

Philosophy Department
University of New Mexico

Academic Program Review

Fall, 2008

Self-Study

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	5
<i>Summary</i>	6
<i>Section I. General Program Characteristics</i>	7
1. Mission	7
2. History of the Department	7
3. The Role of the Philosophy Department within the University	9
4. The Department’s Primary Stakeholders.....	11
5. Previous Program Review	12
6. Leadership, governance, organizational structure	17
<i>Section II: Degree Programs and Curricula</i>	20
1. Philosophy and Outcomes Assessment.....	20
2. Outcomes Assessment Plan: Undergraduate Programs.....	20
3. Outcomes Assessment Plan: Graduate Programs.....	29
4. Assessment of University Core Courses.....	38
5. Teaching Excellence	38
6. Other Curriculum Initiatives, Undergraduate and Graduate	39
7. Extracurricular Programs of the Philosophy Department.....	41
<i>Section III: Institutional Contributions</i>	44
1. General Education and Core Curriculum.....	44
2. The English-Philosophy and Economics-Philosophy Degrees.....	45
3. Religious Studies and Asian Studies	45
4. Contributions of Philosophy to Other Degree Programs in the College of Arts and Sciences.....	46
5. The BA/MD Program and Applied Ethics	47
<i>Section IV: Student Profile and Support Data</i>	49
1. Undergraduate Enrollments and Majors	49
2. Graduate Enrollment and Majors	51
3. Gender and Ethnicity.....	51
4. Graduation Rates	54
5. M.A. and Ph.D. Application and Acceptance Rates	56
6. Financial Support of Students	57
7. Recruitment, Admission, and Retention.....	59

<i>Section V: Student Performance Measures</i>	62
I. Undergraduate Programs	62
1. Growth of Number of Majors	62
2. Student Evaluations: “Rate Your Learning” and “Rate the Course in General” Categories	62
3. Departmental Honors and Acceptance of Philosophy Majors by Graduate Programs	63
4. Student Presentations and Publications	63
II. Graduate Programs	64
1. Qualifying Exams	64
2. Annual Evaluations	64
3. Theses and Dissertations; Degrees with distinction; Graduate Placement	65
4. Student Publications, Awards	68
<i>Section VI: Faculty Matters</i>	69
1. Full-Time Faculty by Rank, Degree, and Specialization	69
2. Part-Time Faculty	85
3. Faculty by Gender and Ethnicity	86
4. Faculty Research Productivity	87
5. Faculty Teaching Productivity	89
6. Grants	90
7. Faculty Compensation	91
8. Other Faculty Support	93
9. Future Hiring	93
<i>Section VII: Facilities and Resources</i>	95
1. Space	95
2. Staff Support	96
3. Library Holdings	97
4. Extramural Support	99
<i>Section VIII: Program Comparisons</i>	101
1. Basis of Comparisons	101
2. Comparison of Faculty, Students and Teaching load	101
3. Comparison of Graduate Programs	103
4. Comparison of Graduate Program Requirements	106
5. Areas of Specialization Represented by Faculty Members	108
6. The Utilization of Program Comparisons	109

7. Quality Comparison with the University of Colorado, Boulder, Philosophy Department 109

IX. Future Direction of the UNM Philosophy Department..... 112

1. The Department’s Vision 112

2. Strategic Objectives and Goals..... 114

Acknowledgements

The compilation of this study would not have been possible without the efficient and responsive assistance of the staff of the UNM Philosophy Department throughout the summer and fall of 2008. Rikk Murphy, our Departmental Assistant, provided invaluable help in collating statistical data and formatting the document. Theresa Lopez, our Administrator, also gathered a great deal of information. Many of the tables in the document were formatted by Laura Taber. Thanks also go to Sherman Wilcox of the Department of Linguistics for making available their self-study from 2007, which served as a pattern for our study.

John Taber, Chair, UNM Philosophy Department, 23 September, 2008

Summary

The UNM Philosophy Department is a small, vital program with excellent faculty dedicated to teaching and research. Undergraduate enrollment has increased steadily in the last five years, as has the number of majors. The graduate program, on the other hand, has been reduced in size in order to concentrate resources on fewer, more highly selected students. The undergraduate program, in particular, shows a healthy ethnic and gender balance and relatively strong graduation rates. Evidence suggests that Philosophy faculty are outstanding teachers; their evaluation scores are high and they have several teaching awards to their credit. The Department is, meanwhile, implementing comprehensive outcomes assessment plans in its core courses and all of its undergraduate and graduate programs. The Philosophy Department also boasts a variety of extra-curricular activities and events – colloquia, clubs, conferences, and seminars – that make it a rich and stimulating intellectual environment for students and faculty alike.

While attempting to cover all the areas of a standard philosophy curriculum the Department has developed certain areas of strength in recent years through strategic hiring, particularly in Indian, continental, and American philosophy. We hope that this unusual configuration of strengths will give us a distinctive profile in the profession as our faculty mature. All tenured and tenure-track faculty are productive scholars. Several have established international reputations in their fields; others, we believe, are rising stars. Two faculty have won grants from federal funding agencies in recent years.

The Department looks forward to continued improvement in the quality of its programs and the expansion of its role in undergraduate education in the University. Its courses already support many other programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Currently responsible for four University Core courses, the Department believes it could make a greater contribution to teaching writing by having Phil. 156, Reasoning and Critical Thinking, count as satisfying the undergraduate writing requirement. The Department seeks more support for its tenured faculty through the establishment of a Senior Faculty Research Leave program within the department. It also seeks more support for graduate students through the establishment of an exchange program for Ph.D. students specializing in Indian philosophy.

The heart of the mission of the Philosophy Department is to give students the experience of thinking about complex problems of ethics, society, and human existence – problems for which there are no clear-cut answers but about which it is everyone’s responsibility, simply as a member of the human race, to have an informed and thoughtful opinion. We believe that this skill is essential to being a good citizen of a democratic society; moreover, we believe that it is the basis, insofar as it involves the development of abilities of oral and written expression, of being an effective member of the work force. The Philosophy Department thus plays a key role in the College of Arts and Sciences and contributes in substantial ways to realizing the “four cornerstones” of the mission of the University.

Section I. General Program Characteristics

1. Mission

The principal mission of the Philosophy Department of the University of New Mexico is to provide high quality education in philosophy at the undergraduate and graduate levels. On the undergraduate level the Philosophy Department offers courses that satisfy general education requirements at the University of New Mexico as well as four majors (two of them in conjunction with other programs) that are central to the mission of liberal arts education in the College of Arts and Sciences. At the graduate level the Philosophy Department offers the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees. The Philosophy Department has a highly trained faculty who are both committed to undergraduate and graduate teaching and actively engaged in research contributing to their areas of specialization. The UNM Philosophy Department is dedicated to keeping alive the ancient tradition of reflection on the deepest problems of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, and human existence, which is at the heart of all civilization, while also helping to create knowledgeable and thoughtful citizens of the 21st century.

2. History of the Department

The UNM Philosophy Department can be traced back to the appointment of Prof. Jay Carroll Knode in 1929, the first UNM professor hired expressly to teach philosophy. When Prof. Knode became dean of UNM's General College (precursor to University College) and also of the College of Arts and Sciences in 1935, Hubert Alexander (Ph.D. Yale University) was hired to take over the teaching of philosophy courses. Prof. Alexander was joined by Prof. Archie Bahm (Ph.D., Univ. of Michigan) in 1948 and Prof. Mel Evans (Ph.D., U. C. Berkeley) in 1955. These three, assisted by occasional visiting professors and graduate assistants, comprised the core of the Philosophy Department until 1965. An M.A. program was inaugurated in 1938. One of our first, and most famous, M.A. students, who was also a GA, was the novelist Edward Abbey.

It should be noted that even during this early period some of the distinctive traits of the current department had already emerged. Prof. Bahm had a passionate interest in Asian philosophy and published several books on the subject over his career, including *Philosophy of the Buddha* (1958) and *The Heart of Confucius* (1960). He traveled extensively in Asia, forging contacts with many scholars there. Several visiting lecturers and guest lecturers who were prominent representatives of Asian, especially Indian, philosophy were invited to UNM during this time. Prof. Alexander, trained primarily in ancient philosophy, had extremely broad interests, including aesthetics (he was co-founder of the UNM Aesthetics Institute, held annually until the mid-90's at the D. H. Lawrence ranch outside of Taos) and Latin American philosophy (he served on the

steering committee of the Inter-American Congress of Philosophy, which met in Albuquerque in 1956). From its early days the UNM department had a “pluralistic” orientation.

What could be called the “modern” period of the department began in 1965, when Paul F. Schmidt (Ph.D., Yale) was appointed to replace Prof. Alexander as chair and begin building the Ph.D. program, which was approved in 1966. Over the next ten years the department grew to approximately ten or eleven regular faculty. Several faculty hired during this period came to play key roles in shaping the department: Brian O’Neil (U.C. Berkeley), appointed in 1966, Howard Tuttle (Brandeis), in 1967, Charlene McDermott (Univ. of Pennsylvania), in 1970, George F. (Fred) Schueler (U.C. Berkeley), Russell Goodman (Johns Hopkins), and Donald Lee (U.C. San Diego), all appointed in 1971, and Matthieu Casalis (Univ. of Paris), Helena Eilstein (Univ. of Warsaw), and Carl Stern (Yale Univ.), all appointed in 1972. Other significant additions were Fred Gillette (Ted) Sturm (Columbia Univ.), who replaced Prof. Schmidt as chair in 1976, and Andrew Burgess (Yale Univ.), who was hired to organize an interdepartmental program in Religious Studies in 1978. During this period the department went through the growing pains associated with building a full-fledged Ph.D. program as it also searched for an identity. The most distinctive aspect of the department remained its diversity. Several faculty had interests or specialized in Asian thought – Sturm, McDermott, and Schmidt – while continental and nineteenth-century philosophy were now strongly represented by Tuttle, Burgess, Cassalis, Stern, and Lee. Prof. Sturm built up the department’s offerings in Latin American philosophy and aesthetics. There was also concern to try to edge the department closer to the analytical “mainstream,” to which Goodman and Schueler contributed. Meanwhile, many if not most members of the department could be seen as working in the history of philosophy. In 1986 John Bussanich (Ph.D. Classics, Stanford) came on board as the Department’s specialist in ancient philosophy, and in 1987 John Taber (Ph.D., Hamburg) replaced Prof. McDermott, continuing the Department’s commitment to Indian philosophy.

In the 1990’s, under the leadership of Goodman and Schueler, the department became more focused on what it could do, given the relatively limited resources of the College and University, to achieve national distinction. There was a perception that the department needed to be made more “respectable” (for lack of a better word) in the eyes of the wider profession by beefing up analytic philosophy. Barbara Hannan (Univ. of Arizona), a specialist in philosophy of mind, and Amy Schmitter (Univ. of Pittsburgh), working in early modern philosophy, were both appointed in 1992. Two years later Aladdin Yaqub (Univ. Wisconsin, Madison), a logician, was hired. Then in 1996 Rebecca Kukla, a specialist in early modern philosophy, and Sergio Tenenbaum, working in ethical theory, both with degrees from the University of Pittsburgh (an analytical powerhouse), were brought on board. Finally, Jennifer Nagel, also with a degree from Pittsburgh and specializing in metaphysics and epistemology, joined the department in 1999. A debate ensued about whether the department should go further in this direction, attempting to develop strengths in areas of analytic philosophy. A key turning point was the decision in 2000 to hire Iain Thomson (U.C. San Diego), a Heidegger scholar, to replace Howard Tuttle, who specialized in continental philosophy,

thereby maintaining a balance between analytic and non-analytic areas. In the process of making subsequent hiring decisions – Kelly Becker (U.C. San Diego), Brent Kalar (Harvard Univ.), and Richard Hayes (Univ. of Toronto) in 2002, Mary Domski (Indiana University) in 2005, Adrian Johnston (SUNY Stony Brook) in 2006, and now Paul Livingston (U.C. Irvine) and Paul Katsafanas (Harvard Univ.) in 2008 – the department has gradually arrived at something close to a consensus about its identity: it is a program where different philosophical traditions are studied with a view, in particular, to bringing together ideas and insights from those diverse traditions to achieve the best possible philosophical results, thereby “building bridges” between them.

The UNM Philosophy Department at present consists of the following thirteen regular faculty: Kelly Becker, Andy Burgess, John Bussanich (Ph.D. Stanford; joined the department in 1986), Mary Domski, Russell Goodman, Barbara Hannan, Richard Hayes, Adrian Johnston, Brent Kalar, Paul Katsafanas, Paul Livingston, John Taber (Univ. Hamburg; joined the department in 1987), and Iain Thomson. Domski, Johnston, Kalar, Katsafanas, and Livingston are (tenure-track) assistant professors; Becker, Hannan, Hayes, and Thomson associate professors; and Burgess, Bussanich, Goodman, and Taber full professors. In addition, we have two lecturers shared with the Religious Studies Program, Lisa Gerber and Michael Candelaria, and another lecturer shared with Women Studies, Rinita Mazumdar. (Each teaches three courses in Philosophy a year.) In any given semester we employ approximately 6-7 part-time instructors and 4-5 student graders (usually taken from the ranks of our M.A. students). Our Departmental Administrator is Theresa Lopez, and our Departmental Assistant is Rikk Murphy. As of spring, 2008, we have 116 undergraduate majors,¹ 7 M.A. students, and 16² Ph.D. students. Nine of our Ph.D. students have Philosophy TA-ships; one has an English TA-ship. One of our M.A. students has a half TA-ship.

3. The Role of the Philosophy Department within the University

At this time we see our principal contributions as an academic unit to lie in four areas.

1. Undergraduate education: The Philosophy Department trains undergraduates across the University to think critically and express themselves effectively through two of its core courses: Philosophy 101, “Introduction to Philosophical Problems,” and Philosophy 156, “Reasoning and Critical Thinking.” These skills help students grow to become active, thoughtful, and productive members of their communities. At the same time, the Philosophy Department offers a wide range of courses that enable students to access “the best that has been thought and said” in

¹ In all undergraduate programs, Philosophy, English-Philosophy, and Economics-Philosophy, counting declared majors in the College of Arts and Sciences and Juniors and Seniors in University College who list Philosophy as their major. Source: Office of the Registrar. See discussion of enrollments and majors in Sec. IV.1.

² The OIR counts of 8 M.A. and 15 Ph.D. students are valid for AY 06-07.

Western civilization and selected Asian intellectual traditions. These courses not only continue to develop skills of analytical and critical thinking and expression but also enable students to “find their own voice” in their historical and cultural situations, thereby giving them a foundation to live rich and rewarding lives. They also provide students a framework for thinking about complex ethical problems, thereby giving them a foundation for being ethically responsible professionals and citizens.

(Enhancing the quality of students’ lives by giving them the capacity not only to think critically and but also to reflect on the deepest problems of human existence is perhaps what philosophers take to be their highest purpose. At the same time, it is very difficult to explain to non-philosophers. For the benefit of those reading this report who are not philosophers we have included in an appendix [Appendix I.1] a recent, and in our estimate very successful, attempt to articulate this purpose by one of our award-winning Teaching Assistants, Carolyn Thomas, in an address delivered to graduating majors and their families at the Department’s 2008 convocation.)

2. Excellence in research: The faculty of the Philosophy Department are dedicated to advancing the frontiers of knowledge in their areas of specialization, thereby enhancing the department’s reputation for scholarship in the three main areas of history of philosophy, continental philosophy, and Asian philosophy. This contributes to the perception of the overall excellence of UNM as a research university, not only in the sciences and fine arts but also in the humanities.
3. Teacher education: The Philosophy Department, principally through its graduate programs, trains teachers of philosophy. Many UNM Philosophy graduates go on to teach philosophy and other subjects in the humanities in secondary schools, junior colleges (almost all of the philosophy instructors at CNM are UNM graduates), liberal arts colleges, and research universities. Many of our majors go on to further graduate study; most of our M.A. students go on to other Ph.D. programs; and most, if not all, of our Ph.D. students find jobs in academia.³ The Philosophy Department is convinced of the value of the study of philosophy at all levels and is, therefore, committed to serving New Mexico by providing future generations with competent, skilled instructors of philosophy who will pass on the ideals of the love of learning and the search for truth.
4. Enrichment and support of other programs: The Philosophy Department serves many other programs in the College of Arts and Sciences. Its faculty regularly offer courses that are cross-listed in Religious Studies and have served as directors and officers in the Religious Studies Program. Most recently, the Philosophy Department has made a commitment to supporting UNM’s BA/MD program by regularly offering the program’s capstone course in medical ethics as well as other courses in applied ethics in the Philosophy Department. The BA/MD

³ These statistics are discussed in greater detail in Section V.

trains pre-med students who intend to work in rural areas of New Mexico after they finish medical school. Finally, the Philosophy Department offers a range of courses, especially in twentieth-century philosophy, that are essential to higher theoretical studies in other disciplines, especially Foreign Languages, Women Studies, Political Science, Economics, and Linguistics, and are often cross-listed as courses in those departments.

The Strategic Framework presented to the University by President Schmidly in spring of 2008 identifies four “cornerstones” of the mission of the University:

- Educate and encourage students to develop the values, habits of mind, knowledge, and skills that they need to be enlightened citizens, contribute to the state and national economies, and lead satisfying lives.
- Discover and disseminate new knowledge and creative endeavors that will enhance the overall well-being of society.
- Deliver health care of the highest quality to all who depend on us to keep them healthy or restore them to wellness.
- Actively support social, cultural, and economic development in our communities to enhance the quality of life for all New Mexicans.

The four principal functions of the Philosophy Department outlined above directly correspond to these four cornerstones of the University’s mission. Specifically, the purpose of “undergraduate education” relates to the first cornerstone; “excellence in research” to the second; “enrichment and support of other programs,” in particular, of the BA/MD Program, corresponds to the third cornerstone – here, however, the Philosophy Department would also point out that fostering “wellness” includes understanding what wellness really means, thus “undergraduate education” also serves this purpose. Finally, “teacher education” corresponds to the fourth cornerstone.

The strategic initiatives of the department arising out of these different aspects of its mission will be discussed in due course in this document, but especially in section IX.

4. The Department’s Primary Stakeholders

In keeping with the mission articulated above the Philosophy Department considers its primary stakeholders to be not only the faculty and the students, both undergraduate and graduate, of the Philosophy Department but those of other programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, especially Religious Studies and the BA/MD program, as well. Other significant stakeholders are the citizens of the State of New Mexico as a whole, who stand to benefit directly and indirectly from the effectiveness of the Philosophy Department in educating thoughtful, articulate, and ethical members of the

community. In this connection, the Philosophy Department undertakes various endeavors to reach out to the wider community, to be explained below.

5. Previous Program Review

In AY 1994-95 (!) the Philosophy Department underwent its last external review, with the site visit taking place in January of 1995. The review team consisted of: Gary Hatfield (University of Pennsylvania; co-chair of the committee), Catherine Wilson (University of Alberta; co-chair of the committee), Barry Stroud (Univ. of California, Berkeley), and Rob Schwartz (UNM Law School). A helpful way to take stock of the progress the department has made is to consider the recommendations of this review and the actions taken by the department in response.

One of the main themes of the report was to praise the Department's distinctive diversity and urge that it be maintained.

