculum, academic and career advising, academic program goals, course scheduling, faculty issues, and alumni involvement in assessment. The Department addressed 18 of the 19 recommendations as part of the current program review and, in general, was responsive to what they contained. It is worth noting that very few of the prior recommendations reappear in those generated by the current program review, indicating that the Department has for the most part effectively dealt with the earlier issues.

Faculty

At the time of the review, the Philosophy faculty consisted of 10 tenure or tenure track faculty – 7 tenured and 3 probationary – and 5 lecturers, two of whom were carrying a full-time teaching load. A strong sense of collegiality exists among the faculty and several individuals attributed this to the Department's recent move to Mendocino Hall, where the new space seems to have promoted greater interaction and increased cohesion. [It is worth noting, however, that since the time of the review the Department has lost two probationary faculty as well as an additional .5 faculty due to a FERP retirement, bringing the Department down to 8 tenure or tenure-track faculty.]

Students in general like the faculty, feeling they are knowledgeable, stimulating instructors and easily approachable. Given the heavy teaching loads, faculty nonetheless find time to engage in wide variety of professional activities, including the ethics center, the symposia, and individual scholarly activity.

Nonetheless, some issues exist among different segments of the faculty. Probationary faculty perceive a lack of clarity in regard to a number of important matters and feel that the Department provides inadequate mentoring where these are concerned. Specifically:

- RTP expectations, particularly at the department-level, are seen as hazy and undefined.
- Class visits, in which senior faculty observe junior faculty in the classroom, are often perceived as a threat since the probationary faculty aren't told what to expect and criticisms are leveled at times without the senior faculty member taking time to first review class goals and direction. There is a sense that the evaluators often fail to make sufficient distinction between pedagogy and content.
- In terms of teaching assignments, new faculty sometimes feel they "are thrown in at the deep end" with large classes and no clear sense of direction.
- There is also a sense among junior faculty that they are frequently denied the opportunity to teach the more desirable upper-division courses, which in their eyes tend to go to senior faculty, while they end up with larger-size G.E. courses. They don't know how to get into the course rotation for desirable classes, such as seminars. While an examination of recent teaching schedules suggests that this concern may be overstated, the perception nonetheless exists.

In many ways these issues simply reflect the more general concerns expressed by faculty across University. Nonetheless, they indicate a need within the Philosophy Department for (1) increased mentoring of junior faculty and (2) better, more frequent communication about department procedures, such as how teaching assignments are determined.

The Department's lecturer pool is one of outstanding quality. All have had considerable experience and have been with the Department for some time. At the time of the program review, none had taught for the Department for less than three years and some had been with the program 10 years or more. Two were on 3-year contracts. As a group, they remain active in areas of research and publication, in some cases more so than many of the senior faculty.

While the lecturers were uniformly positive about Chair Tom Pyne's leadership and their personal relationships with the full-time faculty, they feel they have little direct involvement with the Department beyond their teaching assignments. They don't feel they are part of the program and they sense they are ignored or not consulted when important issues, such as curricular changes, are discussed. Lecturers also feel awkward when their teaching is evaluated by junior tenure-track faculty who frequently have far less teaching experience than they do.

Again, such perceptions are not unique to lecturers in Philosophy but are common to temporary faculty in many departments. Nonetheless, the Department's part-time pool is a valuable resource and the Department would benefit by reducing the sense of exclusion among lecturers and involving them more directly Department matters where possible.

Recommendation # 1: The Department should institute a stronger mentoring system for junior faculty, particularly in the areas of RTP expectations and course evaluations.

Recommendation # 2: To the extent possible, the Department should look for ways of meaningfully including lecturers in program and Department activities.

Students

According to the Philosophy Department's own data, it had 136 Philosophy majors and perhaps 40 Philosophy minors at the time of the program review. This was up from a count of 80 to 100 majors (depending on the data source) at the time of the prior review in 2002. Relatively few students enter the major as freshmen or sophomores, with most students declaring their major during their junior year. This is consistent with national trends. According to OIR data, transfer students account for the majority of the majors. In terms of diversity, the ethnic mix of the major has increased by 50 percent since the last program review, with most of the increase coming from students of Southeast Asian ancestry.

In the case of gender diversity, Philosophy majors remain predominantly male. While this is an anomaly in a College where 60 percent of its majors are female, it is nonetheless consistent with the pattern among Philosophy majors nationwide. As with ethnicity, the number of female students has increased since the past program review, and women now represent about one-third of all majors. The Department has expressed a desire to increase the number of women in the major and notes that it has added PHIL 123: Philosophy and Feminism to its curriculum. Since the course is not in G.E., however, it does not appear to have had a significant impact on recruiting more female students to the major.

