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## MEMORANDUM

| ATtention | Senate | date | October 16, 2013 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Jon Driver, Vice-President, Academic and | PAGEs $1 / 1$ |  |

At its September 25, 2013 meeting, SCUP reviewed the External Review Update Report for the Department of Philosophy within the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. The report is attached for the information of Senate.
c: G. Myers


```
8 8 8 8 \text { University Drive, Burnaby, BC}
TEL: 778.782.4636
avpcio@sfu.ca Canada V5A 1S6
memorandum


The External Review of the Department of Philosophy was undertaken in March 2009. According to the procedures established by SCUP, the Department is required to submit an update describing its progress in implementing the Action Plan, which was derived from the External Review report, in the fourth year following the start of the External Review process. Please find attached this update, together with a copy of the Action Plan approved by Senate.

Based on this midterm report, my assessment is that the Department of Philosophy has made substantial progress toward implementing the Action Plan, within the constraints imposed by its budget.

\section*{memorandum}
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
ATTENTION & Glen Nichols, Director of Academic Planning & DATE & September 10, 2013 \\
FROM & Martin Hahn, Chair, Philosophy & PAGES & \(1 / 1\) \\
RE: & External Review Update & &
\end{tabular}

Attached, please find the External Review Update you requested in your memo of June 19, 2013. The Update addresses itself directly to the points set out in the Action Plan for the Department of Philosophy which resulted from our last (2009) External Review and was approved by Senate on February 8, 2010. All references are to that document.

Yours

Thai. JKL

\section*{EXTERNAL REVIEW UPDATE}

Department of Philosophy

\section*{Recommendation 1:}

No action was indicated. The Department continues to support this recommendation and re-iterates its initial response. The focus of the department will come into more serious play at faculty renewal time.

\section*{Recommendation 2 (Staffing needs):}
(1) One of the spousal hires was carried out and, as of 2012/14 the faculty member has been a solid addition to our strength.
(2) The second spousal hire did not happen and no other position was made available to us.
(3) Except for limited term appointments (Some one-year or shorter lecturer appointments and one Assistant Professor in a four-year position), we have not done any hiring.
(4) We had a retirement in May of 2012 and the position has not been refilled.

Overall, our staffing situation is now worse than it was at the time of the External Review. We were expecting to have a second spousal hire, which did not happen, and we did not get a replacement for the Faculty member who retired. But in addition, one of our Faculty Members has been on long term disability, and so our permanent faculty complement has effectively decreased by two instead of increasing by one, as recommended by the External Review.

\section*{Recommendation 3 (Graduate and Upper division course offerings):}
(5) The recommendation to limit directed readings courses offered is, in part, dependent on our ability to implement (6) below. But even in the absence of extra course offerings, we have been able to reduce the number of directed reading courses by trying to tailor our 400/800 offerings to student interests, encouraging students to compete their course requirements by enrolling in regular courses, and ensuring that when directed readings courses are given, multiple students participate as much as possible.
(6) Unfortunately, we could not increase course offerings at any level, given our continuing staffing issues. The department continues to have barely enough resources to cover the service courses and courses for majors, minors, and graduate students that we were offering at the time of the External Review. There is no room for an increase of any offerings or, for that matter, for any pedagogical innovation that might require a trial run of a course.

\section*{Recommendation 4 (Research productivity)}
(7) Given that the staffing recommendations of the External review committee were not met and in the absence of a plan for faculty renewal, long-term planning for "what the department wants to be in five years" cannot be undertaken in good faith. On the other hand, research by existing members of the department has been strongly encouraged, and the effort has begun to bear fruit, as was evident in last years' Salary Review. Several faculty members whose research
programs have been under-active have started publishing again, and there are some exciting new research programs being proposed that bode well for the future.
(8) Both our rate of application, and our success rate for obtaining tri-council funding have increased. While we continue to hold that, in our discipline, grants are not the best way to measure research success, we recognise their importance and the chair will continue to encourage all faculty, and mentor any new faculty, in their application efforts.

\section*{Recommendation 5 (Senior Lecturer Replacement)}

The Department would have considered the option to replace Dr. Horban with a research faculty member and, indeed, is of the view that it would benefit from having only one, or perhaps 1.5, lecturers and more research faculty. However, given our teaching needs and the continuing staffing issues (see above) such a course of action was simply out of the question. Dr. Horban was replaced with another lecturer.