"The Department faculty represents a variety of philosophical traditions and perspectives. We view this diversity as a strength, and we recommend that the Department seek to preserve this strength in the coming years." (pp. 1-2)

"The scholarly interests and teaching specializations of the faculty divide roughly but not entirely along generational lines. The established strengths are in philosophy of religion, Asian philosophy, history of Latin American philosophy, Hellenistic philosophy, and nineteenth and early twentieth century European and American philosophy. Younger members ... are in analytic branches of philosophy. The committee was impressed by the depth and breadth of knowledge of the older core of the department and concerned that this be appropriately valued." (p. 2)

"The question of the distinctive 'niche' that the Department might fill was raised several times during our visit, and in the Department's self-study and Five-Year Plan. Our position should now be clear: the cluster of nontraditional or uncommon areas that the Department offers already constitutes a distinctive niche." (p. 4)

At the same time, the committee warned,

"While we encourage the Department to strengthen its areas of distinction, we also believe that the search for a 'niche' should not be allowed to overshadow the contribution that a solid program in philosophy makes to a university; it is as important to strengthen the Department in central areas such as social and political philosophy as it is to seek a distinctive area of national specialization." (p. 4)

The Department has indeed followed the advice of the previous review in electing not merely to maintain but to further develop its strengths in nineteenth- and twentieth-century continental philosophy and Asian philosophy over the last several years, while preserving its offerings in philosophy of religion, North American philosophy, Latin American philosophy (taught by one of our lecturers, Dr. Candelaria, since Prof. Sturm's death in 2006), and Hellenistic philosophy. At the same time, the Department continues to cover all the central systematic areas: metaphysics, epistemology, philosophy of language, ethical theory, social and political philosophy, and the various periods of the history of philosophy. Faculty offering courses in these areas – in particular, in ethics and social and political philosophy – may be inclined to follow a historical rather than an “analytic” methodology, which is less historical and more problem-based and perhaps the norm for courses in these areas in other departments. But the analytic approach is not neglected, either; we have strong representation in analytic philosophy in metaphysics, epistemology, and philosophy of language in particular – though some members of the department feel that additional faculty in these areas are needed. In general, however, the Department has tried to achieve a balance between analytic and non-analytic approaches by recruiting, on the one hand, faculty working outside the analytic tradition who are also trained and have interests in analytic philosophy and, on the other hand, faculty working in areas of analytic philosophy who understand and value achievements made in other, non-analytic fields.

The previous review team's recommendations regarding the program's strength in Asian philosophy are of particular interest.

“The most immediate means for strengthening the area of comparative philosophy depends on other parts of the University. The College of Arts and Sciences should help implement a plan for language instruction to support Asian philosophy. This might be accomplished by (1) the Department's involvement in hiring in other Departments where Classical Chinese, Sanskrit, etc. might be taught, (2) provision of intensive summer instruction on campus in these languages, or (3) special arrangements made with another University offering these courses.” (p. 4)

“There is little point to training Ph.D. students in Asian philosophy if they have no opportunity to learn the relevant languages.” (p. 8)

In fact, the Department made a decision in 2002, replacing Prof. Sturm (in anticipation of his retirement) with Prof. Hayes, to focus on Indian philosophy (as opposed to attempting to cover all of Asian thought) and to provide its own instruction in Sanskrit to support its graduate students. Prof. Hayes is an expert Sanskritist specializing in Indian Buddhist thought. He, together with Prof. Taber, also a Sanskritist, and Prof. Bussanich, a classicist with extensive knowledge of Sanskrit, have been able to offer a sequence of tutorials for its Ph.D. students specializing in Indian philosophy – who are required to have had at least two years of previous Sanskrit study in order to be admitted to the program – training them to read Sanskrit philosophical texts. So far, this plan seems to be working quite well.

Some further recommendations of the 1995 review committee and the changes enacted by the Philosophy Department in response are summarized below.

- The committee recommended that the full-time faculty of the Department be increased from eleven to a minimum of twelve and ideally fourteen.

The College of Arts and Sciences has been supportive of the Philosophy Department in replacing faculty as they have resigned or retired over the past ten years. With the replacement of Prof. Schueler and the addition of another faculty member in ethics who can contribute to the BA/MD program this year, the Department has now grown to thirteen.

- The committee recommended that the Department be more selective in admitting students to its graduate programs, and that financial aid for graduate students be increased.

The Department made a decision, when it overhauled its graduate program in AY 1995-96, only to admit students to the Ph.D. for whom it could provide full financial aid, usually in the form of a TA-ship, for at least four years. This immediately increased the selectivity of the Ph.D. program, due to the limited number of TA-ships. (See data on graduate admissions in Section IV.X.) Meanwhile, the number of TA-ships has increased modestly from 6 in 1995 to 9.5 in 2008, and the stipends have also gradually gone up. Some English TA-ships have also been made available to Philosophy Ph.D. students. With reliable funding students are better able to remain in the program until they complete their degrees. Thus, although the Ph.D. program has become more selective, the current number of Ph.D. students is exactly the same as in Fall of 1995 (sixteen). The Department has also considerably tightened up admission to its M.A. program. In Fall 1995 we had twenty-nine M.A. students. Now we have seven. (The graduate admission policy of the Department is discussed in Secs. IV.2 and 5.)

- The committee recommended that TA workload be decreased (“TA’s are now worked so hard that they have little time for their own study and research, thereby causing considerable delay in their progress toward a degree”) and that TA’s have more supervision in teaching stand-alone sections of Phil. 101 and 156.

The Department officially reduced the teaching load of TA’s to one section (of approx. 30-40 students) of Phil. 101 or 156 per term shortly after the review. At the same time, incoming TA’s serve an apprenticeship as graders in “supersections” (of up to 250 students, but usually of around 120 students) of Phil. 101, taught by regular faculty, in their first semesters before being placed in stand-alone sections of Phil. 156. A “156 Advisor” has been made a regular faculty service position. The 156 Advisor is responsible for formally training and supervising TA’s (see Appendix I.2, ‘Phil. 156 Outline,’ and I.3, ‘156 Coordinator’). The teaching of TA’s is observed by the 156 Advisor and other faculty during the course of each year. TA’s are allowed to teach sections of Phil. 101 only after at least two, and in most cases three or more,

years experience teaching Phil. 156, preferably after they have passed their qualifying exam.

- The committee recommended that all graduate students be reviewed each year and sent a letter of evaluation by the Department.

The Department now conducts annual reviews of its graduate students – though in recent years this has been restricted to Ph.D. students – at the end of spring term. Students are discussed at length by faculty in a departmental meeting; the Graduate Director (GD) records the assessments of individual students made by the faculty; evaluations of the students based on the faculty discussion are compiled by the GD and sent out to the faculty for further review; the revised evaluations are then sent out to the students.

- The committee recommended that more graduate seminars for graduate students only be offered.

This has been a difficult problem for the Department to solve. Many of our graduate (500-) level courses are still also listed at the advanced undergraduate (400-) level, and many 300-level undergraduate courses have matching 500-level numbers (so that graduate and undergraduate students sit in the same class). This has to do, in part, with the only real drawback of deliberately restricting the size of our graduate program: we do not have enough graduate students consistently to fill up 5-6 graduate courses every term and so must rely on undergraduate enrollment to compensate. But it also has to do with the fact that we have, until now, wanted certain 300-level courses in core areas, which some incoming graduate students must take in order to make up background core deficiencies, to be able to be taken for graduate credit. In recent years, we have offered at least one “featured” seminar every term strictly for graduate students (i.e., offered only at the 500-level) per term. More significantly, however, the Department is now in the process of undertaking a systematic “scrub” of its catalogue courses that will decouple all of its 300-level and most of its 400-level courses from corresponding 500-level courses while introducing new sequences of 400/500-level seminars that can be taken only by seniors and graduate students as well as a sequence of 600-level courses for Ph.D. students specializing in Indian philosophy. This will be discussed in the next section.

- The committee recommended that comprehensive examinations should not be restricted to value theory, metaphysics, and epistemology.

In 1995-96, the year after the external review, the Department undertook an extensive revision of its graduate programs. Many new requirements were added, including a preliminary examination (to be taken by Ph.D. students in the second semester), a set of “background core” requirements that have to be satisfied by all M.A. and Ph.D. students, and distribution requirements in history of philosophy, ethics, and metaphysics and epistemology. Many of these remain components of our current graduate programs. The Department continued, however, to make adjustments in the

Ph.D. program, especially in the formal examinations for the degree, these changes essentially reflecting new configurations of faculty interests and expertise in the Department. In 2003 the Department arrived at the current system: a qualifying exam to be taken by Ph.D. students in their fifth semester, which essentially replaces the preliminary exam. The reading list for this examination (Appendix I.4) consists of what the Department considers to be fifteen classic texts in the history of philosophy, including ones from both the analytic and continental traditions in twentieth century, relating to all the core areas of metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, social and political philosophy, philosophy of language, etc. The comprehensive exam is now the prospectus exam, which students must take by their eighth semester, and which covers the topic of the dissertation. Thus, the Department has tried to devise a scheme in which students are still broadly educated in the history of philosophy and the various systematic areas but are also examined in the distinctive areas of strength of the Department, in connection with the dissertation prospectus.

- The committee recommended that the Department do a better job of mentoring junior faculty as they advance toward tenure.

Although no formal system for mentoring junior faculty has been set up – for instance, junior faculty are not officially assigned senior faculty “mentors” when they enter the Department – it is accurate to say that recent chairs have become much more aware of the need to spell out clearly for junior faculty the expectations they must meet in order to pass their mid-probationary and, ultimately, their tenure reviews, and have been more conscientious in articulating those expectations in annual faculty evaluations.

- The committee recommended that responsibility for the Religious Studies Program be moved out of Philosophy to a separate Religious Studies Department. (“Housing a faculty member in Philosophy who has primary responsibilities creates an inevitable conflict of interests between the faculty member and his or her colleagues, a conflict that may show itself in allocation of resources, evaluation for raises and promotions, etc. If a separate Department of Religious Studies is not created, then the departments that house the program should not be forced into a conflict of interest or penalized for supporting this program.”)

After directing the Religious Studies Program for twenty-five years Prof. Burgess left that position in 2003. Since then he has been teaching once a year an additional course in philosophy, PHIL 201.

- The committee recommended that the Department take action to improve the morale among graduate students, in particular, to provide opportunity for more intellectual and social contacts among students and between students and faculty.

The Department has made a variety of efforts on this front. It instituted a proseminar for all incoming graduate students in 1998, which provides first-year students an opportunity to get to know each other and to be introduced to the faculty and their

research. It has, since 2003, hosted a graduate student philosophy conference, open to students across the country and featuring each year a distinguished speaker, which has provided a friendly venue for students to present their research and exchange ideas. It has, under the leadership of our Undergraduate Advisor, Mary Domski, founded (in 2005) a Philosophy Club, primarily for undergraduates but welcoming graduate students as well, which meets on a regular basis to hear talks presented by faculty and students or to have free-ranging discussions of philosophical topics. It is our perception that as a result of these and other initiatives the morale of our students has markedly improved; we trust that the review team will tell us whether this is really the case or not.

In summary, the Philosophy Department took to heart the recommendations of the 1995 review committee and has been able to enact most, if not all, of them during the ensuing thirteen-year period. The Department looks forward to the recommendations of the present team of distinguished scholars, so that it can continue to grow and improve.

6. Leadership, governance, organizational structure

The Philosophy Department is strongly committed to a democratic model of governance. The chair, who is elected by the faculty contingent on the approval of the Dean of Arts and Sciences, takes as many matters of administration and policy as is practicable to the faculty for deliberation and determination. (The faculty are the “Deciders.”) The Department prides itself on a tradition of open, rational, and civil discussion of departmental issues in its meetings. We like to think that the strongest argument carries the day. Behind-the-scenes politicking and strategizing are minimized. Intimidation, silencing, and lack of civility are not tolerated. This does not mean that we always agree with each other, however. Rather, it can mean that debate is often frank and spirited.

The Chair (currently, John Taber) serves a term of four years with the possibility of renewal. All faculty, tenured and untenured, vote on all questions except tenure and promotion. In the case of mid-probationary and tenure decisions, only tenured faculty vote; in the case of decisions about promotion to full professor, only full professors vote. Students, lecturers (of which the Department has only two half-time), and part-time instructors do not normally attend faculty meetings and are not asked to participate in voting. On occasion, the faculty have allowed students to sit in on faculty meetings as non-voting observers. The faculty periodically take up the question whether to include students and lecturers in faculty meetings as regular voting members, always so far to have rejected the idea – principally on the grounds of protecting more vulnerable members of the Department from becoming embroiled in departmental controversies. At the same time, the faculty routinely seek the input of students in decisions affecting them, for instance when it comes to the hiring of new faculty. The Department tries to keep faculty meetings to a minimum; it does not have regular monthly meeting times. On average, however, during the term the faculty meet one to two times a month.

All faculty are expected to share in the administration and functioning of the Department. Tasks in which all faculty are requested, and in most cases expected, to be involved include: advising students (especially M.A. and doctoral students), participating in examinations (especially qualifying exams in the fall), participating in job searches (search committees in Philosophy have always been committees of the whole), organizing lectures and hosting speakers, participating in outcomes assessment, selecting candidates for admission to the graduate program, attending faculty meetings, attending departmental colloquia and other important events involving students and faculty (departmental conferences, spring convocation, annual receptions, etc.), observing the teaching of other faculty and TA's, responding to ad hoc requests for information and other assistance from the chair, etc. For the most part, Philosophy faculty willingly and efficiently carry out these tasks.

In addition, the Department has several specialized service positions, which are appointed by the chair, the two principal ones being Graduate Director and Undergraduate Advisor. The former comes with a token SAC (supplemental administrative component) of \$1500 and one-course-per-year teaching load reduction; the latter is uncompensated. Besides these, there is a Philosophy 156 Advisor, an Honors Advisor, Chair of the Speakers Committee, an English-Philosophy Advisor, a Library Liaison, a Phi Sigma Tau Advisor (Phi Sigma Tau is a national honorary organization for philosophy undergraduates), and an Outcomes Assessment Coordinator. (For the coming year at least, as the Department is in the process of developing and implementing its outcomes assessment plan, the Outcomes Assessment Coordinator will have a one-course reduction.) Finally, a Graduate Advisory Committee (GAC) consisting of three faculty, with rotating three-year terms, assist the Graduate Director in making decisions about graduate program policy; their recommendations are in most cases brought to the Department for approval. The current occupants of these service positions are given below.

Graduate Director: John Bussanich

Undergraduate Advisor: Brent Kalar

Placement Office: Mary Domski

Honors Advisor: Russell Goodman

English-Philosophy Advisor: Barbara Hannan

Chair of the Speakers Committee: Adrian Johnston

156 Advisor: Kelly Becker

Graduate Placement Officer: Mary Domski

Library Liaison: Paul Katsafanas

Phi Sigma Tau Advisor: Andy Burgess

Outcomes Assessment Coordinator: Mary Domski

Job descriptions for several of the most important service positions are contained in Appendix I.3.

The Philosophy Department has not felt the need for an executive committee advisory to the chair, chiefly for two reasons: (1) we are a small department with only four full professors, including the chair, who would have a disproportionate burden of serving on the executive committee; (2) for the most part, the faculty are satisfied that the present and past chairs have usually known when to seek the advice of the Department on important matters. In effect, the faculty as a whole serve as the executive committee of the Department. In spring of 2006, however, the Department voted to elect a Salary Committee of three senior faculty to assist the chair, on a trial basis for that year, in determining annual raises. Nevertheless, the Department voted to suspend the Salary Committee in 06-07 and then to scrap it altogether this year. Instead, in spring of this year the Department for the first time worked out a system to be followed by the chair in calculating raises, with different portions assigned for cost-of-living, merit, and, potentially, equity.

Section II: Degree Programs and Curricula

1. Philosophy and Outcomes Assessment

The University of New Mexico has recently, in anticipation of its accreditation review in spring of 2009, intensified its efforts to develop outcomes assessment (OA) plans for all University programs. The Philosophy Department, which prior to Spring 2007 had only a token OA program based on exit surveys sent out to graduating seniors (which were infrequently returned), has worked hard in the last year-and-a-half to develop OA plans for its graduate and undergraduate programs that meet the standards of “best practice” in outcomes assessment. Therefore, it seems most appropriate to present our degree programs within this framework here. The following sections describe each of our programs along with their goals and objectives and methods we have devised for measuring student achievement. Since we are only now in the process of implementing our plans, each section concludes with a timeline for implementation.

2. Outcomes Assessment Plan: Undergraduate Programs

I. Learning Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

Undergraduate majors

Undergraduate students wishing to earn a Bachelor of Arts from the Department of Philosophy have the choice between four majors: Philosophy, Philosophy Pre-Law, English-Philosophy, and Economics-Philosophy.

- **Overview of our majors**

1. Philosophy Major

“Philosophy is a fundamental academic discipline which is related to all areas of human concern. Philosophy courses will be helpful to students in each of the arts and sciences, as well as in professional fields of study. The major and minor programs in philosophy are designed to serve several different functions: 1) the central focus of a liberal arts degree program, 2) a key component in an interdisciplinary program, 3) preparation for graduate work in education, law, medicine, politics, social work, and theology, 4) preparation for graduate work in philosophy” (p. 259 of the UNM 2007-2008 Catalog).

To earn a B.A. in Philosophy, students must complete 31 credit hours, distributed as follows:

PHIL 201: Greek Philosophy (3 credit hours)
PHIL 202: Modern Philosophy (3 credit hours)

PHIL 356: Symbolic Logic (4 credit hours)
PHIL 352: Theory of Knowledge **OR** PHIL 354: Metaphysics (3 credit hours)
PHIL 358: Ethical Theory (3 credit hours)
PHIL 441: Philosophical Movements **OR** PHIL 442: Individual Philosophers **OR**
One of the following: PHIL 402, 403, 404, 406, 409, 410, 412, 413, 421,
422 (3 credit hours)
Twelve hours of electives, six of which must be at or above the 300-level

2. Philosophy Major with Pre-Law Concentration (30 or 31 hours)

This major is geared towards “students considering law school and those who wish a philosophy major with a concentration in ethics, legal and social philosophy” (p. 259 of the UNM 2007-2008 Catalog).

To earn a B.A. in Philosophy with a concentration in Pre-Law, students must complete 30 or 31 credit hours, distributed as follows:

PHIL 156: Reasoning and Critical Thinking (3 credit hours) **OR** PHIL 356:
Symbolic Logic (4 credit hours)
PHIL 201: Greek Philosophy (3 credit hours)
PHIL 202: Modern Philosophy (3 credit hours)
PHIL 352: Theory of Knowledge (3 credit hours)
PHIL 358: Ethical Theory (3 credit hours)
PHIL 371: Classical Social and Political Philosophy **OR** PHIL 372: Modern
Social and Political Philosophy (3 credit hours)
PHIL 381: Philosophy of Law and Morals (3 credit hours)
Nine hours of electives, six of which must be at or above the 300-level

3. English-Philosophy Major (45 hours)

“The purpose of the interdepartmental major is to develop an understanding of the history of ideas, ideals, and values; their expression in literature and philosophy; and the relation of these fields” (p. 196 of the UNM 2007-2008 Catalog).

To earn a B.A. in English-Philosophy, students must complete 45 credit hours, distributed as follows over English and Philosophy:

ENGLISH (18 credit hours): Of the courses taken for the major, 12 credit hours must be numbered 300 or above. Recommended courses: 250 and 410.

PHILOSOPHY (18 credit hours): Of the courses taken for the major, 12 credit hours must be numbered 300 or above. Recommended courses: 156, at least one of 201 or 202, and at least one of 352, 354, or 358.

ENGLISH or PHILOSOPHY: 6 hours additional of English or Philosophy numbered 300 or above.

ENGP 480: Philosophy and Literature (3 credit hours; also offered as PHIL 480)

4. Economics-Philosophy Major (45 hours)

“This major is directed toward a deeper and fuller understanding of the theoretical phases of economics and toward the extension of philosophy into one of its traditional areas of interest, namely that of value theory and its application” (p. 185 of the UNM 2007-2008 Catalog).

To earn a B.A. in Economics-Philosophy, students must complete 45 credit hours, distributed as follows over Economics and Philosophy:

ECONOMICS (21 credit hours): Econ 105, 106, 300,303, 315, and 360 or 450, and 3 hours to be selected from 320, 332, 350 or 424;

PHILOSOPHY (21 credit hours): Courses selected by student in consultation with the Undergraduate Advisor in Philosophy

ECPH 485: Philosophical Foundations of Economic Theory (3 credit hours; also offered as PHIL 485)

- **Broad learning goals for the philosophy majors**

General learning goals for all Philosophy majors

As indicated in the descriptions we include in the UNM Catalog, completion of any one of our four majors will enhance the liberal arts experience for UNM undergraduates and help prepare them for their post-baccalaureate pursuits. Regardless of which major option our students elect to pursue, our general goal is to deepen their knowledge of philosophy, teach them skills that will be an asset to them whatever their chosen career paths may be, and instill in them values that will help them to become life-long learners.