The students in PHIL 141, with whom the review team met, were very positive about the Department, the major, and the faculty, although some suggestions for improvement were expressed. Since many of these involve curriculum they will be addressed below. Several students felt, however, that advising often came somewhat late in the major, making it difficult to schedule courses effectively, particularly in regard to lower-division major requirements. Not all students were aware of the Department's advising packet. A review of the Department's advising practices with an eye toward developing ways to bring students into the advising process earlier on would be desirable.

A student Philosophy club exists but it was unclear at the time of the review how active it was. It appears to be small, not well publicized, and some students felt it is a closed group. A picnic was held shortly before the review team met with the students, and it reportedly was not well attended.

Recommendation # 3: The Philosophy Department should review advising practices with the goal of bringing majors (and minors) into the advising process earlier in their academic program.

Curriculum

The Philosophy Program offers the B.A. degree in Philosophy as well as the Philosophy minor. The major offers the choice of three concentrations – General, Applied Ethics and Law, and Logic and Philosophy of Science. Each requires 36 units of coursework, divided between a series of required courses (the numbers and specific courses vary among concentrations) and a set of upper division electives. Students majoring in Philosophy are spread more or less evenly across the three concentrations. The minor consists of 18 units made up of a combination of required courses and electives.

In addition, the Philosophy program recently instituted an Honors Option that requires both an additional nine units coursework beyond the normal major requirements and the writing of an honors thesis under faculty supervision. The goals of the Honors Option are to attract more “UC-eligible” students to the program and to widen the range of graduate and professional programs to which students will be prepared to apply.

In addition to the major and minor, the Philosophy offers a range of service courses both to other programs (e.g. business ethics, bioethics) and in General Education. At the time of the review, Philosophy had 17 courses in the G.E. curriculum, slightly more than half the total courses offered by the Department. Many of these also serve to fulfill major requirements.

Requirements for the major are generally clear and easy to follow, and students for the most part seem satisfied with it. However, several curriculum related issues did emerge during the course of the review team’s conversation with the different constituents of the Philosophy program. Specifically:

1. There is some confusion among faculty as to the focus of the Department’s course offerings, particularly for those courses that both meet a major requirement and provide a service function to other programs such as GE. In such cases a tension exists between major and service course goals. As service courses, particularly at the lower-division level, they serve as recruiting tools for the major, but it is thought they do so at the risk of failing to provide adequate foundational content for the majors they help recruit.

Recommendation # 4: The Philosophy Department should address the tension between major and service course goals (esp. in G.E.) for those course offerings that fulfill both functions.

2. There is a sense among many native students that the lower division foundational courses such as PHIL 25 and PHIL 27, fail to provide students with sufficient depth

of preparation for upper-division work. There was consensus among students with whom the review team met that transfer students often came with stronger preparation in these areas than did 'native' Sac State Philosophy majors. The review team noted that there was discussion among faculty about the possibility of introducing upper division equivalents of PHIL 25 and 27 specifically for the purpose of providing majors with the additional depth they need. The review team recommends the Department give serious consideration to the possibility.

Recommendation # 5: The Philosophy Department should give serious consideration to developing upper-division counterparts to PHIL 25 and PHIL 27, primarily intended for majors, to ensure that major preparation in these areas is of sufficient rigor.

3. Linkages between the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics and the curriculum are, as of yet, not clearly defined. This is acknowledged by both faculty and students. The Department needs to look at this issue more closely and, where possible, make use of the Center and its activities as part of its curriculum.

Recommendation # 6: The Philosophy Department should clarify and strengthen links between activities undertaken by the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics and its curriculum for the Philosophy major and minor. The Department should specifically seek out way by which the Center's activities may be used to enrich the major curriculum.

4. Students have expressed an interest in the establishment of an internship program. The Department's Self-Study also makes brief mention of the possibility. The Department should actively explore ways of implementing such a program since it would seem to have significant student support.

Recommendation # 7: The Philosophy Department should explore the possibility of establishing an internship program for undergraduate majors, possibly in connection with Center for Practical and Professional Ethics.

The Department offers only 33 courses, which, it notes in its self study, is small even for a department of modest size. In addition, the course list has remained virtually unchanged since 2005 when the decision was made to focus on applied ethics. Thus the Department feels that a need exists for additional or revised courses in its catalog. The external consultant agrees that some curricular changes are probably needed and provides a long list of recommended changes, including new courses, in her report. The review team takes no position on these recommendations (other than where that may intersect with the observations above) other than to urge the Philosophy Department to consider them, but not be bound by them, accepting or rejecting them based on its own best judgment.

As with other programs in the College of Arts and Letters, the Philosophy Department has had to deal with the challenge of increasing class size as student demand increases and available resources dwindle. The College provides departments with a certain amount of flexibility as to how it accommodates this growth, and Dean of the College acknowledges that, so far, Philosophy has managed to deal with this reasonably well. There is concern among the faculty, however, that increases in class size are reaching the point where they negatively affect class quality.