\section*{Recommendation 6 (Salary Review criteria)}

A new, much more precisely articulated, set of salary review, tenure, and promotion criteria has been developed and kept current. In particular, we now systematically assign independent scores for each of research, teaching, and service and have been using the salary review process to encourage faculty members to improve their performance in specific areas. Overall, the process has become both fairer as an assessment tool, and more useful as a means of ensuring department members improve in the next cycle where improvement is needed.

\section*{Recommendation 7 (teaching awards)}

This is out of our jurisdiction, but it has been implemented.

Recommendation 8 (Surrey Programs and Certificate in ethics)

We are ready to implement the Surrey programs, both Graduate and Undergraduate, that we were planning at the time of the External Review, should funding become available. The Certificate in Ethics has been established and is beginning to draw students.

\section*{EXTERNAL REVIEW - ACTION PLAN}


Note: It is not expected that every Recommendation made by the Review Team needs to be included here. The major thrusts of the Report should be identified. Some consolidation of the Recommendations may be possible while other Recommendations of lesser importance moy be excluded.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline External Review Recommendation & Unit's response notes/Comments (if any) & Action to be taken & Resource implications (if any) & Expected completion date \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
1 \\
The Department should reconstrue its historic area of strength in cognitive science as 'metaphysics/epistemology plus' -- broadly construed to include philosophy of cognitive science, philosophy of mind, and philosophy of language -- to reflect departmental realities better, and should target it as an area to be solidiffed and enhanced, which still leaving the Department in a position to provide support to the Cognitive Science programme.
\end{tabular} & The Department agrees with this recommendation, and indeed already does conceive of itself in this way. The Department takes this recommendation, along with the reviewers' noting two other departmental strengths, to support the articulation of our departmental identity in the Three Year Plan as a tightly knit constellation of three strengths, evidenced in teaching (both undergraduate and graduate) and research: Ethics, History of Philosophy, and what the reviewers term Metaphysics/Epistemology Plus. In our recent three year plan, we articulate our departmental identity in greater detail. Briefly, our research focuses on the central question of how to reconcile key normative dimensions of human life with a scientific understanding of the world. & none & none & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
2 Staffing needs \\
(1) University administration should take advantage of the opportunity to secure the promised foreign natural spousal hires (Begby and Nanay), in addition to its new hire (Andersen). This will secure the services of three junior scholars, all apparently very impressive on paper, working in areas close to the department's traditional areas of research and collaborative activity, and will bring the overall complement of continuing faculty to 14, thereby allowing it to deal with the main problems in the delivery of its graduate and undergraduate programs. \\
(2) If the services of Nanay cannot be secured, the Department should be given a position, preferably upgraded, in the area we call 'epistemology/metaphysics pius,' thereby also bringing its complement to 14 continuing faculty. \\
(3) The Department should seek to fill its next position, when
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
The Department fully endorses this set of recommendations. We very much appreciate the limits of the financial situation of the University, and we have been and continue to be very willing to take advantage of the opportunity to make spousal hires. \\
While the Reviewer's Report is clear that Philosophy should have a continuing faculty complement of 14, considering the recommendations concerning the graduate, and to some extent the undergraduate, programmes helps in understanding why they so forcefully recommend this. \\
It is hard to articulate these reasons in this format, and so we append a larger discussion to this document in Appendix A.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

2 Staffing needs
nstration should take advantage of the opportunity to secure spousal hires (Begby and Nanay), in addition to its new hire (Andersen). This will secure the services of three junior scholars, all apparently very impressive on paper, working in areas close to the department's and collaborative activity and will bring the overall complement of continuing faculty to 14, thereby allowing it to deal with the delivery of its graduate and undergraduate programs.
(2) If the services of Nanay cannot be secured, the Department should be given a position, preferably upgraded, in the area we 'epistemology/metaphysics pius,' thereby also bringing its complement to 14 continuing faculty. to fill its next position, when
(1) Should the targeted hire of Nanay fail, we will ask for an LTA for the 2010-11 academic year, with approval to search for a CFL position to start Fall 2011. [At the time of this writing, the hire of Nanay has falled, and we have asked for a position.]
(2) While we walt for Begby's arrival in Fall 2012, we request an LTD to support programming in the interim.
(1) An LTD or/and CFL
(2) LTD, followed by a CFL in 2012 (NOTE: CFL for 2012 has already been approved as a spousal hire of Endre Begby)
(3),(4) Replacement positions for any retirements.