Knowledge: We want all our graduates to have a broad knowledge of both the history of philosophy and the different problem areas of philosophy (such as ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology). By the end of their course of study, they should be aware of issues that have motivated and continue to motivate philosophical debate. Such issues include (but are not limited to): the existence of God, the justification for religious belief, the nature and grounds of human knowledge, the existence and nature of the self, the possibility of free will, the nature and requirements of morality, and the nature and origin of political authority and social justice. These are issues that are covered quite generally in a standard one-semester PHIL 101: Introduction to Philosophy course, but upon completion of any one of our majors, students should have a deeper appreciation for why these questions persist in philosophical discourse as well as for the strategies (of past and present) that philosophers adopt to address these core philosophical problems.

Skills: There are three fundamental skills we want all our majors to master: critical reading, persuasive writing, and critical thinking.

In regard to developing the ability to read critically, we want our students to be able to follow complex, sustained reasoning about the theoretical problems

philosophers find important, and to appreciate the scientific, historical, and cultural significance of those problems.

In regard to developing critical thinking skills, we want our students to be able to approach any given argument or text with a critical eye and assess the merits of the claims being made. Doing so effectively requires that they are able to identify what the author is asserting and what explicit and implicit assumptions he/she is making, analyze the argument the author develops to support his/her claim, assess whether the author's argument actually supports the conclusion he/she wants to draw, and determine whether there are good reasons to deny the truth of the claims the author is forwarding.

In regard to their writing skills, all our majors are asked to compose persuasive argumentative essays throughout the course of their study. Their general goal is to learn how to clearly and convincingly argue for a stated position. In our lower division courses, such as PHIL 156: Reasoning and Critical Thinking, students may be asked to defend their views on abortion or the death penalty, while in our upper division courses, students will more likely be asked to defend a particular interpretation of a historical text or critically engage with the ideas forwarded by a central figure in the history of philosophy. Whatever the specific task before them, effectively crafting an argument will require that students clearly present the position they are critiquing *and* lay out clear and convincing reasons that might persuade their reader of their own stated position.

Values: Philosophy literally means “the love of wisdom.” The highest goal of a philosophical education is to awaken such a love in students. We want our students to become true learners – curious, independent, inquiring minds eager to explore the world and to identify and examine assumptions in their own and others’ thinking. There should be nothing they do not want to know about. They should not have to rely on others setting goals for them. They should take responsibility for their own learning.

Learning goals specific to our major programs

1. Philosophy Major

Our goal for those students opting to pursue the general philosophy major is to acquire a balanced knowledge of the history of philosophy and the different problem areas of philosophy (such as ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology). Thus, we require students to take at least two courses in the history of philosophy (PHIL 201 and PHIL 202), one course in logic (PHIL 356), one course in ethical theory (PHIL 358), and one course in either epistemology (PHIL 352) or metaphysics (PHIL 354). They then have the freedom to tailor the curriculum to their own peculiar interests by selecting a 400-level course and upper division electives that cover other historical periods of philosophy (such as nineteenth and twentieth century Continental philosophy) and other areas of philosophical thought (such as Indian philosophy, philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and philosophy of art and aesthetics).

Ultimately, as our curriculum for the general major suggests, we want our students to develop an appreciation for the interplay between the history of philosophy and the problem areas of philosophy.

2. Philosophy Major with Pre-Law Concentration

Our goal for those students opting to pursue the philosophy major with a Pre-law concentration is to acquire a knowledge of the history of philosophy and a more focused knowledge of ethics and legal and social philosophy. Thus, we require these students to take at least three courses in the history of philosophy (PHIL 201, PHIL 202, and PHIL 371 or PHIL 372), where the PHIL 371 and PHIL 372 surveys focus on historical trends in social and political philosophy. We also require them to take one course in ethical theory (PHIL 358) and one course focused on the relationship between legal and moral philosophy (PHIL 381). They then have the freedom to tailor the curriculum to their own peculiar interests by selecting upper division electives that cover other historical periods of philosophy (such as nineteenth and twentieth century Continental philosophy) and other areas of philosophical thought (such as Indian philosophy, philosophy of language, philosophy of science, and philosophy of art and aesthetics). Ultimately, as our curriculum for the Pre-law major suggests, we want our students to develop an appreciation for the interplay between ethical theory, social and legal philosophy, and other areas of philosophy, such as epistemology.

3. English-Philosophy Major

Those students opting to pursue the philosophy major with a concentration in English-Philosophy have a great deal of freedom in directing the course of their studies. They must take six courses in English, six courses in Philosophy, and two additional upper division courses in either English or Philosophy. By completing this broad range of courses from two different departments, our goal for the students is that they deepen their appreciation for the relationship between these two fields. Thus, when we advise students on which philosophy courses they should take to complete this degree, we urge them to take courses that touch on a wide variety of philosophical problem areas and a wide variety of historical eras. Our hope is that a broad knowledge of philosophy and its history will grant our students a view of the different formats in which philosophy has been written – from the dialogues of Plato to the aphorisms of Nietzsche to the more standard essay style of contemporary philosophy – in order for them to better appreciate the way in which prose style may or may not influence the effectiveness with which a philosopher defends his/her ideas. This particular issue is often addressed in ENGP 480: Philosophy and Literature, a course that our English-Philosophy students are required to take for the major. The course is dedicated in general to the interplay between literature and philosophy, and students completing this course should come away with a deeper appreciation for how these two fields have continued and can continue to inform each other.

4. Economics-Philosophy Major

Those students opting to pursue the philosophy major with a concentration in Economics-Philosophy have a great deal of freedom in directing the course of their studies. They must take seven courses in Economics and seven courses in Philosophy, which the student chooses in consultation with the undergraduate advisor. By completing this broad range of courses from two different departments, our goal for the students is that they deepen their appreciation for the relationship between these two fields and understand how philosophy, and value theory in particular, has informed the study of economic trends. This particular question is addressed in PHIL 485: Philosophical Foundations of Economic Theory, a course that our Economics-Philosophy students are required to take for the major.

- **Student learning outcomes (SLOs) for the philosophy majors**

General student learning outcomes for all Philosophy majors

In measuring the success of our students, we focus on the very knowledge, skills, and values that we want our majors to acquire in the course of their studies. Thus, our student learning outcomes (SLOs) are in general:

1. Students can explain the main problems of metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics.
2. Students can outline the history of philosophy from ancient to modern times, identifying its major periods, movements, and figures.
3. Students can give a general account of the thought of at least one systematic philosopher in the history of philosophy and explain at least some of his/her views in depth.
4. Students can represent the logical structure of an argument.
5. Students can write a philosophical essay, explicating a philosophical idea or argument, evaluating its soundness and persuasiveness, and developing a counter-position.
6. Students can articulate their own thoughts clearly in philosophical discussion and in writing.
7. Students can articulate why philosophy is important to them in their own lives.

Student learning outcomes specific to our four major programs

As detailed above, there are specific goals for students depending on the major they opt to pursue.

1. Philosophy Major

The specific goal for our students pursuing a general philosophy degree is to acquire an appreciation of the interplay between the history of philosophy and the problem areas of philosophy. Courses in the history of philosophy, especially PHIL 201 and 202, emphasize outcomes 1 and 2 above. Required courses in metaphysics (PHIL 354), epistemology (PHIL 352), and ethical theory (PHIL 358) emphasize outcome 1. PHIL 356 emphasizes outcome 4, PHIL 442 outcome 3, and PHIL 441 outcome 2. *All* required and elective courses contribute to the achievement of outcomes 5, 6 and 7.

2. Philosophy Major with Pre-Law Concentration (30 or 31 hours)

The specific goal for our students pursuing a philosophy degree with a Pre-law concentration is to acquire an appreciation of the interplay between ethical theory, social and legal philosophy, and other areas of philosophy, such as epistemology. Thus, in addition to the general outcomes for all Philosophy majors emphasized in PHIL 156 or 356, 201, 202, 352, and 358, which are also required for the Pre-Law major, Pre-Law majors should be able to explain the nature and function of public law and its relation to moral belief, as well as the role of epistemological questions in legal debates. The achievement of this outcome is the emphasis of PHIL 381: Philosophy of Law and Morals. Students pursuing this major should also be able to give an account of the major political theories devised in ancient and modern Western philosophy. This outcome is emphasized in PHIL 371 and 372.

3. English-Philosophy Major (45 hours)

The specific goal for our students pursuing a philosophy degree with an English-Philosophy concentration is to acquire an appreciation of the relationship between English literature and Philosophy. Thus, in addition to the general outcomes for all Philosophy majors emphasized in the Philosophy courses recommended for the English-Philosophy major, English-Philosophy majors should be able to articulate how philosophy and literature have mutually informed and influenced each other. The achievement of this outcome is emphasized in ENGP 480: Philosophy and Literature.

4. Economics-Philosophy Major (45 hours)

The specific goal for our students pursuing a philosophy degree with an Economics-Philosophy concentration is to acquire an appreciation for the relationship between Economics and Philosophy, and understand how philosophy, and value theory in particular, has informed the study of economic trends. Thus, in addition to the general outcomes for all Philosophy majors emphasized in the Philosophy courses selected in consultation with the Philosophy Undergraduate Advisor for this major, Economics-Philosophy majors should be able to give an account of the diverse ways in which philosophy and economic theory have mutually influenced each other. The achievement of this outcome is the emphasis of PHIL 485: Philosophical Foundations of Economic Theory.

II. Assessment of Learning Objectives

• Measurement tools

After considerable discussion, the Philosophy Department faculty has identified two kinds of measurement tools as most useful in assessing the achievement of the above-described learning objectives among our philosophy majors:

- (1) Sets of writing assignments (“portfolios,” if you will) which individual students completed for the required courses for the major; and
- (2) A comprehensive exit interview.

There is also some support for the idea of including the performance of our majors in PHIL 356: Symbolic Logic as another way of assessing the effectiveness of our program in teaching reasoning skills, but there is no consensus for it at this point. (We may add this in the future.)

By way of justification of (1) and (2): Writing and speaking are the two media of philosophy. Every philosophy course places a premium on the ability to express one's own ideas, analyze others' ideas, and develop persuasive arguments in both writing and philosophical discourse. The mastery of important philosophical theories and the systems of the great figures in the history of philosophy is exhibited primarily not by "objective tests," which rarely bring the creativity of students into play, but by the ability to articulate and reflect on them in writing. Thus, throughout the curriculum for each of our majors students are constantly being asked to write papers (varying in length, but the 4-5 page paper remains the standard). One of the most straightforward ways to measure the level of education of our students at any given time is, thus, to survey a collection of papers they have written. Meanwhile, they are also asked, throughout the curriculum, to develop the skills of articulating and defending positions, as well as respectfully critiquing the positions of others, in class discussion. The best way to measure these kinds of skills is to engage graduating seniors in some kind of philosophical discussion and observe how well they do. Thus, the measurement tools identified – portfolios and exit interviews – seem most apt for measuring the kinds of objectives we have set for our students.

- **Assessment of measurement tools**

- 1. Portfolios**

- At this time, none of our majors has a formal capstone experience. There is, however, for each major a required junior/senior-level course: for the general Philosophy major, PHIL 441 (Philosophical Movements) or 441 (Individual Philosophers); for the Philosophy Pre-Law major, PHIL 381; for the English-Philosophy major, ENGP 480; and for the Economics-Philosophy major, ECPH 485. These courses serve, for all intents and purposes, as capstone seminars for their respective majors.

- For each major, in every fourth year, we will identify 7-10 students (with a representative range of GPA's in Philosophy courses) who 1) will either graduate that year or the following year, 2) have taken almost all of the coursework for the major, and 3) are willing to compile portfolios of what they believe to be their (four or five) best papers from required courses for the major. For the general Philosophy major these will be: PHIL 201 or 201, 352 or 354, 358, and 441 or 442. For the Philosophy Pre-Law major: PHIL 201 or 202, 352, 371, 381. For the English-Philosophy major: PHIL 201 or 202, 352 or 354 or 358, one elective, and 480. For the Economics-Philosophy major: three courses of the student's choosing, but preferably either from PHIL 201 or 202, 358, and 371, as well as ECPH 485. A committee of four faculty will review and assess the portfolios according to a scoring rubric similar to the one already used for assessing assignments in PHIL 101 and 156. The details of the rubric we will use for assessing student portfolios will be worked out by a committee

of faculty, who will present it to the department for revision and eventual approval in fall '08.

2. Exit Interviews

The same students who volunteered to submit portfolios will also be asked to participate in exit interviews. The purpose of the interview will be two-fold:

- (a) To collect information about the student's experiences in the undergraduate Philosophy program and learn, in particular, which courses the student deemed his/her favorite and least favorite, and why; which courses the student felt he/she learned the most in, and why; in what ways the student thinks the Philosophy program or our individual courses could be improved, etc.; and
- (b) To assess the ability of the student to discourse about philosophical topics.

For example, in the course of the interview the faculty interviewing the student will attempt to engage him/her in discussions about some of the most interesting ideas and theories he/she encountered during his/her course of study, and observe how proficient the student is at articulating his/her own thoughts, outlining philosophical views/positions, and reflecting on those views/positions. In fall '08 a committee of faculty will draw up the protocol for the interview and present it to the department for revision and eventual approval. It will also develop a system for scoring both the department's and the students' 'performance' in the interviews.

Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Tools:

The department will begin the assessment process with the general Philosophy major in AY 08-09, with the assessments of Philosophy Pre-Law, English-Philosophy, and Economics-Philosophy to follow in AY 09-10, 10-11, and 11-12, respectively. The data collected from student portfolios and exit interviews, along with an analysis of these sets of data, will be included in the Philosophy Department's annual outcomes assessment reports for those years.

III. Utilization of Assessment Findings

The Philosophy Department has now established an Annual Assessment Meeting of its core courses, Phil. 101, 156, 201, and 202. At this meeting, which will take place in the second or third week of every spring term (i.e., the beginning of February) the faculty who are teaching sections of those courses that academic year (i.e., who either taught a section in the fall or are teaching a section in the spring) will review data gathered from those courses over the previous year (i.e., from the previous spring and fall semesters) and attempt to evaluate its significance and, in particular, whether it has any implications for the effectiveness of those courses. At the first such meeting held last year (see "Data Review Narrative" under Appendix II.3) the faculty decided to introduce a unit on "writing a philosophical essay" in Phil. 101 in the Success-TA assisted supersections of the course to see if it will have a positive impact on the development of writing skills. Likewise, at the end of spring term, in the same meeting where the Department conducts

its review of graduate students, the philosophy faculty will review a report of the Undergraduate OA Team (co-directed by the OA Coordinator and Undergraduate Advisor) which has reviewed the data for the major being assessed that year and discuss whether they (the faculty) think, in light of the report, any changes need to be made in the undergraduate program in question, both as pertains to specific courses required for the major and to the structure of the program overall.

3. Outcomes Assessment Plan: Graduate Programs

I. Learning Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

Graduate Programs

Graduate students in the Department of Philosophy have the opportunity to pursue either a Masters of Arts or a Doctorate of Philosophy.

- **Overview of Graduate Programs**

General admission requirements for our graduate students

All graduate students, whether M.A. or Ph.D., must meet a "background core" requirement consisting of six courses in basic areas (namely, metaphysics, theory of knowledge, ethical theory, Greek philosophy, modern philosophy and symbolic logic). Courses taken to satisfy the background core requirements will not count toward satisfying the graduate distribution requirements (see below). Most students entering the program with a B.A. in philosophy will already have satisfied this requirement.

General overview of our graduate programs

1. M.A. in Philosophy

To earn an M.A. in Philosophy, students must complete 32 credit hours of graduate coursework. Twelve of those hours (four courses) at the graduate seminar level must satisfy distribution requirements in the history of philosophy, metaphysics, ethics, and the theory of knowledge. Twenty hours required for the M.A. may be taken in subjects of the student's choosing. At the end of his or her period of study each M.A. student must also pass an oral M.A. exam, focused on a paper he/she has written of 30-40 pages.

The program is designed so that full-time students can complete requirements for the M.A. in two years.

2. Ph.D. in Philosophy

To earn a Ph.D. in Philosophy, students must complete 48 credit hours of graduate coursework. Fifteen hours (five courses) must satisfy distribution requirements in the history of philosophy, metaphysics, ethics, and the theory of knowledge. Usually, thirty-three of the forty-eight hours of coursework required for the Ph.D. may be

taken in subjects of the student's choosing. We encourage students to focus early on a particular area of interest while continuing to acquire a broad education in philosophy which will qualify them to become teachers.

Ph.D. students must also pass 1) a qualifying exam in the fifth semester that tests students on their general knowledge of the history of philosophy, metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, 2) a language exam (reading competence in a language related to one's dissertation topic is required for the Ph.D.; a course in meta-logic may be substituted for the language requirement by students working in appropriate areas), 3) a dissertation prospectus exam, and 4) an oral dissertation defense based on the dissertation.

The program is designed so that full-time students can complete requirements for the Ph.D. in four to six years.

Proseminar requirement for all graduate students

In addition to fulfilling the requirements detailed above, all entering graduate students are required to take the 1 credit hour Graduate Proseminar in Philosophy (PHIL 520) during their first year in residence. This course serves as an introduction to graduate study in philosophy at UNM. This includes introduction to the faculty and to their research programs, as well as an opportunity for scholarly interaction with fellow graduate students. The course is offered once a year.

NB: The official departmental description of the M.A. and Ph.D. programs, posted on the departmental website, is contained in Appendix II.1 (or access: <http://www.unm.edu/%7Ethinker/grad%20details.html#General%20Policies>).

• Broad learning goals for graduate students in Philosophy

General learning goals for all graduate students in Philosophy

The graduate programs in philosophy are aimed at broadening and deepening the knowledge of philosophy that our students began to acquire at the undergraduate level while at the same time guiding them in focusing on a particular area of specialization. The ultimate aim of the graduate programs is to enable students to produce original research in some area of philosophy which will potentially contribute to the advancement of the discipline. To that end, the further development of written and oral communication skills is essential. Through the completion of our programs, our graduate students are also exposed to the expectations and demands of a professional career in academic philosophy.

Given these general aims, many of the broad learning goals are the same for both the M.A. and Ph.D. programs. However, we expect the level of knowledge, the development of communication skills, and the originality and creativity of the research of our Ph.D. students to significantly exceed those of our M.A. students, who are typically in our department for only two years.

Knowledge of Philosophy: Given that all our graduate students must complete the “background core” requirements described above, and given as well that most of our in-coming students have an undergraduate degree in philosophy, we expect that the students entering our graduate programs will already have a broad knowledge of both the history of philosophy and the different problem areas of philosophy (such as ethics, metaphysics, and epistemology). Our goal in our graduate programs is to broaden and deepen their knowledge of philosophy by offering graduate seminars that emphasize (1) the relationship between the different problem areas of philosophy and the history of philosophy, and (2) the problems that dominate contemporary philosophy.

In regard to (1), graduate students must complete at least one seminar, and in most cases will complete several seminars, dedicated to a central figure or an important movement in the history of philosophy. In these seminars, graduate students are expected to do close and careful readings of primary texts, but they are also expected to stay mindful of how the works of central historical figures gave rise to problems in contemporary philosophy. For instance, when discussing Descartes’ *Meditations*, students are expected to understand the context in which this landmark text was written and know, for instance, that Descartes was responding to the Scholastic philosophy of the early seventeenth century as they try to interpret the text. But they are also encouraged to remain aware of how Descartes’ suggestions regarding human knowledge, free will, and the existence of God helped motivate many of the central questions that continue to shape discussions in contemporary epistemology, ethics, and metaphysics.

In regard to (2), graduate students must complete at least one course in each of the main problem areas of philosophy, namely, metaphysics, ethics, and the theory of knowledge. In these seminars, students are exposed to recent literature that addresses some of the problems that characterize contemporary philosophy. For instance, recent seminars have addressed the current popularity of contextualism in epistemology, the importance of Kantian themes in late 20th Century ethics, and recent metaphysical attempts to explain causation and the nature of space and time by appeal to science. Moreover, by completing the Proseminar requirement, our graduate students are introduced to the contributions our faculty members are making to the contemporary philosophical landscape. Recent faculty presentations have focused on current debates in Indian Philosophy, Kierkegaard scholarship, and 20th Century Continental philosophy.