Before concluding its discussion of the Philosophy curriculum, the review team wishes to address the desirability of the Department pursuing a Master's degree program at this time. A key argument for doing so is that currently no other institution offers a terminal Masters degree in the region. While this is true, in this case the review team nonetheless agrees with the external consultant and recommends against the proposal. There are three reasons for this recommendation:

1. Despite the lack of such a program in the region at the present time, it isn't clear to the review team that sufficient need exists to support it at this time;
2. The department faculty is divided on the desirability of such a program;
3. The costs look to be prohibitive, especially in this fiscal environment.

Recommendation # 8: The Philosophy Department not pursue the possibility of establishing a M.A. degree program in Philosophy at this time.

PART II: ASSESSMENT

The University, in compliance with the 2007 WASC mandate, requires that all academic programs have in place a plan to assess student learning outcomes. The Philosophy Department has had an assessment plan formally in place since Spring, 2000, although it begun to implement it in Fall, 1999. A copy of the plan is found in the Self-Study.

The plan is based upon programmatic assessment in three areas:

1. Curriculum: This is based around the review of instructor course materials for compliance with requirements in areas such as course goals, syllabus requirements, GE area goals, and accessibility;
2. Major Performance: Assessment of student progress in the major is, ideally, carried out throughout the student's time in the major in the form of advisement sessions with a faculty advisor. A review of student coursework is part of each session. Graduating seniors are required to submit a writing sample as part of the assessment process.

3. General Education: GE courses are assessed through review of student evaluations, questionnaires administered to students in class, compliance with a GE syllabus template and “assessment plan” for each GE course.

Within these three general areas, the program is then assessed in terms of outcomes on 19 criteria grouped under three general headings, *Knowledge of Philosophy*, *Proficiency in Philosophical Investigation and Expression*, and *Appreciation of the Contributions of Philosophy*. (These are displayed in grid form in Appendix III.5 of the self-study.)

The assessment plan is ambitious and, while the Self-Study admits that some components have been implemented more effectively than others, it has the potential to provide the Department with useful information, particularly in regard to curricular issues.

However, as it currently exists the plan does have some problems. As the Self-Study notes, it attempts to assess too many criteria. In addition, responsibility for carrying out assessment is currently divided among three committees and the department chair, making the plan’s implementation and coordination cumbersome. Second, as the annual assessment reports themselves note, the level of compliance when it comes to implementing the assessment procedures seems to vary and in some areas it has declined in recent years. Compliance in curricular assessment is reportedly very high, for example, while parts of the process assessing performance in the major are carried out with less regularity. It should be noted that having a faculty advisor review student course work during an advising session could be a useful means for collecting assessment data if done consistently and purposefully. The biggest problem, however, is that the assessment relies too heavily on an evaluation of course inputs (syllabi reviews, etc.) and does not directly assess student learning outcomes. As a result, it fails to meet the University and 2007 WASC assessment requirements. Under current policy, an assessment plan must have the following components:

- An identified set of measurable student learning outcomes for the program;
- A method for assessing learning out comes, including by use of direct measures, on a regular basis;
- A process by which the results are incorporated into program curricular planning.

Program Review Option C, which the Department has elected to pursue, also requires a discussion of assessment results to date as well as documentation of the use of assessment results in order to bring about program improvement. These are significantly lacking in the Philosophy assessment plan, as it is now written. What’s there tends to focus primarily on course inputs and appears cumbersome to implement. The program review team recognizes that the Department’s current assessment process is useful in many respects, but it doesn’t adequately address student outcomes.

The Department is aware of this and recognizes it will have to revise its assessment process to meet these requirements. Reviewing course materials, including course syllabi, may continue to be useful, although changes should be guided in part by how well students are accomplishing the learning outcomes. Using advising as an assessment strategy may also be useful, but it cannot replace the examination of student work done throughout the program.

The lack of an adequate assessment plan is the biggest challenge the Philosophy program currently faces and it needs to be addressed in the near future, well before its next program review.

Recommendation # 9: It is imperative that the Philosophy Department work with the university assessment coordinator to develop and implement a workable student learning outcomes assessment plan that satisfies both University and WASC requirements, which include:

- 1. Identification of a measurable set of student learning outcomes;**
- 2. Methods (including direct measures) for assessing those outcomes;**
- 3. Demonstrated mechanism for using the assessment results in programmatic planning.**

PART III: THE FOCUSED INQUIRY

In 2005 the Philosophy Department made the strategic decision to focus on applied ethics. As described above, the decision was made in recognition of the fact that the department was too small “to be all things to all people” and that, in order to offer a program of high quality, a more focused use of its resources was necessary. By focusing on applied ethics the department hopes to (1) establish a distinctive identity for the department, (2) become the center for the study of philosophy in the Sacramento region and (3) use the focus on applied ethics as a means of increasing its engagement with the greater regional community. Much of this has been in line with the broader university goals outlined in the Destination 2010 initiative.