(1) Fall 2010 or Fall 2011
(2)Fall 2012
(3),(4) Upon any retirements within the department
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
available, in the History of \\
Philosophy, preferably in an \\
area, e.g. the history of \\
ethics, which both \\
complements current \\
strength in the history of \\
philosophy and its other \\
strengths, and strengthens \\
Its position for collaboration \\
in research and teaching \\
with other programmes in \\
the university.
\end{tabular} & & \\
(4) Current faculty members \\
should be replaced, upon \\
retirement, to maintain a \\
continuing faculty \\
complement of 14. & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline (6) The Department should use some of the additional teaching capacity from its expected new appointments to put on more classes at the \(\mathbf{4 0 0}\) and \(\mathbf{8 0 0}\) levels. & \begin{tabular}{l}
satisfy the major requirements (while also satisfying their upper division \(W\) requirement). \\
It is important to note that these recommendations do not target the overall quality of either the graduate or undergraduate programs, but rather aim to sustain that quality. \\
In Appendix A, we provide additional discussion of the challenges, and indeed impossibility, of meeting these recommendations given our current staff.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
courses and 400-level undergraduate courses recommended, the department requires a faculty complement of 14 CFL. At the very least we need support in the form of temporary instruction budget to replace course release and study leaves, and ideally we would be able to hire LTDs untll we reach our full faculty complement of 14. \\
The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will review the curriculum to see if additional efficiencies can be found
\end{tabular} & timely degree completion. & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
4 Research Productivity \\
(7) The Department should undertake a planning process, under the guidance of the Chalr, to determine what it wants to be and do in five years. \\
(8) The Department should set itself a target for SSHRC SRGs, e.g., 1/3 of graduate faculty, and the Chair should indicate to incoming junior
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
(7) As the reviewers note, various departures (Jeff Pelletier, Oliver Schulte) and health issues have compromised the research profile of the department. While some members do have active research programmes, a number of members' research efforts need invigoration. \\
(8) The Department wants to emphasize that holding of research grants is but one of several equally valid measures of research success in our discipline (and
\end{tabular} & (7) The Department will define its 'identity' in its 3 year plan. The Chair will mentor new faculty, and work with continuing faculty to set targets and develop strategies for achieving them. The Chair will also aim to identify and nurture departmental strengths that emerge & & \begin{tabular}{l}
(7) Fall 2009 and Fall 2014 \\
(8) Fall 2014
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline faculty Department expectations of application, assigning them mentors from successful grant applicants in the department to advise them on their applications. & indeed, in many disciplines in Arts and Social Science), and indeed grant holding is not even typically taken to be the principal measure of success. Nonetheless, the Department supports this recommendation as a way of strongly encouraging faculty to apply for SSHRC funding, and notes that preparing a SSHRC application can help in focusing research aims. Additionally, it notes that younger scholars have an advantage in applying for SSHRC funding, and the Chair will both encourage and mentor new faculty on the application process. However, since the results of competitions are not predictable, we want to emphasize that the percentage of faculty holding grants is a target. & \begin{tabular}{l}
or solidify. \\
(8) Faculty will be encourage to apply for SSHRC grants, with a goal of having \(1 / 3\) of faculty (currently 4) either hold grants or apply.
\end{tabular} & & \\
\hline 5 Senior Lecturer Replacement The Department should consider a regular tenure track replacement for Dr. Horban, when he retires, in order to bring it in line with other research universities and SFU's goal of being a research intensive university. & The Department believes this issue neither has to be nor ought to be addressed now. As our senior lecturers retire, the Department can, at those times, consider what sort of replacement position would best serve the long-term interests of the Department. It should be noted that the department as a whole very much appreciates the choice SFU has made to have teaching appointments. Permanent lecturer positions provide a distinct advantage not only to the lecturers, who have job security and full benefits, but also to departments and students to whom lecturers afford consistency in both course offerings and high quality instruction. & & Upon the retirement of Peter Horban, the Philosophy Department will require either an Assistant Professor or a Permanent Lecturer as a replacement position. & Upon the retirement of Peter Horban \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
6 \\
The reviewers mention a number of issues involving criteria used in salary review (see I(c), II(I), III(i), and IV(b)).
\end{tabular} & & The department will undertake a review of its policies regarding tenure, promotion and salary review in Fall 2009. Any revisions to the expectations will be applied in the biannual review of the cohort in January 2011. & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { December } \\
& 2009
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
7 \\
The reviewers recommend that FASS should establish a number of awards for undergraduate teaching, and the University should consider establishing teaching awards for different kinds of teaching and different categories of teachers.