Ability to Carry Out Philosophical Research:

In the course of studying the history and the different systematic areas of philosophy in greater breadth and depth students naturally find themselves drawn to certain figures or philosophical issues about which they believe they have something unique and interesting to say. Students at this point are expected, with the mentorship of individual faculty in independent studies and in chosen seminars, to begin to develop expertise in a chosen area of specialization that will

eventually serve as the basis for writing a work of original philosophical research. Students must master the primary and secondary literature of the problem or figure in which they are interested, acquiring whatever technical skills may be necessary to comprehend that literature. They must learn to formulate a clear thesis that articulates an interpretation of the thought of a particular philosophical figure or the solution of a particular philosophical problem. They must be able to relate their thesis to current secondary literature, explaining among other things how their project constitutes an original contribution to the field. They should be able to develop their thesis thoroughly, rigorously, and at length, laying the historical and/or theoretical groundwork for it, constructing a comprehensive argument for it, and defending it against possible objections.

Scholarship Skills: Essential to being able to carry out philosophical research are two fundamental skills that graduate students must develop throughout the course of their studies: the ability to write publishable papers and the ability to communicate ideas orally, whether in general seminar discussions or paper presentations.

In regard to their written work, we set the standards very high in our graduate seminars and expect students to compose research papers that reflect their knowledge of primary texts, their understanding of the problems emerging from the texts, and their ability to propose novel ways for addressing these problems. Doing so, of course, requires that our students know how to craft a clear and well-organized paper, but they must also be able to articulate their ideas in a way that meets the standards of professional philosophy. In particular, they must be able to motivate the problems they address, usually by appeal to current debates in contemporary scholarship, and argue for the novelty and effectiveness of the approach they wish to defend. We expect our students to hone these skills by applying feedback they receive from faculty members and also by applying principles of writing learned from reading secondary literature to their own written work.

We also want our students to develop their abilities to communicate orally. We thus encourage our graduate students to actively participate in seminar discussions and also, in some cases, require that they prepare presentations and lead the seminar on a chosen day. All our graduate students must also complete oral examinations during the course of their studies. Our M.A. students must orally defend a research paper, and our Ph.D. students must give an oral defense of their dissertation prospectus and their dissertation. They may also elect to take the qualifying exam, which gauges their general knowledge of the history of philosophy, metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, as an oral exam.

For students working in an area of the history of philosophy an additional skill is necessary for research, namely, the ability to read the texts they will be focusing on in the original language(s) in which they were composed. Thus, Ph.D. students

working in the history of philosophy are required to pass a reading comprehension exam in a language related to their dissertation topic.

Knowledge of Professional Philosophy: In addition to broadening and deepening our students' knowledge of philosophy, providing them with the basic scholarly skills necessary for carrying out philosophical research, and guiding them in producing a work of original scholarship, we want to introduce our graduate students to the standards and conventions of the academic profession of philosophy. They should, for instance, know the major professional organizations and journals in philosophy, the journals that publish papers in their area of specialization, and the annual conferences where they can present their research. Though much of this knowledge is passed on to students through mentoring by faculty in independent study and thesis and dissertation work, we have recently added a new session to our annual Proseminar ("A Beginner's Guide to Professional Philosophy") that, among other things, introduces students to the major philosophical organizations as well as outlets for presenting and publishing their work.

Moreover, we want our students to be familiar with the professional standards of publication and conference presentation. Our students will gain much of this knowledge by reading secondary literature in their fields and by attending the talks that are part of our colloquium series. We also actively encourage and financially support our students attending and reading papers at national meetings of the American Philosophical Association.

We want our students to be prepared for the next stage of their professional career in philosophy. Whether they are M.A. students moving on to a Ph.D. program or Ph.D. students moving on to a job at an institution of higher learning, our students should know how to prepare a professional CV, write a statement of research interests, and compose letters of application for an academic position. Though much of this knowledge is gained from consulting with a faculty advisor, these skills are also covered in our annual Proseminar.

Values: We wish to inculcate two values of particular importance for graduate students in philosophy: *intellectual independence* and *intellectual integrity*. Intellectual independence is the resolve to take upon oneself all that is necessary to become an expert in one's chosen field. Although one should certainly seek guidance from faculty mentors, one recognizes, in the end, that philosophy is a solitary quest bounded only by one's own desire and ability, and that philosophers of substance are largely self-taught. Successful graduate students should be committed to acquiring on their own, without external guidelines or limits, whatever knowledge and skills are necessary to excel in their areas of specialization.

Intellectual integrity is a commitment to openness and honesty in the pursuit of knowledge. It includes a willingness to recognize when one has made a mistake or

failed adequately to comprehend an idea and to make appropriate corrections; the courage to take risks – to advance theses, for instance, which attempt to take the discipline in new directions; and the perseverance to keep working on the solution of a problem until one gets it right. Intellectual integrity is the very heart of philosophy; it is the virtue that yields philosophical results of substance and moves the discipline forward.

Given the distinctive character of our department, there is another value that we seek to cultivate in our graduate programs. Many if not most philosophy departments that offer graduate degrees focus entirely on the Western philosophical tradition and emphasize either the history of philosophy, analytic philosophy, or Continental philosophy. Our department cannot be classified in this way. While many of our faculty members are trained primarily in Western philosophy, we have a distinctive strength in non-Western/Asian philosophy, and our faculty members have a diverse set of interests and specialties that span the history of philosophy and trends in contemporary analytic and Continental philosophy. Given the distinctive character of our department, and thus, the distinctive character of our course offerings at the graduate level, we want our graduate students to develop an appreciation for the diversity of approaches that one can adopt in addressing philosophical problems.

Learning goals specific to our graduate programs

1. M.A. Program

By developing the knowledge, skills, and values listed above, we want our M.A. students to be prepared for further study of philosophy. In particular, we want them to have a solid understanding of what will be expected of them, both as scholars and professionals, if they continue their study of philosophy at the doctoral-level. For students who seek a terminal M.A. degree and do not intend to pursue further graduate study, the goal of the M.A. program is to offer further opportunity, for those who have developed an interest in a particular area of philosophy at the undergraduate level, for the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake. (Philosophy is distinct from other areas of study in that students frequently pursue it without any conscious economic objective! Aristotle was the first to comment on this – and to suggest that it is indicative of the unique value of philosophy.)

2. Ph.D. Program

By developing the knowledge, skills, and values listed above, we want our Ph.D. students to be prepared for an academic career in philosophy. The goals above will help them develop as scholars, researchers, and members of the professional community. There is a further goal for our Ph.D. students: we want to prepare them for service as teachers to undergraduate students. Thus, all our Ph.D. candidates are given teaching responsibilities throughout their time in our program. They usually begin their training as graders for a large section of a lower-division course, such as PHIL 101: Introduction to Philosophy. Then, within two semesters, they move on to teach independently a section of PHIL 156: Reasoning and Critical Thinking. We

currently require that each course taught independently by our Ph.D. students be observed by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member. The faculty member writes an evaluation of the session observed, which is placed in the student's file, and, in some cases, also meets with the student to discuss her or his teaching performance.

- **Student learning outcomes (SLOs) for graduate programs in Philosophy**

General student learning outcomes for all graduate students in Philosophy

In measuring the success of our students, we focus on the very knowledge, skills, and values that we want our graduate students to acquire in the course of their studies. Thus, our student learning outcomes (SLOs) are in general:

1. Students can explain the main problems of metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics in depth, appropriate to a teacher of philosophy at the college level.
2. Students can give a thorough, detailed account of the history of philosophy from ancient to modern times, identifying its major periods, movements, and figures, appropriate to a teacher of philosophy at the college level.
3. Students can give an overview of the current state of knowledge and research in a chosen field of specialization, referencing both major primary works and important secondary studies.
4. Students can formulate a thesis expressing an interpretation of the thought of a particular figure in the history of philosophy or the solution of a particular problem in contemporary philosophy.
5. Students can write a publishable philosophy paper.
6. Students can present a paper at a professional conference, preferably one of the national meetings of the American Philosophical Association.
7. Students can compose a work of original philosophical research built around a clearly articulated thesis and constituting, arguably, a contribution to a particular field of philosophical study.

Student learning outcomes specific to our graduate programs

1. M.A. in Philosophy

The specific goal of the M.A. is to prepare students to go on to the Ph.D. Thus, both programs share the same overall goals. However, it is not expected that M.A. students will demonstrate the same level of proficiency as Ph.D. students. Completion of the distribution requirement in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics for M.A. students emphasizes outcome 1, while completion of the distribution requirement in history of philosophy emphasizes outcome 2. All of a student's coursework will contribute to achieving outcomes 4, 5, and 6 (some of our M.A. students indeed give presentations at national conventions). The M.A. Plan II paper or Plan I thesis, finally, emphasizes outcomes 3 and 7.

2. Ph.D. in Philosophy

The specific goal of the Ph.D. program is to prepare students for an academic career in philosophy, more specifically, to be instructors of philosophy. As for the M.A. program, completion of the distribution requirement in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics emphasizes outcome 1, while completion of the distribution requirement in history of philosophy emphasizes outcome 2. Independent preparation for the qualifying exam also contributes significantly to the realization of these outcomes. Again, as for the M.A. program, all of a student's other coursework will contribute to achieving outcomes 4, 5, and 6. Ph.D. students are expected, in the course of their study, to give a presentation at a national meeting of the APA. Finally, the writing of a dissertation and all that it involves, including the writing of the prospectus, prospectus exam, and dissertation defense, contribute to achieving outcomes 4 through 6 as well, but especially emphasize outcomes 4 and 7.

II. Assessment of Learning Objectives

- **Measurement tools**

As for the undergraduate programs, the Philosophy Department faculty feels that the best way to measure the achievement of the above-described learning objectives for our graduate programs is to assess a body of written work that graduate students produce during their course of study. Each of our graduate programs culminates in the writing and defense of a work of original philosophical scholarship, the M.A. thesis or Plan II paper and the Ph.D. dissertation. In addition, students will have written substantial papers in each of the seminars they have taken satisfying distribution requirements. The faculty also remain confident in the "oral defense" of the M.A. paper or Ph.D. dissertation as an effective measure of not only the student's knowledge of his/her area of specialization but also of the field of philosophy as a whole – since in the defense the student must typically show how his/her thesis relates to relevant problem areas as well as the history of philosophy – and, not least of all, of his/her skill as a philosophical interlocutor. Thus, for each graduate program the Philosophy Department envisions two principal types of measurement tools:

- (1) Portfolios of writing assignments completed to satisfy degree requirements; and
- (2) Evaluations of final oral presentations of research.

The justification of these measurement tools is much the same as that for the measurement tools for the undergraduate programs. Essentially, the same basic skills and knowledge that are developed as an undergraduate major in Philosophy are to be brought to fuller expression by graduate students. In addition, however, graduate students are expected to achieve expertise in a certain area of specialization and to conduct an original research project that contributes to that area.

- **Assessment of measurement tools**

M.A. Program

1. Portfolios

Every M.A. student, in his/her last semester, will be asked to assemble a portfolio consisting of: (1) three papers submitted for courses that satisfy distribution requirements in the history of philosophy, metaphysics, ethics, or the theory of knowledge; (2) the M.A. thesis or Plan II paper.

Every fourth year, a committee of four faculty will review and assess a selection of the portfolios for all M.A. students who graduated during the previous four years according to a scoring rubric.

2. Evaluation of final oral presentations

Oral defenses of theses and Plan II papers by M.A. students will be evaluated by their examining committees according to a standard rubric, to be developed in Fall 2008, which will specifically measure SLO's 1 or 2 (depending on the topic of the paper), 3, and 4. Every fourth year, the same committee of faculty who review the M.A. portfolios will also review the oral exam reports of the previous four years and compile a summary report.

Ph.D. Program

1. Portfolios

Every Ph.D. student, in his/her last semester, will be asked to assemble a portfolio consisting of: (1) three papers submitted for courses that satisfy distribution requirements in the history of philosophy, metaphysics, ethics, or the theory of knowledge; (2) the Ph.D. dissertation.

Every fifth year, a committee of four faculty will review and assess the portfolios for all Ph.D. students who graduated during the preceding five-year period according to a scoring rubric.

2. Evaluation of final oral presentations

Oral dissertation defenses of Ph.D. students will be evaluated by their dissertation committees according to a standard rubric, to be developed in Fall 2008, which specifically measures SLO's 1 or 2 (depending on the topic of the paper), 3, and 4. Every fifth year, the same committee of faculty who review the M.A. portfolios will also review the oral exam reports of the preceding five-year period and compile a summary report.

Timeline for Implementation of Assessment Tools:

The department will begin the assessment of its graduate programs with the assessment of its M.A. program in AY 11-12, followed by an assessment of its Ph.D.

program in AY 12-13. The data collected from student portfolios and evaluations of oral presentations, along with an analysis of these sets of data, will be included in the Philosophy Department's annual outcomes assessment reports for the years in question.

III. Utilization of Assessment Findings

At the end of spring term, in years in which either the M.A. or Ph.D. program is being assessed, in the same meeting where the Department conducts its review of graduate students, the philosophy faculty will review a report of the Graduate OA Team (co-directed by the OA Coordinator and Graduate Director) which has reviewed the data for the graduate program being assessed that year and discuss whether they (the faculty) believe, in light of the report, any changes need to be made, both as pertains to individual courses and to the structure of the program overall.

4. Assessment of University Core Courses

In Spring 2007 the Philosophy Department began developing an OA plan for its general education courses, Phil. 101, 156, 201, and 202. This plan is contained in Appendix II.2. The plan was implemented in Fall 07. The Department submitted its first Annual Outcomes Assessment report to the Office of the Provost in June, 2008. This is contained in Appendix II.3. The report details the collection of outcomes data for these courses in AY 07-08 as well as the evaluation of the data by the Department and measures contemplated by the Department to enhance learning in these courses.

5. Teaching Excellence

The evaluation of faculty teaching independently of Outcomes Assessment, primarily through student evaluations and peer observations, remains an important way of measuring the Department's success in achieving its educational goals. Student learning is the product of two components: student performance and teacher performance. Outcomes Assessment seeks to measure the combined product of these two factors without distinguishing their individual contributions. Assessing teaching separately, therefore, is essential for focusing on teacher performance, the factor in learning over which the Department has the most direct control.

Philosophy faculty administer student teaching evaluations every semester in every course they teach. These evaluations, along with the syllabi and other materials for the course, are examined at the end of the semester by the chair. Each regular faculty member, teaching assistant, and part-time instructor is also observed by another faculty member at least once during the course of the academic year. At the end of the year, student evaluations and peer observations for both semesters are discussed by the chair in annual faculty evaluations. Concerns about teaching raised in evaluations by the chair are often taken up in further discussions with the faculty member. Meanwhile, peer observations are discussed between the observer and instructor, which is the basis for an

ongoing conversation among faculty, informally and in departmental meetings, about teaching methods and other pedagogical issues.

One indication of a department's commitment to excellent teaching is the winning of teaching awards by its faculty. In recent years, several Philosophy faculty have won major teaching awards. Prof. Thomson won the Gunter Starkey Award for Teaching Excellence in 2002-03; Prof. Becker won the Starkey Award in 2006-07; Prof. Dowski won the Outstanding Teacher of the Year Award also in 2006-07; and two of our teaching assistants, Carolyn Thomas and Mark Ralkowski, won the Outstanding Teaching Assistant of the Year Award in 2007-08.

Yet teaching evaluation scores are generally very high across the entire department for all categories of instructors: professors, teaching assistants, lecturers, and part-time instructors. As evidence of this we have included a summary of the teaching evaluations in all sections of courses offered by the Department in Spring 2008. See Appendix II.4. These statistics show, strikingly, an overall 'GPA' of 3.61 (on a four-point A to F scale) for the "rate the instructor" category in all sections of Phil. 101, of 3.68 for "rate the instructor" in all sections of Phil. 156, of 3.05 for "rate the instructor" for all sections of Phil. 201 and 202, of 3.71 in all 300-level courses, and of 3.86 in all 400- and 500-level courses. Individual evaluation sets with student comments for Spring 2008 will be made available to the external review team during its site visit.

6. Other Curriculum Initiatives, Undergraduate and Graduate

Preserving Educational Standards

The University of New Mexico is a "moderately selective" institution. It essentially accepts all New Mexico high school graduates with a cumulative GPA of 2.25. The ACT cutoff score is 18 (SAT combined score: 860). The mid-50% ACT range is 19-25.⁴ This is the range into which 50% of freshman ACT scores fall. (That is to say, the scores of 25% of entering freshmen fall below this range; those of 25% of entering freshmen fall above it.) This presents considerable challenges to faculty teaching undergraduates with a wide variation in levels of college preparedness. Faculty often feel they are faced with a dilemma in deciding how to "pitch" their courses: should they attempt to bring all students along, at perhaps the cost of covering less material or decreasing the level of difficulty; or should they persist in covering what they feel is dictated by the topic of the course, at perhaps the cost of leaving behind those students who "shouldn't be in college in the first place." The UNM Philosophy Department refuses to accept this as a real dilemma. It rejects the suggestion that educational standards have to be compromised in order to serve the needs of all students. Its faculty continually seek ways to present complex and difficult philosophical concepts through the reading and analysis of original sources that can be mastered by all students willing to

⁴ Compared to 21-26 for the University of Arizona and 23-28 for the University of Colorado, Boulder.

learn, while at the same time providing as many supports as possible for students who need help, especially in its core courses.

At the same time, the Department has recently come to recognize that students would benefit from an improved sequencing of philosophy courses, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, and therefore has undertaken an extensive revision of its offerings listed in the UNM Catalogue. It began its review of Catalogue courses in fall of 2007, completing it finally at its fall retreat in August, 2008. The changes will be submitted to the Office of the Registrar in November, 2008, with the hope that they will be approved by the appropriate University committees by the end of Spring term, 2009. We envision these revisions serving five purposes.

- (1) They will provide a more rational sequencing and grouping of our undergraduate offerings, which will enable students (and advisors) to understand more easily which philosophy course is appropriate for a student at a certain stage.
- (2) They will introduce more appropriate prerequisites for our undergraduate courses, thereby ensuring that undergraduates have the right preparation for a given course.
- (3) They will “decouple” 300-level courses from 500-level courses, thereby reducing the pedagogical challenges of 300-level courses by ensuring that the students taking them have approximately the same level of preparation.
- (4) At the advanced undergraduate level 400-level courses will still be coupled with 500-level (graduate) courses, or else they will be starred (i.e., they may be taken for graduate credit with the instructor’s permission). However, in accordance with a new policy of the Faculty Senate Graduate committee, 400-500 level courses will include only undergraduates who are classified as seniors. This will make these courses more effective as graduate courses. Meanwhile, it will be departmental policy to allow graduate students to take 400* courses only when essential to their programs of study.
- (5) A sequence of seminars at the 600 level exclusively for Ph.D. students specializing in Indian philosophy has been introduced. (This in effect formalizes the tutorials in Sanskrit texts that have been conducted by Profs. Hayes and Taber the past five years. See below.)

A draft of the proposed catalogue changes is to be found in Appendix II.5.

The “Student Success” Program

In Fall 2005 the Philosophy Department was awarded a “Success TA-ship” to enhance student learning in University core courses. It was up to the Department’s discretion to devise an effective way of employing the Success TA. After experimenting with supplemental instruction sessions for Phil. 101 outside regular class times, which were poorly attended, the Department decided to introduce discussion sections held every other week during regular class periods in one supersection of 101 each semester. The purpose of the discussion sections was not just to allow students opportunity for freer

discussion of the material covered in the lectures, but also to review for exams and provide assistance in preparing upcoming paper assignments. The students have responded very favorably to this format, and the Department will continue to employ it in at least one supersection per term, with the consent of the instructor. An increase of a ½ TA-ship in Fall 2007 has made it possible now to split the class into two sections on “discussion Fridays.” The full-time Success TA has been an entering Ph.D. student assigned to this position for the full year (instead of moving into a stand-alone section of Phil. 156 Spring semester, as other first-year TA’s do). The half-time TA, who assists the full-time TA, has been an M.A. student.