The Department has undertaken a number of major initiatives to reach these goals, many of which are described in the general program overview above. Key among these have been the creation of an Applied Ethics and Law concentration in the major, the establishment of the Center for Practical and Applied Ethics (CPPE), and the Regional Philosophy Consortium. The CPPE merits particular mention since, in the time since it formally began operation in 2007, it has developed a series of clearly articulated three-year and six-year goals, established a Fall Ethics Symposia held in conjunction with Cosumnes River College and has entered into a three-year partnership with the Regional Credit Association (RCA) and its Sacramento Region Community Foundation to establish a Program in Ethics open to members of the community at large. Several thousand participants – faculty students, and community members – have participated to

date. The Center is also working to develop links both with other programs on campus and with organizations in the greater community to promote collaborative development of specialized courses and workshops in applied ethics to meet the needs of these groups.

It is worth repeating that in these fiscal times the Department has been able to support these activities out of either its own budget or external funds, and has not had to rely upon subsidies from the College or University. At the same time it is also worth noting that the demonstrated success of these initiatives suggests that, when the fiscal situation improves, support from the University for the Director of the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics is clearly justified.

As part of the inquiry focusing on its decision to concentrate on applied ethics, the Department identified series of questions to be explored as part of the program review. They centered around:

1. Development of an undergraduate Honors program;
2. The possibility that the department hire an additional faculty member with a specialization in applied ethics;
3. Other potential CPPE activities and the potential for institutional support;
4. Questions about potential changes in class size and instructional modes of delivery;
5. The appropriateness of the Elon Model for the Philosophy program at Sac State.

While these questions were posed as part of the program review, the Committee feels that not all of these questions can be meaningfully addressed by the review team. At least one of these questions has already been resolved on its own: a proposal for an undergraduate honors program was already under development at the time of the review and, as of this writing, is already in place.

The Committee believes that the Department itself, because of its expertise in these areas, is best suited to address the other questions. The Department can best identify appropriate additional activities for the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics. Similarly, the department is in the best able position to decide the suitability of the Elon Model (which stresses training students in how to solve ethical problems and conflicts) for the program at Sac State. To this end the review team draws the Department's attention the external consultant's comments in this regard.

Questions of class size and instructional modes appear to have arisen primarily out of fiscal exigency and seem best negotiated between the Department and the dean. Again, it is the Department that would be best equipped to weigh the pedagogical trade-offs involved.

At the time of the review, the Committee agreed with the external consultant that it was unclear whether a faculty hire in the area of applied ethics is justified at that point, particularly given current budget realities. However, the loss of the loss of 2.5 faculty (due to separations and FERP), 1.5 of whom specialized in applied ethics, alters the situation. While recognizing that the University's fiscal situation means this may not be practical in the short-term, the Committee feels a new hire in the area of applied ethics is now justified.

Recommendation # 10: The Department should seek permission to hire a full-time faculty member in the area of applied ethics as soon as circumstances permit.

The Committee also agrees with the external consultant that, given both the level of activity undertaken by the CPPE and the potential this has for enhancing the profile of both the program and the university in the Sacramento region, that additional assigned time be made available to support the Center's operations. The Committee also recognizes that, given the present budget environment, this might not be possible immediately, but it should be supported as a longer-term goal.

Recommendation # 11: The Department and the Dean of the College should work together to find a way by which support for the Center for Practical and Applied Ethics can be made available in the form of additional assigned time.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The Philosophy program is in good shape. In recent years the Program has evinced a new vitality with the addition of new full-time faculty, enrollment growth, and increase in the number of majors, and the identification of a new focus in applied ethics. Student morale is high, and it offers a conceptually solid curriculum at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The creation of the Center for Practical and Professional Ethics adds a distinctive identity to the department and helps it toward its goal of becoming the "face of philosophy" in the Sacramento region. All of this bodes well for the Program's future.

All those involved with the Philosophy Program at Sac State are to be congratulated for their efforts toward these ends.

However, given the importance attached by the University and WASC to programmatic assessment of student learning outcomes and the need for the Philosophy Department to develop and implement an assessment plan as soon as possible (See Recommendation 9 to the Department) the review team, in accordance with program review practice, is recommending only a three-year provisional approval of the Philosophy program. Once the assessment plan is in place the approval will be extended to the customary six years.

Recommendation: The Philosophy Program Review Team recommends to the Faculty Senate that (1) the Philosophy Program be granted provisional approval for three years pending development *and implementation* of a workable student learning outcomes assessment plan that satisfies both University and WASC requirements, and (2) upon successful development and approval of such a plan by Academic Affairs, the Program shall be approved for the remainder of the six years or until the next program review.