\end{tabular} & While not within our purview, the department concurs with this recommendation. & & & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
8 \\
The external reviewers found "the MA programme [proposed for Surrey] in professional and applied ethics innovative and well thought out, and the certificate programme a good idea."
\end{tabular} & Funding for the proposed Surrey programme was frozen, and so MA programme there has been put on hold. However, we note that the VPA's recently announced strategic plan emphasizes the place of ethics and citizenship, as well as relevance and community involvement, in SFU's educational mission. A programme in Professional Ethics would fit perfectly into this part of the strategic plan. Additionally, this programme, and an associated Centre, & \begin{tabular}{l}
Philosaphy will propose \\
an Undergraduate \\
Certificate in Ethics. \\
Philosophy will work with the Dean of FASS to collaborate with other faculties, including Business, FHS and Environment, to conceive and initiate a
\end{tabular} & Coordination with FASS and other faculties to conceive of and fundraise for a Centre for Ethics. & \begin{tabular}{l}
Certificate \\
Program will \\
be proposed \\
in 2009-10 \\
academic \\
year. \\
Timeframe for Centre for Ethics will depend on
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l} 
would allow for a central core through \\
which applied ethics courses associated \\
with the new Faculties (i.e., Environmental \\
Ethics, Health Care and \\
Biomedical Ethics, and Ethics and \\
Technology) could be taught.
\end{tabular} & Centre for Ethics. & \begin{tabular}{l} 
cooperation \\
of others.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The above action plan has been considered by the Unit under review and has been discussed and agreed to by the Dean.


Dean's comments and endorsement of the Action Plan :

The external review team assembled to evaluation the Department of Philosophy has done a full and exemplary job of appraising the strengths and weaknesses of the Department, as well as providing thoughtful suggestions for the future. I am in broad agreement, both with the external review and with the Department's response. Let me take the main points in order.
1) I leave it to the Department to decide what areas of strength would best develop their research and teaching programs. The idea of a 'metaphysics/epistemology plus' area fits well within the areas of strength already established in the Department and will provide a good focal point for much of their research. I also agree with the external review team's assessment that history of philosophy is an area of strength for SFU and one where we could make a strong national and international showing.
2)-5) Staffing. I have been delighted to facilitate the hiring of Holly Andersen in the past year. I know her participation will be significant to the Department. I am also pleased to have secured the funding for 2 spousal hires in the next 2 years. I have been working with the Chair and the Department to make these hires happen and I am hopeful that they will be successful. If Nanay does not come, we will do our best to provide the position in another form. In the case of Begby, however, there is no funding available in advance of his taking up the position and so a Limited Term may not be possible.
6) and 7) Teaching capacity. I am in complete agreement with both the external review and the Department's response. However, FASS has no
temporary instruction budget and therefore is not able to replace faculty on study leave or administrative duties in any departments. This is also true for replacing a course release for the graduate chair. At the moment, FASS does not have the resources to replace this teaching.
8) Research. The 3 -year plan was a good first step in planning for the Department and I encourage them to take up the external review recommendation to think carefully about their 5 year plan especially in research. I also encourage the Department and the Chair to continue to think of ways to reengage faculty members whose research programs have stalled.
9) Given that SSHRC funding is important not just for the researcher, but for the graduate students who can be funded and for research funding more generally in the Department, I agree with this recommendation. In making this recommendation, I recognize that input measures are only one (and not the best) measure of research productivity and success. FASS will be working with department chairs and directors to develop more robust output measurements in the coming year.
10) Replacement for Dr. Horban. I leave this to the Department, as the time approaches, to consider this recommendation and I neither agree nor disagree. Much will depend upon circumstances at the time of this decision, both in terms of funding and teaching capacity, and research directions and productivity.

There are several recommendations that speak to the need for a robust salary evaluation, taking into account all three areas of teaching, research, and service. While I believe that this is generally the case already, I applaud Philosophy's decision to work on this area, and will work with them to ensure that excellence in all three areas is appropriately rewarded. After some delay, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Teaching awards will be proceeding in Spring, 2010, thereby fulfilling one of the other recommendations of the review.

Finally, I would like to note that, although the funding for a Surrey program in applied ethics has probably disappeared for any foreseeable future, FASS is working with Philosophy to conceptualize a centre for Applied Ethics, or Ethics in the professions. We will be working with the faculties of Business, Health Sciences, and Environment especially in order to make use of synergies in these areas.