In Fall 2008 the Department will attempt to measure the success of its “Success Program” by comparing student outcomes in its success supersection with those of other sections of 101. Student outcomes for Phil. 101 emphasize the development of writing and reading comprehension skills.

Advanced Instruction in Sanskrit

In 2002 the Department made a decision to replace Prof. Sturm (in advance of his retirement) with Richard Hayes, a noted specialist in South Asian Buddhist thought from McGill University (see Sec. I.5) This would allow the Department to develop a focus in Indian philosophy at the graduate level, under the joint direction of Profs. Hayes, Taber, and Bussanich, with the potential to train students to read Sanskrit philosophical texts. Since Fall 2005 the Department has attracted several excellent graduate students (Laura Guerrero, Ethan Mills, John Hartnett [M.A.], Stephen Harris, and Jeremy Martin) with at least two years’ previous study of Sanskrit. In addition to completing their regular Philosophy requirements students specializing in Indian philosophy participate in a tutorial each semester in which they are introduced to the literature of a particular school of Indian philosophy and read representative texts. These tutorials are, with the implementation of the Catalogue changes discussed above, to be formalized as a sequence of rotating Ph.D. seminars designed to give Indian philosophy students in-depth knowledge of some of the most important thinkers and systems of classical Indian philosophy as well as to develop proficiency in reading Sanskrit philosophical literature. As students move toward their dissertations they enroll in independent study (Phil. 651) with individual faculty, advancing further in their knowledge of Sanskrit as they read the texts that will be the focus of their dissertations. It is the firm conviction of not only the Indian philosophy faculty but all faculty in the Department that students working in the history of philosophy should be able to access historical materials in their original languages.

7. Extracurricular Programs of the Philosophy Department

Besides its academic degree programs the Philosophy Department offers a variety of other programs that serve the Department, the University community, and the citizens of New Mexico.

The O'Neil Lecture Series

Since 1988 the Philosophy Department has sponsored the **O'Neil Lecture Series**, a series of two public lectures, usually taking place in the spring, presented by a distinguished scholar in the history of philosophy. The series is named after Prof. Brian O'Neil, a popular and influential member of the Department in the '70's and '80's, who died of cancer in 1985. It is supported by a small endowment. The lectures are widely advertised in the University and Albuquerque communities. In fall of 2007 over four hundred people attended an O'Neil Lecture given by Slavoj Zizek. The series is also an opportunity for faculty and graduate students, in particular, to get to know and interact with famous philosophers. Appendix II.6 is a list of the O'Neil speakers of the last nine years.

The Philosophy Department Colloquium Series

The Philosophy Department also sponsors a regular **colloquium series**. Colloquium talks are held most Friday afternoons in the departmental library (Humanities 519) during the term, though recently we have had to move to a larger venue in Dane Smith Hall. These lectures, which feature leading philosophers from other U.S. universities and abroad, are well attended by philosophy faculty and students as well as students and faculty from other departments and members of the Albuquerque community. They are advertised by flyers posted around campus and by an announcement that goes out to our extensive email list. Appendix II.7 contains a list of selected colloquium speakers since Fall, 1999. Funding to support travel of outside speakers is provided by the Gwen Barrett Foundation.

The UNM Graduate Student Philosophy Conference

Since 2003 the Philosophy Department has hosted an **annual graduate student philosophy conference**, which is organized and run by our graduate students. Each year a leading philosopher from another university is invited as the keynote speaker. Programs from the last three years ("The End of Philosophy," "Philosophy and Popular Culture," and "Philosophy and Its History") are found in Appendix II.8. The conferences have been partially supported by grants from the College of Arts and Sciences. Many of our students have presented papers at these conferences, but students from other universities have also attended and read papers. The quality of the papers has been very high. For the last three years the Department has covered the costs of publishing the proceedings of the conferences. Although we encourage our students to submit papers to other philosophy conferences, especially divisional meetings of the APA (the American Philosophical Association), we find that our own conference provides a particularly supportive, stimulating venue in which students may present and receive feedback about their work.

In spring of 06 the Philosophy Department hosted the annual meeting of the **Southwest Seminar in Early Modern Philosophy**, which also provided our undergraduate and graduate students the opportunity to hear papers by first-rate scholars in the field and to meet and talk with them.

The Philosophy Club and Phi Sigma Tau

In fall of 2005 Prof. Mary Domski, the Undergraduate Advisor, organized the **UNM Philosophy Club**. Membership is open to all UNM students, but the most active members have been undergraduate Philosophy majors. The club meets at least a couple times each month during the school year, usually Tuesday evenings in the Philosophy Department lounge. Food (pizza) and refreshments are provided by the Department. Events have included: meet-and-greet sessions for new faculty, presentations by students and faculty of their work, open discussions of philosophical problems of general interest, and forums on issues relating to the profession, such as how to apply to graduate school, etc.

The Philosophy Dept. also has a chapter of **Phi Sigma Tau**, the national philosophy honor society for undergraduates. Members are formally elected to this club at the end of spring term on the basis of at least a 3.5 GPA in Philosophy. The current faculty advisor for Phi Sigma Tau is Prof. Burgess. Phi Sigma Tau also sponsors a variety of events for Philosophy students and faculty throughout the year.

The Summer Seminar on Buddhism

Every June the Philosophy Department sponsors, together with the Religious Studies Program and Rinzai-Ji Zen Center, a two-week seminar on Buddhism, held at the Bodhi Manda Zen Center in Jemez Springs. The Seminar was founded in 1977 by Kyozan Joshu Sasaki Roshi, the spiritual head of Rinzai-Ji, for the purpose of providing more accurate information about Buddhism for American students and practitioners. The Seminar is open to the public, but many participants are UNM students, who may obtain three hours of UNM credit, under Phil./Relig. 440/540, "Buddhist Sutras Seminar," by attending both weeks. Usually about 15-20 UNM students attend. The UNM course is administered by an instructor appointed by the Philosophy Department. Internationally-known Buddhologists are brought in to give lectures. Past speakers have included Carl Bielefeldt (Stanford), Philip Yampolsky (Columbia), Martin Colcutt (Princeton), Houston Smith (Syracuse University), Frederick Streng (Southern Methodist University), Harold Roth (Brown University), Peter Gregory (Smith College), Jay Garfield (Smith College), and Robert Buswell (UCLA). In the early days of the Seminar leading Japanese philosophers were invited, such as Keiji Nishitani and Masao Aabe. The Seminar provides an invaluable opportunity for our students to study Buddhism with distinguished experts in Buddhist Studies while participating in the life of a Buddhist monastery.

Section III: Institutional Contributions

The Philosophy Department has a history of contributing extensively to other programs throughout the University, but especially in the College of Arts and Sciences, both through the courses it offers and the activities of its faculty.

1. General Education and Core Curriculum

The Philosophy Department offers four courses which are included in the University core curriculum: Phil. 101, "Introduction to Philosophical Problems," in the Humanities category; Phil. 156, "Reasoning and Critical Thinking," in the Writing and Speaking category; and Phil. 201, "Greek Philosophy," and 202, "Modern Philosophy," also in the Humanities category.

The Philosophy Department is known for having regular faculty (as opposed to exclusively graduate TA's or part-time instructors) teach University core courses. Every semester at least two "supersections" of Phil. 101, which enroll 120 students or more, are taught by full-time faculty, preferably our most successful lecturers, who are assisted by graduate student graders. Some other, smaller sections of 101 are taught every term by TA's and part-time instructors (PTI's). Phil. 201 and 202, which are also offered every term in sections of 50-100 students, are taught *only* by regular, full-time faculty. Since these are the only philosophy courses many UNM students will ever take, the Department feels that it is important that they are of the highest possible quality, therefore that they are taught by our most experienced and knowledgeable instructors. We also think it is important for regular faculty to be acquainted first-hand with the pedagogical challenges TA's face in teaching lower division courses.

Phil. 156 is a course that stresses learning to write philosophical essays. Students are introduced to the principles of informal logic and argument analysis, as well as the fundamentals of style and essay form. Thus, it serves as a basic writing course, similar to – but, we believe, in certain respects more rigorous than – English 102. Writing portfolios consisting of assignments from courses besides English 101 and 102, such as Phil. 156, may already be submitted by students to meet the undergraduate writing requirement; in fact, the English Department now encourages students to do, for the sake of providing multiple options. One of the strategic initiatives of the Philosophy Department is to have Phil. 156 formally recognized as fulfilling part of the University writing requirement, perhaps substituting for English 102. At this time, the Philosophy writing program, consisting in up to ten sections (of approx. 30-40 students) of Phil. 156 per semester, is administered by our TA's, supervised by the 156 Advisor. Faculty observations and student evaluations indicate that this is a highly successful course, which we believe has much to do with the fact that all of our TA's are carefully screened Ph.D. students. Recognition of Phil. 156 as partially satisfying the University writing requirement will require the addition of more sections of 156, consequently a substantial increase in the number of TA lines in Philosophy. (See Sec. IX, Strategic Plan objective 1.)

2. The English-Philosophy and Economics-Philosophy Degrees

Philosophy is a richly interdisciplinary field. In the Middle Ages it received the title “Queen of the sciences” because it was considered to rule over all the sciences insofar as it examines their fundamental presuppositions and methodologies. Logic falls under philosophy; at the very least, philosophy relates to all other disciplines to the extent that they employ logic and argumentation. In turn, philosophy is influenced by developments in virtually every other field of study, from mathematics to quantum physics, biology, cognitive science, anthropology, and history.

The Philosophy Department proudly boasts participation in two interdepartmental degrees, the English-Philosophy major and the Economics-Philosophy major. Both of these have been described in the previous section of this self-study. The former, which is the more popular, allows students to explore ideas as they are expressed in both literature and philosophy and the relationships between these two disciplines. The Economics-Philosophy major provides students interested in economics the opportunity to focus on its theoretical foundations.

3. Religious Studies and Asian Studies

The **Religious Studies Program** originated in the Philosophy Department in the 1970’s when Matthieu Casalis was hired to develop a curriculum of religious studies courses. An interdepartmental program in religious studies was founded in 1971. Prof. Andrew Burgess assumed responsibility for the program in 1978 and served as its director until 2005. Several other faculty have been actively involved in the Religious Studies program, in particular, Profs. Sturm, Bussanich, and Taber. Currently, Prof. Hayes serves on the Religious Studies Committee. It seems accurate to say that the Philosophy Department and its faculty have had primary responsibility for the Religious Studies Program for most of its existence. The Department continues to see Religious Studies as central to the liberal arts mission of the College of Arts and Sciences and is committed to supporting it in any way that is consistent with its mission as a philosophy department.

Numerous Philosophy courses are also offered as Religious Studies courses. These include the following:

Phil. 331/531 Ch’an and Zen Buddhism	also offered as (aoa): Relig. 331/531
Phil. 360/560 Christian Classics	aoa : Relig. 360/560
Phil. 361/561 Modern Christian Thought	aoa : Relig. 361/561
Phil. 365/565 Philosophy of Religion	aoa : Relig. 365/565

Phil. 389/589 Latin American Thought I	aoa : Relig. 389/589
Phil. 390/590 Latin American Thought II	aoa : Relig. 390/590
Phil. 404/504 Augustine	aoa : Relig. 404/504
Phil. 413/513 Kierkegaard	aoa : Relig. 413/513
Phil. 438/538 Buddhist Philosophy – India	aoa : Relig. 438/538
Phil. 439/539 Buddhist Philosophy – China	aoa : Relig. 439/539
Phil. 440/540 Buddhist Sutras Seminar	aoa : Relig. 440/540
Phil. 449/549 The Bhagavad Gita and Yoga	aoa : Relig. 449

Besides the Religious Studies Program, the Philosophy Department has played a key role in the administration of the **Asian Studies Program** since its inception. Prof. Sturm served as director of the program for many years; other Philosophy faculty have been or currently are on the Asian Studies Committee, e.g., Prof. Goodman, Hayes, and Taber. Several Philosophy courses currently in the catalogue are on the Asian Studies course list: Phil. 334, “Philosophies of India;” Phil. 336, “Chinese Philosophy I;” Phil. 337, “Chinese Philosophy II;” Phil. 348, “Comparative Philosophy;” Phil. 438, “Buddhist Philosophy – India;” Phil. 439, “Buddhist Philosophy – China;” Phil. 440, “Buddhist Sutras Seminar;” and Phil. 449, “The Bhagavad Gita and Yoga.”

4. Contributions of Philosophy to Other Degree Programs in the College of Arts and Sciences

Numerous Philosophy courses may also be taken for credit toward degrees in other programs. **Latin American Studies** lists Phil. 389 and 390 (see above) as approved electives for its undergraduate major and includes their graduate-level counterparts for its Religion and Philosophy concentration for the M.A. **European Studies** includes numerous Philosophy courses on its list of approved courses for the major (<http://www.unm.edu/~eurost/approved-courses%202-08.pdf>). **Medieval Studies** lists Phil. 308, “Medieval Philosophy,” as an approved elective. Phil. 358, “Ethical Theory,” is included under courses that may be taken for the **Peace Studies** minor. Conversely, the Department regularly cross-lists courses from other programs, especially **Women Studies**, that we believe will be of interest to philosophy students and may count toward a Philosophy major, for example, WS 324, “Contemporary Feminist Theory,” and WS 410, “Introduction to Feminist Theory.”

There are, besides all these courses that officially satisfy requirements for majors and minors in other programs, numerous other Philosophy courses that support other fields of study and are taken as electives, at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, by students from other departments. These are listed below together with the fields of study they support:

Philosophy course	Supported discipline(s)
Phil. 350/550 Philosophy of Science	all the natural sciences
Phil. 415/515 Hist. and Phil. of Math	mathematics
Phil. 445/545 Philosophy of Language	linguistics
Phil. 367/567 Phil. Art and Aesthetics	fine arts, English, foreign languages
Phil. 332/532 American Philosophy	American studies
Phil. 371/571 Classical Social and Political Philosophy	political science
Phil. 372/572 Modern Social and Political Philosophy	political science
Phil. 384 Philosophy of Mind, Phil. 358 Ethical Theory, Phil. 441 Philosophy and Psychoanalysis	psychology
Phil. 381/581 Philosophy of Law and Morals	political science, criminology

Finally, while the Philosophy Department's strength in Indian philosophy allows it to make extensive contributions to other programs, especially Religious Studies and Asian Studies, its strength in continental philosophy provides support for higher-level studies in several disciplines that are related closely to continental philosophy, especially **English, Women Studies, Comparative Literature**, and what is broadly called **Cultural Studies** (including Africana Studies, Chicano Hispano Mexicano Studies, American Studies, etc.) Many of the theories employed in these disciplines derive from ideas of leading twentieth-century continental thinkers such as Heidegger, Freud, Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, and Levinas. The Philosophy Department, by frequently offering advanced undergraduate courses and seminars on these figures (usually under Phil. 441/541, "Philosophical Movements" and Phil. 442/542, "Individual Philosophers"), serves as an essential resource for students and faculty in other departments needing to understand the historical and philosophical background of the theories they work with. Some of the seminars the Department has offered in recent years meeting this need are: "Levinas," "Heidegger," "Being and Time," "Orientalism," "Twentieth-Century French Thought," "Postmodern Epistemology," "Psychoanalysis and European Philosophy," and "Post-War French Political Philosophy."

5. The BA/MD Program and Applied Ethics

In spring of 2007 the Philosophy Department was approached the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences with a request to search for a new faculty member who could teach a range of ethics courses in the Philosophy Department and also offer the capstone seminar on biomedical ethics in the newly-established Combined BA/MD program. The BA/MD Program, which is administered by a committee of faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences, is an enhanced pre-med program for gifted undergraduates who are pre-selected for UNM's medical school. Preference is given to students from

rural New Mexico who intend to return and practice in their communities upon completing medical school. The curriculum of the program, which is now in its third year, culminates with a capstone seminar on biomedical ethics, HMHV 401, "Ethics, Medicine, and Health." After a national search the Department hired Dr. Paul Katsafanas (Ph.D. Harvard University) in spring of 2008 for this position. Prof. Katsafanas will significantly enhance the Department's offerings in ethical theory and also teach the BA/MD capstone seminar on a regular basis. He will also have committee service duties in the BA/MD Program. The Department, meanwhile, which already offers a popular course Phil. 245, "Professional Ethics," which usually covers biomedical ethics, will introduce a new course, Phil. 368, "Biomedical Ethics," along with the revision of its catalogue courses (see Sec. II.6) in fall of 2008.

Another of the Department's popular offerings in applied ethics has been Phil. 363/563, "Environmental Ethics," which is regularly taught by one of our lecturers, Dr. Lisa Gerber. In Spring 2009 Dr. Gerber will offer a seminar on "Aldo Leopold and the Land Ethic," in conjunction with the centennial of Aldo Leopold's visit to New Mexico, which is being celebrated widely in the Southwest. (Dr. Gerber, it should be noted, received her Ph.D. in Philosophy from UNM in 1999 under the supervision of Prof. Fred Schueler. Three current Ph.D. students are specializing in environmental ethics: Theresa Burke, Tara Kennedy, and Allison Hagerman.)

Section IV: Student Profile and Support Data

1. Undergraduate Enrollments and Majors

Like most departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, the Philosophy Department has seen healthy growth in both enrollment and majors over the five year period from AY 02-03 to AY 06-07.

Table 1: Undergraduate Credit Hours (Unrestricted), Majors⁵, and Degree Recipients⁶

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
a. Philosophy					
Credit Hours	7719	8408	8402	8658	8823
Majors	48	64	51	85	86
Graduates	7	15	14	17	13
b. English-Philosophy					
Credit Hours ⁷	33	24	30	18	0
Majors	19	20	22	19	25
Graduates	10	4	6	8	6
c. Economics-Philosophy					
Credit Hours ⁸	0	0	0	0	21
Majors	3	3	9	4	3
Graduates	0	0	0	2	2

The increase in unrestricted credit hours across all three of our majors from AY 2002-03 to 2006-07 is from 7752 to 8844, or 14%. This compares favorably with 12.8% growth in undergraduate student credit hours in the College of Arts and Sciences over the same period.⁹ The increase in our majors is from 70 to 114, or 61%. Major counts provided by the Office of the Registrar to the Philosophy Department from the last two spring semesters,¹⁰ which differ from the OIR statistics in the above table, confirm this substantial growth. In Spring 2007 there were 64 Philosophy majors, 22 English-Philosophy majors, and 6 Economics-Philosophy majors = a total of 92; in Spring 2008,

⁵ Counting only students admitted to the College of Arts and Sciences upon formally declaring Philosophy as their major.

⁶ Source: Office of Institutional Research (OIR).

⁷ This represents enrollment in Phil. 480, "Philosophy and Literature."

⁸ This represents enrollment in Phil. 485, "Philosophical Foundations of Economic Theory."

⁹ UNM Factbook 2006-07.

¹⁰ These are made available to the Undergraduate Advisor for the purpose of identifying majors.

81 Philosophy, 27 English-Philosophy, and 5 Economics-Philosophy = a total of 113. Moreover, the Office of the Registrar statistics also show 14 students who had selected Philosophy as a second major in Spring 2007 and 19 who had done so in Spring 2008, and – not least significantly – 70 students in University College, the college to which students are assigned as freshmen until they officially declare their majors, who had listed Philosophy as their *intended* major in Spring 2007 and 31 who had done so in Spring 2008. (Some students who have remained in University College as juniors and seniors in order to pursue Bachelor of University Studies degrees also list Philosophy as their major – 7 in Spring 2007 and 3 in Spring 2008 – and should be counted toward Philosophy majors.) Thus, it appears this growth will be sustained.

The Philosophy Department has not attempted to conduct scientific research to explain the growth in enrollment in Philosophy courses and majors. We suspect, however, that the following factors are involved:

1. an overall increase in enrollment at UNM,
2. the retention of full-time faculty lines in Philosophy (that is, faculty who have resigned or retired have been regularly replaced),
3. the acquisition of dynamic younger full-time faculty,
4. the featuring of “star” lecturers in Phil. 101 “supersections,”
5. strong teaching at all levels across the department,
6. an increase in the quality of graduate teaching assistants as admission standards to Ph.D. program have tightened,
7. improved undergraduate advising,
8. a national trend of increased interest in the study of philosophy among undergraduates.

Factors 4, 7, and 8, in particular, bear further comment.

Re 4: Several years ago the Department decided to merge sections of Phil. 101 into large “supersections” of anywhere from 120 to 260 students, which would be taught by our most successful lecturers. Three of the faculty who regularly teach these sections have won major teaching awards: Kelly Becker, Mary Domski, and Iain Thomson. In general, there has been a “youth movement” in the Department the last several years, marked by the hires of Thomson, Kalar, Becker, Domski, and Johnston – and now, this year, by the hires of Katsafanas and Livingston. Statistically, younger faculty receive higher student evaluation scores than older faculty. One should note, however, that Prof. Hayes, who was also brought on board during this period, consistently receives excellent evaluation scores, too.

Re 7: We have recently had two very conscientious and effective Undergraduate Advisors: Kelly Becker (from S 03 to S 05) and Mary Domski (F 05 to S 08). Prof. Becker was a gifted one-on-one advisor of students. Prof. Domski, besides being a very conscientious and accessible advisor, developed the Philosophy Club and a Listserv for Philosophy majors.

Re 8: As documentation of this point I have included, as Appendix IV.1, a recent *New York Times* article covering this trend.

2. Graduate Enrollment and Majors

While undergraduate enrollments have increased, graduate enrollments have remained steady or declined by about 10-11%, and student numbers have also decreased – by about 18% since Fall 2003 but even more dramatically since our last review in 1995, when we had a total of 45 graduate students. This reduction in size of the graduate program is the result of *deliberate* policy decisions made since our last external review. See Sec. I.5. *Overall, applications to the graduate program have increased significantly for entering classes from F 2003 to F 2008.* See Sec. IV.5 below.

Table 2: Graduate Credit Hours (Unrestricted), Majors, and Degree Recipients¹¹

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Credit Hours	449	446	392	402	387
Students enrolled M.A.	15	8	8	6	8
Students enrolled Ph.D.	13	16	17	17	15
M.A. recipients ¹²	5	4	6	7	1
Ph.D. recipients	1	1	1	1	1

The decision to reduce the size of our graduate program in order to improve its quality – both in terms of the caliber of students admitted to the program and the level of support we are able to provide them – has not had serious repercussions for overall graduate enrollment. The main drawback has been the reduction in the number of students available to fill sections of graduate-level courses. This has caused the department to rely to a great extent on “hybrid” 400/500-level and even 300/500-level courses, which include both graduate students and advanced undergraduates. As the Department moves away from such courses (it will still offer 400/500-level sections, but they will only be open to undergraduates who are seniors; see Sec.II.6.II and accompanying Catalogue Revisions) it hopes to bring the number of its M.A. students back up to around 12-15 while still maintaining high admission standards; indeed, it has already significantly increased the number of students admitted to the M.A. program in Spring 2008 (see Table 7). A total of around thirty graduate students in our program would still preserve an advantageous student-faculty ratio of 2.3 to 1.

3. Gender and Ethnicity

For its undergraduate and graduate programs the Philosophy Department shows a gender balance that appears to be consistent with national norms.

¹¹ Source: OIR.

¹² Includes M.A.’s received enroute to Ph.D.

Table 3: Enrollment and Degree Recipients by Gender

I. Undergraduates

a. Philosophy undergraduates admitted to program¹³

	F 03	F 04	F 05	F 06	F 07
Female	29	28	29	44	35
Male	41	59	53	64	78
Total	70	87	82	108	113
% Female	41%	32%	35%	41%	31%

b. Degree recipients

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Female	5	5	9	12	13
Male	12	14	11	15	8
Total	17	19	20	27	21
% Female	29%	26%	45%	44%	62%

II. Graduate Students

a. Graduate students admitted to program

	F 03	F 04	F 05	F 06	F 07
Female	12	10	12	10	9
Male	16	14	13	13	14
Total	28	24	25	23	23
% Female	43%	42%	48%	43%	39%

b. Graduate degree recipients¹⁴

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Female	2	3	3	1	2
Male	4	2	4	7	0
Total	6	5	7	8	2
% Female	33%	60%	43%	12.5%	100%

While there are no national statistics on undergraduate philosophy majors by gender and ethnicity, a few statistics are available on Ph.D.s in philosophy and the humanities. According to *Doctoral Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2005* (Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago, 2006) 49% of the Ph.D.'s in the category "other humanities" were awarded to women. The figure for female recipients of philosophy Ph.D.'s, however, is likely to be considerably lower. According to specific figures on philosophy Ph.D.'s in the same publication for the years 1991-96 (these are the most recent statistics available), women earned 27%, 24%, and 29% of the philosophy Ph.D.'s in 1994, 1995, and 1996, respectively. Thus, the UNM undergraduate numbers for female philosophy majors and graduates – 36% of majors overall for the period from Fall 2003 through Fall 2007 and 42% of graduates – may well be higher than the current national percentage. Meanwhile, the figures for women graduate students – 43% of

¹³ In all three majors: Philosophy, English-Philosophy, and Economics-Philosophy. Source: OIR.

¹⁴ Includes M.A.'s received enroute to Ph.D.

students in the M.A. and Ph.D. programs over the same period and 39% of the graduates – look quite encouraging in a discipline in which students traditionally have been mostly male.

The data on ethnicity in the undergraduate and graduate programs looks even more promising.

Table 4: Enrollment and Degree Recipients by Ethnicity¹⁵

I. Undergraduates

a. Philosophy undergraduates admitted to program¹⁶

	F 03	F 04	F 05	F 06	F 07
African-American	2	0	0	1	2
American Indian	3	5	2	6	7
Asian	0	0	2	3	4
Hispanic	15	17	22	30	29
White (non-Hispanic)	43	57	48	53	61
International	1	1	0	0	0
No Response	6	7	8	15	11
Total	70	87	82	108	113
Total Minority ¹⁷	20	22	26	40	41
% Minority	29%	25%	32%	37%	36%

b. Degree recipients

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
African-American	0	2	0	0	0
American Indian	1	0	1	1	1
Asian	1	0	0	0	1
Hispanic	2	2	5	4	7
White (non-Hispanic)	13	13	11	19	11
No Response	0	2	3	3	1
Total	17	19	20	27	21
Total Minority	4	4	6	5	9
% Minority	23.5%	21%	30%	18%	42%

II. Graduate Students

a. Graduate students admitted to program

	F 03	F 04	F 05	F 06	F 07
African-American	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian	1	1	1	0	0
Asian	1	1	1	1	1
Hispanic	6	3	4	2	2
White (non-Hispanic)	14	12	11	16	17
International	2	3	4	4	2

¹⁵ Source: OIR.

¹⁶ In all three majors: Philosophy, English-Philosophy, and Economics-Philosophy.

¹⁷ Includes African-American, American Indian, Asian, and Hispanic.

No Response	4	4	4	0	1
Total	28	24	25	23	23
Total Minority	8	5	6	3	3
% Minority	28%	21%	24%	13%	13%

b. Graduate degree recipients¹⁸

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
African-American	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian	0	0	0	1	0
Asian	0	0	0	1	0
Hispanic	0	2	3	1	1
White (non-Hispanic)	6	3	4	5	1
No Response	0	0	0	0	0
Total	6	5	7	8	2
Total Minority	0	2	3	3	1
% Minority	0%	40%	42%	37%	50%

Data on ethnicity from both studies mentioned above show very small numbers of minority students going into philosophy at the graduate level. According to the *Doctoral Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2005* only 3.7% of “other humanities” Ph.D.’s were received by African-Americans, 3.8% by Hispanics, and .5% by Native Americans; according to the *Summary Report* for 1996, 1.6% of philosophy Ph.D.’s were obtained by African-Americans, 2.6% by Hispanics, and 0% by Native Americans. Thus, in general, philosophy is not a discipline that has attracted significant numbers of minorities. The UNM Philosophy Department is clearly far ahead of national trends in recruiting minority students to its undergraduate and graduate programs – as it should be at a university with a large percentage of minority students. Minority students comprised 32% of **undergraduate** philosophy majors and 27% of philosophy B.A. recipients from F 03 – F 07 and AY 2002-03 to 2006-07, respectively. (Compared with an average 47.3% minority undergraduates at UNM from F 02 – F 06 and an average 42.7% minority degree recipients from AY 2002-03 to 2005-06.) Minority students represented 20% of philosophy **graduate** students from F 03 – F 07 and 32% of graduate degree recipients from AY 2002-03 to 2006-07. (Compared with an average of 24.9% minority graduate students at UNM from F 02 – F 06 and an average 23% minority graduate degree recipients from AY 2002-03 to 2005-06.)¹⁹

4. Graduation Rates

While UNM keeps statistics on graduation and retention rates of UNM undergraduates it, unfortunately, does not have such statistics for individual programs. We believe that a key factor in addressing the graduation and retention problems at UNM would be to provide individual departments statistics for their own majors, so that they could know if there are problems specific to their programs and adopt measures to

¹⁸ Includes M.A.’s received enroute to Ph.D.

¹⁹ *UNM Factbook 2006-07*.

correct them. In the absence of detailed OIR statistics, then, we are only able to give a rough picture of Philosophy graduation rates by comparing the number of students who graduate in a certain year with students classified as seniors in that same year. For a few of these years we have figures for A&S senior graduation rates.

Table 5: Graduation Rates for Undergraduates²⁰

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
Seniors enrolled in fall	38	39	43	38	49
Graduates	17	19	20	27	21
Senior graduation rate	44%	49%	46.5%	71%	43%

The data shows that in the period from AY 2002-03 to 2006-07 overall 50% of the Philosophy majors classified as seniors graduated. This compares favorably with the overall UNM graduation rate after six years of around 41% for freshman matriculating in 1998, 1999, and 2000.²¹ Moreover, the Philosophy senior graduation rates for 2002-03, 2003-04, and 2004-05 of 44%, 49%, and 46.5%, respectively, compare very favorably with the Arts and Sciences senior graduation rates of 36%, 35%, and 33% for those same years.

The following table shows the average time (in years) it takes a student to obtain a Philosophy M.A. or Ph.D. *The figures for M.A. students include only those who received terminal M.A. degrees, not M.A.'s enroute to the Ph.D., and therefore differ from OIR numbers given in Tables 3 and 4.*

Table 6: Graduate Students: Time to Degree²²

	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07
a. M.A. recipients	3	4	4	5	0
Average time to degree (semesters)	7.33	8.75	7.6	5.4	NA
b. Ph.D. recipients	1	1	1	1	1
Time to degree (semesters)	10	6	7	4	5

This data shows a welcome trend toward a shorter time to degree for our M.A. students, having to do, we believe, with greater selectivity in admissions and better advisement. Thus, this trend mirrors the decline in numbers of M.A. students over the last ten years. We would like to see all of our M.A. students get through the program in two years. The time to degree for Ph.D. students has also gotten shorter since AY 2002-03, but the number of students involved is too small for this decrease to be statistically significant.

²⁰ Source: OIR.

²¹ UNM Factbook 2006-07.

²² Source: Philosophy Department records.

5. M.A. and Ph.D. Application and Acceptance Rates

Acceptance rates to the Ph.D. program in particular show that the UNM Philosophy Department graduate program has become much more selective since 1995.

Table 7: Graduate Application, Admission, and Acceptance Rates²³

a. M.A. Students

	F 03	F 04	F05	F 06	F07	F 08
Applied	26	39	33	26	37	38
Admitted	13	15	11	9	10	14
%Admitted	50%	38%	33%	19%	35%	37%
Avg. GRE of students admitted (verbal/quantitative/analytical)	610/656/506		607/624/4.78	569/624/4.78	633/678/4.83	
Avg. GPA of students admitted	3.51		3.65	3.62	3.46	
Accepted	6	5	1	2	4	8

b. Ph.D. Students

	F 03	F 04	F05	F 06	F07	F 08
Applied	28	44	41	28	46	49
Admitted	4	4	6	3	5	7
%Admitted	14%	9%	15%	11%	11%	14%
Avg. GRE of students admitted (verbal/quantitative/analytical)	620/676/6.4		640/687/5.33	675/573/5.5	700/726/5.6	
Avg. GPA of students admitted	3.7		3.8	3.5	3.71	
Accepted	4	1	4	2	2	2
Total applications	37	48	51	35	59	60

The number of students who applied to the M.A. program includes both students who applied directly to the M.A. as well as students who applied to the Ph.D. who had not previously earned an M.A. degree; the latter are also automatically considered for the M.A. Thus, over the period in consideration (F 03 – 08) a total of 199 students applied for the M.A. program, of which 72 were admitted = 36%. For the same period 236 students also applied specifically to the Ph.D. program, of which 29 were admitted = 12%. These figures can be compared to those of other highly selective programs, such as Harvard and UC San Diego (approx. 3%) or University of Colorado, Boulder (6%). We acknowledge that a low admission rate by itself does not mean that a program is higher in quality, but for a program such as ours a lower admission rate indicates increased selectivity, hence an improvement in the quality of the program's students. The Department now feels, however, that it has perhaps been too strict in screening M.A. applicants for the last few years – perhaps some students who might have succeeded in the program have not been given a chance – and so offered admission to a significantly greater number this year over

²³ Source: Philosophy Department records.

the previous three years (14). This will also help to maintain the total number of students in the graduate program closer to “critical mass,” which we believe to be around thirty.

We also note that there has been an encouraging upward trend in total applications to the program, from 37 and 38 for 2003 and 2004, respectively, to 59 and 60 for 2007 and 2008 (after a dip to 35 for 2006). Average GRE scores of admittees for both the M.A. and Ph.D. also appear to be climbing. We expect to continue to receive increasing numbers of applicants of increasing quality in the future as the Department continues to have success in placing its graduates and to build its reputation in its areas of strength.

Since the significance of GRE scores for graduate admissions is much disputed – indeed, the single most important item for evaluation for admission in our department is the writing sample – these figures are given here without comment. Two other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences have provided information on the GRE scores of students admitted to their graduate programs, which are summarized in the table below:

Table 7a: Comparative GRE Scores

Department	population	F 05	F 06	F 07	F 08
Psychology	Admittees to experimental and clinical Ph.D. progs.	Verbal: 586 Quant.: 681 Analytic: 5.1	Verbal: 597 Quant.: 682 Analytic: 4.9	Verbal: 626 Quant.: 701 Analytic: 5	Verbal: 578 Quant.: 693 Analytic: 4.7
Political Science	Admittees to M.A. and Ph.D. programs		Verbal: 557 Quant: 576 Analytic: 4.5	Verbal: 518 Quant.: 610 Analytic: 4.7	Verbal: 512 Quant.: 551 Analytic: 4.5

6. Financial Support of Students

a. Undergraduates

The Philosophy Department does not have any scholarships or grants for its undergraduates. It does receive an annual work-study allotment (\$5,231 for FY 09), which it uses to hire one or two students to work as librarians in the departmental library.

b. Graduate Students

i. TA-ships, Graderships, Part-Time Appointments

The following table summarizes the amount of support, by way of TA-ships and other appointments, the Philosophy Department has been able to provide its graduate students from various sources for the last five years.

Table 8: Financial Support for Graduate Students

	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08
Philosophy TA-ships FTE	3.75	4.0	4.5	4.75	4.75
English TA-ships FTE	1.5	1.25	2.0	1.0	1.00
Graderships (PTI) FTE	1.0	1.5	1.5	1.25	1.25
Barrett Fellowship FTE	0	.5	.5	0	.5
Total FTE support	6.25	7.25	8.5	7.0	7.75
Total students enrolled	24	25	23	23	23
No. students supported	15	15	20	15	18
% students supported	62.5%	60%	87%	65%	78%

The Philosophy Department had eight Philosophy TA-ships through 2004-05. We received an additional full TA-ship through the Success Initiative of the Office of the VP for Academic Affairs in 2005-06 and another ½ TA-ship through the same program in 2006-07. Thus, the Department currently has 9.5 regular Philosophy TA-ships. (The Success TA-ships are renewable each year.) Philosophy TA's teach one section of Phil. 101 or 156 each semester; Success TA's assist (lead discussion groups, provide supplemental instruction and mentoring) in large sections of Phil. 101. A full TA-ship counts as .5 FTE. In addition, some Philosophy Ph.D. students (in one case, an M.A. student) have received English TA-ships. Their duties include teaching two (smaller) sections of freshman English in the English Department (English 101 and 102) per semester. The Department also has a dissertation fellowship, **the Barrett Dissertation Fellowship**, which it awards on an occasional basis – ideally, once a year – to a Ph.D. student who is thought to be in an position to benefit optimally from having a year or a semester off to focus on writing his/her dissertations. This fellowship is funded by the Department's **Gwen Barrett Endowment**. Finally, the Department is able to hire a few M.A. students every semester as graders using the PTI budget allotted to the Department by the College. A gradership is equivalent to .25 FTE. The Department also occasionally hires Ph.D. students who are beyond their TA-ships, and in rare cases ones who still hold their TA-ships, to teach additional PTI courses. (The latter are not included in Table 8.)

With these varied sources of funding the Department is able to provide all incoming Ph.D. students with a full TA-ship (current annual salary: \$15,636) for up to five years (length of commitment depends on previous graduate study) and also partially support many of its M.A. students, so that during this period 60% or more of active students receive at least some support each year, and in some years above 75%. Note that this includes Ph.D. students past their TA-ships who are working on their dissertations. Thus in effect, in most years only a handful of students taking courses are without any support.

ii. Other Support

The Department uses some funds every year from the **Barrett Endowment** for support of graduate students. The amount varies with the annual yield of the Endowment (normally around \$20k) and any carry-over from the previous fiscal year. In FY 2007

(when no regular Barrett Dissertation Fellowship was awarded) the amount available for this purpose was \$4000. In FY 2008 (when a student was awarded the Barrett Dissertation Fellowship) \$1000 was available. Students may apply for funding to offset expenses of attending conferences (provided they are presenting papers), attend summer language institutes, and travel to libraries in connection with their research.

7. Recruitment, Admission, and Retention

a. Undergraduate Program

With four University core courses in its curriculum the Philosophy Department has not felt the need to make extraordinary efforts to recruit **undergraduate majors**; and with a satisfactory gender and ethnicity balance among its students, it has not felt it necessary to target specific ethnic groups. In general, the Department feels that the best advertisement for the Philosophy major is to offer high-quality undergraduate courses which also place high expectations on students. The Department regularly participates in the various recruitment fairs at UNM (High School Senior Day, Hispanic Day, etc.), though it has missed some of them in recent years. At the beginning of fall and spring term it sends out a letter to all students who received an A- or better in Philosophy 101 the previous term (a list is provided by the Registrar's Office), inviting them to consider becoming Philosophy majors and to arrange a meeting with the Undergraduate Advisor. See Appendix IV.2. Some faculty, in particular Prof. Thomson, have in recent years given lectures at Albuquerque Academy, partly to interest Academy students in UNM and the Philosophy Department, and we intend to continue this effort. Prof. Paul Livingston, who will be joining the Department in Spring 2009, is a native of Albuquerque and a graduate of the Academy, and is eager to assist in this.

Once students select Philosophy as a major – we have no admission restrictions for the undergraduate majors – we seek to provide them thoughtful and attentive guidance towards graduation – this is the chief role of the Undergraduate Advisor – and to include them in a community of scholars through the various clubs, colloquia, and lectures sponsored by the Department.

b. Graduate Program

Recruitment of students to graduate programs in philosophy is now chiefly done through departmental websites. The UNM Philosophy Department has a website - <http://www.unm.edu/~thinker/> - that is adequate for this purpose. Although it has been improved dramatically over the last few months through the efforts our Departmental Assistant, Rikk Murphy, most faculty feel that it could be still further enhanced. In the past, the Department has also sent out a poster-sized flyer advertising its graduate program to philosophy departments across the country on a regular basis. Some faculty feel that we should suspend this practice and invest our resources instead in our website. As with the undergraduate program, the Department generally feels that conventional means of advertising are not the best way to attract attention to its graduate program.