Date


\section*{APPENDIX A}

The External Review recommends strongly that Philosophy have a faculty complement of 14, rather than our current 12. This Appendix aims to explain that recommendation.

As evidenced in the table below In order to mount simply a bare bones set of undergraduate courses (i.e., with any general education courses offered only at SFU Vancouver and Surrey where they can still be taught by sessionals), allowing for course releases to the Chair (2) and Grad Chair ( 1 ; see IV(a) below), and not allowing for any study leaves, we require a faculty complement of 12 , two of whom are Senior Lecturers, which is our current size. At this size, without allowing for study leaves, we can add two graduate courses.

The problems begin to arise as soon as study leaves are allowed for. Allowing for one study leave a year, we require a complement of 13, and allowing for two study leaves a year (reasonable enough in a department this size), we require a complement of 14. And again, this is teaching only a 12 bare bones undergraduate curriculum and adding only two graduate courses.

The reviewers recommend we add additional graduate and 400 -level courses, both to relieve the pressure on faculty of offering multiple directed studies in addition to load and to improve the graduate program. Currently, we do not have the capacity to offer additional graduate level courses. To add an additional 1-2 graduate courses a year, as the reviewers recommend in their more detailed discussion, would require a facuity complement of 15 .

These data reveal just how thinly stretched the department is: we are operating at saper-maximal efficiency, and have absolutely no room for expansion. With our current faculty complement it is unavoidable that a significant number of graduate students will have to complete directed reading courses simply to complete their degrees in a timely manner while focusing on an area of interest.

We anticipate the loss of budget for temporary instruction to impact us quite hard, in terms of being able to allow both for well-deserved study leaves and regular offerings of undergraduate courses. Indeed, the reviewers note that this is a 'source of stress' and 'seriously jeopardizes the vitality and diversity of the programme.' To try to manage this pressure, and to see if there is a way to offer additional graduate courses with current staff, while allowing for study leaves, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee will review the curriculum to see if additional efficiencies can be found.

Moreover, it is worth noting that any new course offerings must be viable in terms of enrolments. But to have sufficient students registered in the 3-4 additional graduate courses the reviewers recommend, we would need to increase the number of students in our graduate program, and be able to support them financially. Second, as already noted above, our current faculty complement (even with the arrival of Andersen) is insufficient to our graduate program as it currently stands. In order to mount two additional graduate courses, we would need not only the two additional faculty required to maintain a program of our current size but also at least one more, for a complement of 15 . See the table below for further detail.

\section*{Bare Bones Course Offerings with Assessment of Staffing Requirements}


\subsection*{11.875}
( \(\mathbf{1 0 . 6 2 5} \mathbf{t t}\) faculty plus 2 SR
Lec)
(11.375 tt faculty plus 2 SR

Lec)
(11.875 tt faculty plus 2 SR

Lec)

Lec)
(13.875 tt faculty plus 2 SR

Lec)
(14.125 tt faculty plus 2 SR

Lec)
(14375 tt faculty plus 2 SR Lec)
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline 110 Intro to Logic \& Reasoning Q \\
\hline 120 Facts and Values W \\
\hline 144 Intro Phil of Natural \& Soc. Sci B \\
\hline 150 Hist of Philosophy I B \\
\hline 151 Hist of Philosophy II B \\
\hline 201 Epistemology \\
\hline 203 Metaphysics \\
\hline 210 Natural Deductive Logic \(Q\) \\
\hline 214 Axiomatic Logit \\
\hline 220 State and the Citizen \\
\hline 231 Selected Topics \\
\hline 240 Philosophy of Rellgion \\
\hline 241 Philosophy in Literature \\
\hline 200 Intro to Philosophy \\
\hline \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline 300 level totals \\
\hline \\
\hline 421 Ethical Theories \\
\hline 435 Selected Toplcs \\
\hline 444 Philosophy of Language II \\
\hline 451 Kant \\
\hline 455 Contemp Issues in Epist \& Meta \\
\hline 467 Seminar II \\
\hline 477 Honours Tutorial \\
\hline 478 Honours Tutorial III \\
\hline \(8 x X\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{400 plus grad totals}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
14 & 460 & 3.5 \\
& & \\
0.5 & 10 & 0.125 \\
1 & 15 & 0.25 \\
0.5 & 7.5 & 0.125 \\
0.5 & 7.5 & 0.125 \\
0.5 & 7.5 & 0.125 \\
2 & 30 & 0.5 \\
& & 102.5 \\
\hline 2 & 25 & 1.75
\end{tabular}```