Students searching for graduate programs in philosophy are very sophisticated at discovering accurate information about the strengths and weaknesses of programs and are suspicious of anything that smacks of hype. There are also websites, such as *The Philosophical Gourmet* (<http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/default.asp>), which critically analyze and rank programs. The best way to recruit students to graduate study in philosophy at UNM is (1) to build a strong community of scholars doing interesting work that receives national and international recognition and (2) to succeed in placing our graduates in strong Ph.D. programs (in the case of M.A. students) and academic positions (for Ph.D. students). (See Sec. V.3.) This kind of information is more effectively delivered through a well-designed website.

In AY 2008-09 the Department will participate in a pilot program administered by the Office of Graduate Studies that will use the GRE database to target prospective students. One may search the database to identify students with, say, high GPA's interested in studying in a pluralistic philosophy department in the Southwest. GRE will then sell an electronic file containing contact information for the students. OGS will pay for up to \$500 worth of names.

The quality of applicants to our M.A. and Ph.D programs has continued to improve during the past five years, but we face many challenges. Despite the increasing national prominence of our faculty and our graduate programs and the competitive financial support we offer to both M.A. and Ph.D. admittees, we face tough competition in our efforts to recruit the best B.A.'s and M.A.'s. Recruitment of new graduate students occurs in two phases: (1) attracting applications from qualified applicants and (2) convincing students who have been admitted to accept our offers. We can and need to improve our performance in both respects.

Phase 1. Our doctoral TA-ships are commensurate with those of philosophy departments about our size in state-funded research universities. Financial support for MA students has improved in recent years. We now offer grader positions to most of our MA students and in-state tuition is available to them beginning in their second year. *It would be particularly helpful in recruiting more high-quality M.A. students if we could offer them tuition remission or in-state tuition to them in their first year.*

Phase 2. Expanded efforts to woo newly admitted M.A. and Ph.D. students so that they accept our offers may be necessary in light of our experience in spring 2008. While eight new M.A. students have accepted offers to enroll in fall 2008, none of our top five doctoral admittees accepted our offers. Most of these five were higher quality applicants than we have encountered in the past and some, understandably enough, chose elite graduate programs (e.g. Georgetown) instead of UNM. Perhaps the most effective means of inviting applications but also of convincing admitted students to accept our offers has been and should continue to be personal contact between applicants and individual faculty members under whom they aspire to conduct research. During the past application season there was contact between the five top prospects, as well as others not admitted, and individual faculty. *We also paid for one admittee to visit UNM in order to facilitate his decision. It would be particularly advantageous if we could do this for more admittees*

in a more organized fashion. (Perhaps bring in all top candidates together during a recruitment week” sometime in March.) Prestigious and wealthy departments have more lavish recruitment budgets than we do. Currently, our department must use very limited funds from our Barret Endowment for this purpose that would otherwise go for student support.

The recruitment of UNM Philosophy majors to the graduate programs is done chiefly through the advisement of individual students by the Undergraduate Advisor, the Graduate Director, and other faculty as they approach graduation and begin thinking about graduate school. Outstanding majors are identified by the faculty and encouraged to apply to either the M.A. or Ph.D., especially if they think they want to specialize in our areas of strength. (Faculty typically volunteer to write them letters of recommendation.)

After being admitted to the program all **graduate students** attend an orientation that takes place the week before school starts, followed by an individual “entrance interview.” At the entrance interview the student and Graduate Director work out an initial plan for completing basic degree requirements and working toward a specialization in some area of study. The GD often refers the student to other faculty members for further advice at this time. In general, however, the Graduate Director serves as the faculty advisor for all graduate students until they form an M.A. Exam Committee or Dissertation Committee (which Ph.D. students should do upon passing the qualifying exam). Students submit a “coursework form” at the beginning of each semester informing the GD of the courses they intend to take that semester. At the beginning of fall semester each graduate student has a meeting with the GD to review their progress. In January a letter goes out to all graduate students from the GD summarizing his/her progress toward completing degree requirements. At the end of spring term each year Ph.D. students are evaluated by the entire faculty in a departmental meeting presided over by the GD. The faculty comments about individual students are summarized by the GD and communicated diplomatically to the students in letters sent out to them over the summer.

When they are close to finishing their degrees Ph.D. students begin working with the Graduate Placement Officer who assists them in “going on the market.” The Placement Officer helps students prepare CV’s and dossiers, advises them on which positions to apply for, coaches them in preparing for interviews, arranges mock interviews and job talks in the Department, organizes faculty support, etc.

Minority TA-ship

When Carlos Sanchez was admitted to the Ph.D. program in Fall, 2001, Dean Reed Dasenbrock of the College of Arts and Sciences agreed to provide an additional TA-ship to support Carlos. In Fall 2005 this TA-ship was made a permanent line by Interim Dean Norwood. At that time the Department decided informally that this TA-ship should be reserved for an entering Hispanic Ph.D. student. The current holder of this TA line is Laura Guerrero. The Department intends this year to name the TA-ship, establish a protocol for selecting a recipient, and advertise it properly, in consultation with the proper University authorities.

Section V: Student Performance Measures

The Outcomes Assessment plans for the Philosophy Department's undergraduate and graduate programs outlined in Section II of this study now provide for the objective measurement of student learning outcomes at all levels. Prior to this, the Department has relied on a medley of indicators of student success – such things as placement in graduate programs, awards and publications, entry into the profession, etc. – which are summarized below. This should not at all be taken to mean that the Philosophy Department has had a cavalier attitude toward the success of its students. It should be kept in mind that the recent emphasis on Outcomes Assessment signals a paradigm shift in higher education, at least in the humanities. *Prior to now, faculty have focused not on collective data but on the growth of individual students.* Over the years the Department has developed a culture of commitment to developing the full potential of its students through teaching, advising, and mentoring. The achievement of individual potential is not something that can be measured collectively, but is only evident case-by-case to the trained eye of a caring, dedicated teacher. When we see it, we are encouraged; when we think we don't see it or aren't seeing it as much – when a Ph.D. student fails to complete a dissertation, when a significant percentage of students in a 101 supersection seem to lack basic writing skills – we make adjustments. We sincerely hope that the kind of data provided through Outcomes Assessment in the future will further help us in this.

I. Undergraduate Programs

1. Growth of Number of Majors

In the past the Philosophy Department has, with the encouragement of the College of Arts and Sciences, chiefly measured the success of its undergraduate program in terms of its enrollments and the number of students who have chosen Philosophy as a major. We believe that these figures indicate not only effective teaching but also productive learning: students will major in a subject they believe they are able to learn and will place confidence in a department that they feel will support them in achieving academic success. Thus, the Philosophy Department is pleased to see from the statistics provided by OIR for this review, reported in Sec. IV (and corroborated by statistics from the Office of the Registrar), that enrollments and the number of Philosophy majors continue to grow at a steady rate.

2. Student Evaluations: “Rate Your Learning” and “Rate the Course in General” Categories

In Fall 2005 the Philosophy Department revised its student evaluation form (see Appendix V.1; we have never used ICES and will probably not elect to use the new

IDEA forms) to include a new category, “Rate Your Learning,” in which the course is to be given a grade on a scale from A to F. This, together with the question, “Rate the Course in General,” provides a subjective measurement of how much students feel they learned in the course. Although faculty tend to look first at the score for “Rate the Instructor” as a measure of their own performance, we are also concerned to balance instructor performance against student learning. It is therefore of interest that for Philosophy courses at every level the average scores for “Rate the Course in General” and “Rate Your Learning” are significantly lower than the average scores for “Rate the Instructor,” though they are still quite good – in the 2.9 to 3.5 range. (See Appendix II.4.) In the future we hope to be able to explain why this is the case and address any problems that might underlie it. To begin with, we need to refine the question, “Rate Your Learning,” which admits of various interpretations. (One might add as a clarification: “Do you feel that the course was taught effectively, in a way that enabled you to acquire important knowledge and skills?”) Second, we might make a point of asking students to be sure to explain their answers to this question in the commentary part of their evaluations. The information obtained from the answers to this question on student evaluations can then be compared with data obtained from Outcomes Assessment, especially for University core courses.

3. Departmental Honors and Acceptance of Philosophy Majors by Graduate Programs

The Philosophy Department strives to serve all of its students, from the average to the gifted. We encourage our more talented students to write honors theses, and we are especially gratified when our graduates are accepted into graduate programs on the basis of the preparation they have received in our program. Since Spring 2006 **fifteen** students have received departmental honors in Philosophy. Since Spring 2003 **sixteen** of our B.A. graduates have gone on to further graduate study, five of them in philosophy or related programs (Social Thought, Theology). Although our statistics are incomplete – they are based chiefly on surveys taken of our faculty – and do not go back very far in either of these categories, we are confident that these figures are representative: four to five of our undergraduates earn departmental honors every year; two to three of our undergraduates go on to graduate school.

4. Student Presentations and Publications

We encourage our undergraduates as well as our graduate students to present their research in appropriate venues. The philosophy conferences sponsored by the Department the last several years have provided welcome opportunities for our undergraduates to read papers in a professional setting. Since Spring 2005 **five** of our undergraduates have presented papers in these conferences. Since Spring 2002 **three** Philosophy students have had papers published in UNM’s *Best Student Essays*, one of them twice.

II. Graduate Programs

1. Qualifying Exams

The most direct way of measuring student success in our graduate program is by means of the Qualifying Examination, which Ph.D. students must take in their fifth semester. The Qualifying Exam is a comprehensive written or oral examination (according to the student's choice; the oral exam lasts approximately three hours), which covers a reading list of fifteen classics of the history of philosophy (including the twentieth century; see Appendix I.4). A student can receive either an M.A. pass or a Ph.D. pass. The latter qualifies him/her to continue in the Ph.D. program; the former is sufficient to receive a terminal M.A. degree. The criteria for an M.A. pass as described in the protocol for the examination (See Appendix V.2) are:

The student must demonstrate basic knowledge and expository ability: he or she should show an acquaintance with the main ideas of most of the readings on the reading list and an ability to explain them in a manner that would be appropriate for an introductory philosophy course.

The criteria for a Ph.D. pass are:

In addition to meeting the criteria for an M.A. pass (basic knowledge and expository ability), the student should demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and analytical ability. That is to say, he or she should show a firm grasp of the philosophical problems addressed in most, if not all, of the readings and their broader significance, a comprehension of the main arguments presented therein, and an ability to analyze and critique them.

Since the inception of the Qualifying Exam in Spring 2005 all **nine** students who have taken the exam have received a Ph.D. pass. While this indicates a satisfactory level of success for our Ph.D. students, the Department has also noted weaknesses in the performance of some students. One concern which has emerged in departmental discussions is that while the exam covers several key texts of 20th-century analytic philosophy, we do not emphasize 20th-century analytic in our curriculum. The Department must either take steps to prepare students better in this area, the addition of faculty in analytic philosophy being essential, or further reduce the analytic component of the exam.

2. Annual Evaluations

At the end of spring term every year the Philosophy Department conducts an extensive review of its Ph.D. students. One entire faculty meeting is devoted to this. The Graduate Director summarizes the comments of the faculty about individual students, edits them, returns them to the faculty for revision, then sends them to the students. The evaluations

of our Ph.D. students for Spring 2007, redacted for confidentiality, are included in Appendix V.3. The Department has found this method of monitoring Ph.D. students' progress to be a good one, since it provides for a frank discussion of each student by all the faculty. The evaluations for 2007 – confirmed by this year's evaluations – show that the Department is generally encouraged by the progress each student is making. A persistent concern, however, is the length of time students are taking to complete the dissertation. We believe that this usually has to do with the fact that after students' funding runs out, they take on outside employment. The key to getting students through the program (and onto the academic job market) quickly, we believe, is to make sure they are well on their way to completing their dissertations (if they have not already completed them) by the time their funding expires.

3. Theses and Dissertations; Degrees with distinction; Graduate Placement

a. M.A. students

There are two options for the M.A., Plan I and Plan II. Plan I requires 24 graduate credit hours and a master's thesis; Plan II requires 32 hours and a paper of not more than 12,500 words, of the quality one would submit for publication to a philosophy journal. Most students opt for Plan II. Titles of recent M.A. theses and papers will give an idea of the range of research being done by M.A. students in our Department.

“Søren Kierkegaard and Paul Martin Möller and the Debate on Immortality,” Tamara Marks, S 2002, Advisor: Burgess

“The Influence of Schopenhauer's Metaphysics on Nietzsche's Birth of Tragedy,” Robert McCall, S 2003, Advisor: Thomson

“Mourning Mourning Itself” (on Derrida) West Gurley, S 2004, Advisor: Thomson

“In a World of Pain and Beauty: A Schopenhauerian Phenomenology and Environmental Ethic” (M.A. thesis), Robert Watson, S 2004, Advisor: Goodman

“Things” (on Levinas), Brian Wunsch, S 2005, Advisor: Taber

“Living with Death: Kierkegaard and the Samurai,” Adam Buben, F 2005, Advisor: Burgess

“Schlegel and the Limits of Philosophy,” Geoffrey Pfeiffer, Su 2005, Advisor: Taber

“Suffering Tragedy: Hegel, Kierkegaard, and the Tragedy of Antigone,” Shoni Rancher, S 2006, Advisor: Burgess

The M.A. degrees of six of the above students were awarded distinction, chiefly on the basis of the paper or thesis. These were the only six to receive distinction for the period under consideration from AY 02-03 to 06-07. Thus, 6 out of 17 terminal M.A.²⁴ students = 35% received distinction over that period. Meanwhile, all but two of the above students went on to further graduate study in philosophy, ten M.A. students from the program overall for the period considered = 59%. Students were accepted to the following institutions: University of South Florida (3), University of Nebraska, CUNY Graduate School, Texas A&M University, Florida State University, SUNY Binghamton, Duquesne, and Fordham University. The Department strongly encourages its M.A. graduates to complete their Ph.D.'s at other universities. In Summer 2008 another of our M.A. graduates, John Hartnett, received distinction for his paper "God as Nous in the Third Meditation" (Advisor: Domski). He will be pursuing his Ph.D. at University of California, San Diego.

Overall, the Department has been encouraged by the quality of the work of its M.A. students. Even those students who did not receive distinction or go on to Ph.D. programs wrote good papers. Measuring the learning outcomes of the M.A. program in terms of the M.A. paper or thesis as the "capstone assignment," the level of student success is very high. But more importantly, we believe, each student has had his or her own individual "success story."

b. Ph.D. students

The titles of the six doctoral dissertations accepted since Summer 2002 are:

"Reasons and Causes: A Critical Approach to the Causal View of Reasons," Bryan Benham, Su 2002, Advisor: Hannan

"Reflective Judgement and Non-Discursive Intelligibility in Kant's Third Critique," Amy Lund, F 2003, Advisors: Schueler and Tenenbaum

"Seven Spears in My Heart: Passion and Renunciation in the Philosophy of Bhartrhari," Jessica Posniak, F 2004, Advisor: Taber

"Motivation and Renunciation: The Discarding of Desire in Indian Philosophy," Christopher Framarin, Su 2005, Advisor: Schueler

"From Epistemic Justification to Philosophical Authenticity: A Study of Husserl's Philosophical Epistemology," Carlos Sanchez, Su 2006, Advisor: Thomson

"Heidegger's Platonism," Mark Ralkowski, S 2008, Advisor: Bussanich

²⁴ That is, M.A. students who do not continue on to the Ph.D. at UNM. The OIR data shows a total of 23 students who received the M.A. during this period. Six of those received the M.A. en route to the Ph.D. Thus, there were 17 students who received terminal M.A.'s, which tallies with departmental records.

Two of the dissertations – Posniak’s and Ralkowski’s – were awarded distinction. The dissertations of Framarin and Sanchez have been the basis of further publications; Framarin’s revised dissertation is coming out under the title *Desire and Motivation in Indian Philosophy* with RoutledgeCurzon this year. Posniak’s and Ralkowski’s dissertations are also considered to be of publishable quality. Thus, the Department has been very pleased with the quality of dissertations produced by its Ph.D. students, especially in the last four years.

All of our recent Ph.D. graduates have been placed in academic positions, several of them in tenure-track positions.

Bryan Benham	Assistant Professor, Lecturer, Philosophy, University of Utah
Amy Lund	Assistant Professor, Arts and Philosophy, Miami Dade College
Jessica Posniak	Full-time Instructor, Department of Philosophy, Religion, and Humanities, Central New Mexico Community College
Christopher Framarin	Assistant Professor, Philosophy and Religious Studies, University of Calgary
Carlos Sanchez	Assistant Professor, Philosophy, San Jose State University
Mark Ralkowski	Part-time Instructor, Philosophy, University of New Mexico

For the placement of previous Ph.D. graduates one can consult the departmental website www.unm.edu/~thinker. Our graduates have continued to be productive scholars after leaving UNM. Over their careers so far, the above six Ph.D. graduates have published one book, fifteen articles, and thirty-one conference papers (no data available for Amy Lund).

We might mention here in particular two of our recent graduates who have gone on to teach at the United States Military Academy, West Point: Dan Zupan, who received his Ph.D. in Summer 2000, and Jon Martinez, who received his M.A. in Spring 2006. Both came to UNM as commissioned officers with orders to complete their graduate degrees in order to return to West Point as teachers in the humanities. The title of Major Martinez’s M.A. paper was “Death Through Technology, Resurrection Through Education” (on Heidegger) and the title of Colonel Zupan’s dissertation, which received distinction, was “Autonomy and Non-Combatant Immunity: An Investigation in Just War

Theory.” Major Martinez remains at West Point. Colonel Zupan (now retired) has been Dean of Valley Forge Military College since 2007.

4. Student Publications, Awards

The Philosophy Department’s record-keeping leaves much to be desired in this area. Certainly, one of things to come out of the present review will be to set up a comprehensive database for charting student accomplishments before and after graduation. According to our incomplete data, over the last five years our M.A. and Ph.D. students have published six articles, nine book reviews, and one edited volume; they have delivered 29 conference presentations. Our students have read papers at meetings of the American Philosophical Association, the International Society for Neoplatonic Studies, the American Academy of Religion, the North Texas Philosophical Association, and the Society for Asian and Comparative Philosophy, as well as at the annual UNM Graduate Student Philosophy Conference. They have received RPT grants from the Office of Graduate Studies (five times); two are currently being funded by an NSF grant directed by Prof. Domski to train teachers of engineering ethics. Several former M.A. students who went on to further study received large graduate fellowships from the Ph.D. programs to which they were accepted. One former M.A. student received the prestigious Visiting Scholar Fellowship at the Hong Kierkegaard Library for 2008. Two of our graduate TA’s earned the Susan Deese Roberts Outstanding TA of the Year Award in Spring, 2008. Also last spring, another of our graduate students received the First Place prize in UNM’s *Best Student Essays* contest.

Section VI: Faculty Matters

The faculty are the heart of the Department. They define the character of the Department as a community of scholars with a distinctive configuration of interests. Their research is the basis of the national and international reputation of the Department. Through their teaching and mentoring students grow intellectually and develop into philosophers themselves. They embody the ideal of what it is to be a philosopher-scholar, which they transmit to the next generation.

1. Full-Time Faculty by Rank, Degree, and Specialization

The UNM Philosophy Department at this time consists of thirteen full-time tenure-track faculty and three part-time lecturers.

Table 1: Current UNM Philosophy Department Faculty					
Faculty	Rank	Degree	Institution	Hired	Specializations
Becker	Assoc.	Ph.D., Philosophy	Univ. California, San Diego	2002	Epistemology, Phil. Language
Burgess	Full	Ph.D., Religion	Yale	1978	Kierkegaard, Philosophy of Religion
Bussanich	Full	Ph.D., Classics	Stanford	1986	Ancient, Neo- Platonism, Mysticism
Candelaria	Lecturer ²⁵	Th.D.	Harvard	2005	Latin American Thought, Critical Theory
Domski	Asst.	Ph.D., Hist. and Philos. Science	Indiana	2005	Early Modern, Kant, Phil. Science
Gerber	Lecturer ²⁶	Ph.D., Philosophy	New Mexico	2005	Environmental Ethics
Goodman	Regents Prof.	Ph.D., Philosophy	Johns Hopkins	1971	American Philosophy, Wittgenstein
Hannan	Assoc.	JD, Ph.D., Philosophy	Arizona	1992	Phil. Mind, Phil. of Law, Schopenhauer
Hayes	Assoc.	Ph.D. S. Asian Studies	Toronto	2002	S. Asian Buddhism, Buddhist Logic

²⁵ Joint appointment with Religious Studies.

²⁶ Joint appointment with Religious Studies.

Johnston	Asst.	Ph.D., Philosophy	SUNY Stony Brook	2006	19 th and 20 th -c. European Phil., Psychoanalysis, Contemp. French Philos.
Kalar	Asst.	Ph.D. Philosophy	Harvard	2002	Kant, 19 th -c. Philos., Aesthetics
Katsafanas	Asst.	Ph.D., Philosophy	Harvard	2008	Moral Philos., Philos. of Action, Nietzsche
Livingston	Asst.	Ph.D., Philosophy	Univ. California, Irvine	S 2009	20 th -c. Continental, History of Analytic Phil.
Mazumdar ²⁷	Lecturer	Ph.D., Philosophy	Brown	2007	Feminism, Philos. and Economics, Post- Colonial Theory
Taber	Full	Ph.D., Philosophy	Univesität Hamburg	1987	Indian Philosophy, German Idealism
Thomson	Assoc.	Ph.D., Philosophy	Univ. California, San Diego	2000	20 th -c. Continental, Heidegger

As discussed in Section I of this study the UNM Philosophy Department has traditionally been oriented toward the history of philosophy. Recently (in the past ten years), however, it has been able to hire opportunistically to develop graduate strengths in Continental Philosophy and Indian Philosophy. The latter in particular sets the Department apart from virtually every other philosophy program in the country. At the same time, the Department has sought to maintain a balance of areas that meets the interests of a diverse population of students and provides for a well-rounded philosophical education at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The faculty of the Department can be grouped into different clusters that allow for concentrated study in a variety of fields and for forming M.A. thesis (paper) and Ph.D. dissertation committees.

History of Western Philosophy: Burgess, Bussanich, Domski, Goodman, Kalar, Katsafanas, Livingston, Thomson

Core Analytic Philosophy: Becker, Domski, Goodman, Hannan, Katsafanas, Livingston

Twentieth-Century Continental Philosophy: Johnston, Livingston, Thomson, Candelaria, Mazumdar

Nineteenth-Century Continental Philosophy: Burgess, Goodman, Johnston, Kalar, Katsafanas, Taber

American Philosophy: Becker, Candelaria, Goodman, Kalar, Livingston

²⁷ Joint appointment with Women Studies, F 2007 – S 2009.

Ethics: Gerber, Goodman, Hannan, Johnston, Kalar, Katsafanas

Indian Philosophy: Bussanich, Hayes, Taber

To give a more detailed idea of the kind of scholarly work the Department's faculty are doing – and as a way of introducing the reader of this study to individual faculty members – we have included recent research statements of faculty members, which focus on what they have done in the last five years and on future projects.

Kelly Becker

To this point in my career, my research has had two somewhat distinct focuses. My doctoral thesis was a careful study of the grounds for and a defense of meaning holism. That work led to three publications—one on the pitfalls of meaning holism, two on the implications of Quine's rejection of analyticity for the philosophy of mind and language and for epistemology. I have since changed my research orientation, for both negative and positive reasons. The negative is that, by the time I finished my thesis, I no longer believed that holism was a viable theory of meaning and mental content. The positive reason is that work I was already doing on the epistemology of mental content—work that led to a publication on self-knowledge—sparked an interest in general epistemological issues, taking me back to an area of philosophy that had interested me as an undergraduate. So about seven years ago, I changed my research focus from the philosophy of language and mind to epistemology. It took some time to get up to speed on the literature, but I am becoming a recognized figure in my new field. I have published several epistemology papers in prominent journals, read papers at several small conferences attended by well-known epistemologists, written (as contributor and founding co-editor) on a philosophy weblog (JanusBlog) devoted to virtue epistemology and ethics, and published my monograph, *Epistemology Modalized*, with Routledge in 2007.

In the book, I explain and assess the extant modalized analyses of knowledge that aim to preclude the kind of epistemic luck revealed in Gettier cases and others like them. On the basis that there are two central kinds of luck, I defend an analysis incorporating process reliabilism and a version of Nozick's sensitivity condition. Modalization plays a central role here, for in Gettier cases, one actually has a true belief, but very easily *might have* had a false one. Hence the idea is to construct necessary conditions that would preclude even justified true beliefs that might easily have been false from counting as knowledge. (For example, Nozickean sensitivity says that S knows that p only if S would not believe p if it were false.) There are a number of claims in the book that could use elaboration, so I've recently been working on several papers stemming from not entirely finished business. One of them recently (June, 2008) appeared in *Philosophical Studies*, in which paper I provide a neat solution to the generality problem. Another that is nearly complete focuses on the idea that knowledge requires discrimination, and I try to show how the contrastivist account of discrimination (most closely associated with Jonathan Schaffer) is inadequate. A third paper aims to square inductive knowledge with sensitivity in response to independent arguments by Sosa and Vogel that they are incompatible. This is just a sample of work currently in progress, and in future work I

plan to take up the very idea of discrimination: What does it entail? Which theories have the basic notion correct? Does discrimination entail skeptical consequences? (After all, I cannot tell the difference between the world as I believe it to be and the possible world where I am a brain-in-a-vat.) I'm also interested in current work on contextualism and virtue epistemology, and I hope to be able, in the not too distant future, to reappraise some of my starting points, for instance my commitment to externalism, with a view toward providing them solid philosophical groundings.

More recently, I've become interested in the relationship between contemporary skepticism—brains-in-vats, evil demons, the Matrix, and the like—and the sort of skepticism associated with Pyrrhonism. The former is thought by those “in the business” to present a serious *prima facie* threat to knowledge, but for many other philosophers it is at best a novelty, at worst a silly waste of time. (Ask around and see what I mean.) The latter was intended to be a prescription for achieving peace of mind. Differently put, the former has no real significance, practical or otherwise, for many philosophers, whereas the latter is pitched as nothing less than a way of life. Since my own interest in contemporary skepticism is motivated by a felt insecurity in my own knowledge status—an issue that has hounded me from my youth—it seems to me that the two kinds of skepticism might be mutually informative. For example, we might use contemporary skepticism to determine the limits and barriers to knowledge, and the latter to put us at ease when confronting those barriers. I see these as more than mere philosophical exercises with no connection to how we live. Just as the evil demon is invoked to reveal our problematic knowledge statuses, so too one might describe, say, the problems of knowing the truth about why we went to war in Iraq, of knowing whether budget-busting tax cuts are really best for the economy, of knowing whether one's friend is telling the truth about an important personal matter, as an inability to achieve knowledge because a more powerful force may be hiding something. I see the evil demon as simply the ultimate expression of these more commonplace worries. After all, even the most concerted fact-finding efforts may bring us up short in our efforts to know the truth about matters relevant to our everyday lives, once we start taking seriously the possibility that we are being deceived. Yet we do not worry about the evil demon, largely because we know we are powerless to prove that he doesn't exist, and so we deem the issue irrelevant, just as I am not bothered by the fact that I cannot time travel and so I ignore the fact that I cannot. Shall we take a similar stance toward more practical issues? Shall I stop reading all the newspapers and op-ed pieces, stop watching the news, quit worrying about why we went to war? Shall I ignore my suspicion that a friend took \$50 from my wallet, knowing that it's almost impossible to prove? Can I achieve peace of mind by halting pursuits into questions whose answers I know that I may never know? Or shall I press harder, gather data, and remain suspicious and ill at ease? More generally, can reflection on the problems thrown at us by academic skepticism lead us to a modern version of Pyrrhonism, and if so, how far along that path shall we travel? Perhaps this paragraph's length is misleading, since this is only the fitful beginning of a future.

Andrew Burgess

Since coming to UNM in 1978 in order to head up the UNM Religious Studies Program, I have focused my research on Kierkegaard, rather than also spreading it out, as before, among

other figures (such as Brentano and Wittgenstein), in order to make room for the heavy administrative duties of that director position. The change made sense in any case, since I had already moved in that direction with a book (*Passion, "Knowing How," and Understanding: An Essay on the Concept of Faith*, Missoula MT: Scholars Press 1975. The American Academy of Religion series in which this book was put out has since been taken over by Oxford University Press.

The year 2003, the *terminus a quo* for this report, is also the year I exited the directorship of the Religious Studies Program. Of course the areas of my earlier research carried over to the 2003-2008 period, as can be seen in the following account. (I will refer to the 2003-2008 publications according to the numbers given them in this departmental review's publications list.)

a. Kierkegaard's "upbuilding discourses" of 1843-44. Starting in the late 1980s I began to present papers and to publish essays, mainly at the AAR, at St. Olaf, and in Copenhagen, on this topic (a total of ten, including #s 3 and 4), with a view toward eventually combining them into a book. A director's position being what it is, however, that book has not yet materialized. I continue to study the topic, and I am giving a paper August 2008, at a Seoul theology conference on "The Apostle Paul in the Strategic Humor of Kierkegaard's 1843-44 Upbuilding Discourses."

b. Kierkegaard's concepts of irony, humor, and argumentation. Starting in 1994 I began regularly to present papers and publish essays (a total of ten, including #s 1, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, and 15), often at national and international conferences sponsored by the International Society for the Study of Argumentation, in order to explore Kierkegaard's use of irony and other forms of indirection in his argumentation. As is apparent from the title of the forthcoming "Apostle Paul" paper, this topic may easily overlap with that of the upbuilding discourses.

c. Kierkegaard's Moravian background. Starting in 2003, on a research grant, I began to look into the almost totally neglected topic of the implications of Kierkegaard's religious background within the Moravian tradition for understanding his views in philosophy of religion. This project has involved taking two courses (2005 and 2006) at Bethlehem PA learning to read old German Gothic cursive handwriting, in order to be able to decipher the remaining records of the Copenhagen Moravian congregation, which are stored in Herrnhut, Germany (visited in 2004, 2006, and 2007), in Christiansfeld (Denmark), and perhaps also at other locations. This is an immense, long-range project, but I have published from it (#s 10 and 12), and I will be delivering a paper at an international conference of Moravian scholars in Oct. 2008, relating Kierkegaard's use of Moravian tradition to that of another (ex-) Moravian philosopher, Schleiermacher.

d. Kierkegaard and religious pluralism. For the 2007 AAR convention I helped arrange two sessions on this topic and put out the proceedings in book form (# 14). The sessions were so successful that the editor of Mercer University Press asked me to publish the best papers with that press. If that is to be done, it will have to be quickly, before the papers are printed elsewhere. Meanwhile I have helped put together two sessions at the World Congress of Philosophy in August 2008—on Kierkegaard as a resource for comparative philosophy—including participants from China, India, Japan, Korea (2), Australia, Canada, and (in absentia) Spain. At one of the two sessions I will be contributing a paper entitled "Kierkegaard and the Rhetoric of Silence."

e. Other. One of my main tasks over the past five years has been helping graduate students who have studied with me prepare their research for publication. The result is that there are now at least nine such papers either recently published or soon to be published by next year. For my part, I am looking to find time finally to edit some of my own papers; for example, on the

treatment Kierkegaard gives in his last works to Socrates, on Kierkegaard's "stages" (a multi-dimensional computer analysis), and on Bonhoeffer's debt to Kierkegaard on discipleship.

John Bussanich

During the period 2003-2008 my research has focused on (1) Neoplatonic metaphysics and mysticism, (2) religious experience in Plato, and (3) comparative study of Greek and Indian philosophy.

(1) In "Plotinus on the Being of the One" I revisited the metaphysical problem of the nature of the One in Plotinus, which I discussed in detail in my 1988 book *The One and its Relation to Intellect in Plotinus* and in my 1996 essay "The Metaphysics of the One" in the *Cambridge Companion to Plotinus*. I revised my earlier interpretation of the negative conception of the One as beyond being, which is still the dominant view among Neoplatonic scholars, arguing that Plotinus' position is closer to Plato's and to his student Porphyry's. Plotinus' claim that the One is beyond knowledge and predication is consistent with his experiential accounts of the One's fullness and blissful nature. In my 2005 essay on recent work on Iamblichus I challenged recent interpretations of Plotinus' important successor.

I have been working on an anthology of Neoplatonic texts in English translation to be published as *Neoplatonic Mysticism in Late Antiquity: Selected Texts in Translation with Introduction & Commentary*, Classics of Western Spirituality Series, Paulist Press.

(2) My 2006 book chapter "Socrates and Religious Experience" in the *The Blackwell Companion to Socrates* and an earlier article "The Limits of Rationalism in Socratic Philosophy" together embody a new research interest – religious experience in Plato. So far I have focused on this topic in Plato's earlier writings, viz. the *Apology* and early dialogues, with some attention also devoted to strongly biographical texts like *Symposium* and *Phaedo*. I hope to pursue this theme in all phases of Plato's writings.

(3) Since beginning the study of Sanskrit about ten years ago, I have been actively studying particular authors and themes in Indian philosophy and religion. The first fruit of this activity is my 2005 essay "The Roots of Platonism and Vedānta," which begins with an assessment of the detailed comparisons of these two philosophical movements within their respective traditions in *The Shape of Ancient Thought: Comparative Studies in Greek and Indian Philosophies* by Thomas McEvelley (2001). I challenge the author's claims about direct influence from India, arguing instead that similar metaphysical schemes and experiential accounts in the writings of key Platonists and Vedāntists arise from the indigenous wisdom traditions in both milieus. My research interests in Indian philosophy continue to develop as I've worked on my forthcoming introductory essay "Ethics in Ancient India" to be published in a volume on ethical thought in various traditions East and West.

Michael Candelaria

My philosophical interests are both analytic and historical. I will briefly mention two current projects and research programs (out of several), one analytic and one historical.

Analytic Philosophy

Social policy proposals like state and federally mandated minimum wages, in one way or another, are grappling with the question, “How much is enough?” They propose to set limits. Proponents and opponents, among the other things they argue about, argue about where to draw the line. If there is to be a mandated floor wage, what should be the minimum? Are state sponsored health care programs going to be accessible to all or to some? Should eligibility for child care assistance be set at 155% of the poverty level or 200%? Is capping interest rates on payday-loans at 56% fair?

My recent paper, “The Limits of Justice: Ethics and the Concept of the Minimum Wage,” demonstrates my interests in the ethical problems raised by limit-setting in social policy. Limits and limit setting in social policy practice depend, to a great extent, consciously or not, on moral values like fairness and equality, and, generate moral questions regarding legitimacy and social validity. I am seeking to show that what is required for rational limit setting strategies is recognition of a ‘natural’ benchmark or criterion understood in terms of vital biological and biographical needs necessary for the possibility of a flourishing human life.

Historical Philosophy

Concerning historical philosophy, I am almost finished writing a book entitled: *Miguel de Unamuno and Antonio Caso. IberoAmerican Philosophy at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century*. Anti-positivism and anti-intellectualism strongly characterized philosophy in Spanish-speaking countries beginning roughly about 1900 and continuing until about World War II. French spiritualism, Schopenhauerean voluntarism, Bergsonian vitalism, Nietzscheanism nurtured and nourished a vigorous Spanish and Latin American reaction against institutionalized positivism rooted in Auguste Comte and Herbert Spencer. Spain’s Miguel de Unamuno while not properly a professional philosopher engaged philosophers like Spinoza, Kant, James and many others with great acumen on philosophical problems like that of personal identity and the limits of rationality. Mexico’s Antonio Caso was installed as the first chair of a philosophy faculty in Mexico’s secular university. He attempted to base a metaphysics upon a scientific basis. In this book I investigate the ways in which Unamuno and Caso, respectively, attempted to reconcile the conflicting claims of reason and science on the one hand, and those of morality, art, and faith on the other.

Mary Domski

My research centers on the history and philosophy of science during the early modern period, a period ranging roughly from Galileo’s work at the turn of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries up to and including Kant’s “critical” account of knowledge in the late eighteenth century. I focus in particular on the interplay between early modern mathematics, metaphysics, and natural science, and investigate how philosophers of the early modern period brought their accounts of mathematics and natural science to bear on their metaphysics as well as how their metaphysics shaped their accounts of mathematics and natural science. In some of the work I have completed to date, I have, for instance, examined the influence of Descartes’ notion of geometrical intelligibility on his early mechanistic metaphysics of nature; the relationship between Locke’s theory of ideas and his skeptical attitude towards the certainty of natural

science; and the ways in which Kant's novel views on geometry fit within his general philosophical program and also support his defense of Newton's natural science.

Lisa Gerber

My research focuses on environmental philosophy. I have published essays on environmental virtues and on environmental aesthetics. I have an article in review at *Environmental Ethics* on the reintroduction of the Mexican Gray Wolf in the Southwest United States. This will be one chapter in a book about specific bioregional environmental issues with wider global implications about our relationship to nature. Chapters will cover issues of wilderness, water use, environmental justice, energy use, and agriculture. In addition, I am currently working on an essay on beauty and ethics.

Russell Goodman

Since I published *American Philosophy and the Romantic Tradition* in 1990, I have continued to work on traditions of American philosophy, specifically, pragmatism, transcendentalism, and the philosophy of Stanley Cavell.

In 2005 I published a four volume collection on pragmatism with Routledge, and I have since written papers on Dewey, Putnam, Rorty, and (for the *Oxford Handbook of American Philosophy*) on Romanticism and Classical American Pragmatism. In 2007, I directed a summer seminar for the National Endowment for the Humanities called "Pragmatism: A Living Tradition." The seminar highlighted ongoing developments in pragmatism, for example the work of Richard Rorty, and the "new pragmatism" among analytic philosophers championed by Cheryl Misak.

Concerning transcendentalism, I hosted an NEH Seminar on Emerson in 2005 entitled "Reading Emerson's Essays," a follow-up to the NEH Emerson Institute I directed in 2003. I have written several papers on Emerson over the past few years that are now in press: one on friendship, another on the essay "Nominalist and Realist," a third a book chapter on Emerson's philosophy of religion. I am working towards a book on Emerson, tentatively entitled *Paths of Coherence In Emerson's Philosophy*. I am also working this summer on a paper about Thoreau, to be presented in July at a conference in Santa Fe and expected to be part of a volume on Thoreau.

Regarding Cavell, I edited a volume of essays on his work in 2005, which included my paper "Cavell and American Philosophy." I have just presented a paper on Cavell and Emerson's "Experience" as a keynote address at a conference in Edinburgh on Cavell and Literary Criticism. This paper will go in my Emerson book. A paper on my first encounters with Cavell will be published in Spanish in a collection devoted to Cavell entitled *Encuentros con Stanley Cavell*.

I have taken on a new project this summer after being invited by Oxford University Press to write a history of American philosophy before pragmatism. I've been reading Edwards, Franklin, Jefferson, and others in preparing to submit a formal proposal to Oxford later this summer. Provisionally the book will focus on Edwards and Franklin as opposed 18th century figures, then the political philosophy of the founders, then, in the 19th century, Emerson and Thoreau (who are given short shrift in some histories of

American thought but whose work has been opened up in new ways by Cavell and others.)

Barbara Hannan

I strive to write something clear and true about the central problems of human existence: what is real? What is knowledge, and what can I know? How should I live? Over the past five years I have been occupied with doing just that, by understanding and evaluating the thought of a great philosopher I admire --- Arthur Schopenhauer. The result, a book called *The Riddle of the World: A Reconsideration of Schopenhauer's Philosophy*, will be published by Oxford University Press this coming year.

I have an ongoing interest in so-called "emergent" phenomena, such as life and mind. I am drawn to animism or panpsychism, according to which these phenomena are not really emergent, but ubiquitous (present in all reality as a matter of degree). This conviction drew me toward Schopenhauer's metaphysics of will, and also attracts me to Spinoza's dual-aspect theory. Schopenhauer and Spinoza intrigue me not only with their metaphysics, but also with their ethics. Both of these philosophers attempt to show us how to live with dignity and peace of mind in the face of a world that cares nothing for human needs and desires.

Writing my book on Schopenhauer taught me something about myself: when I work effectively, I am motivated by something deeply personal and even *libidinous* (as odd as that may sound.) I was able to write on Schopenhauer because I *fell in love* with the man and with his philosophical system. Anything else of merit that I produce will have to be motivated in the same peculiar way.

My new research project is a book on Spinoza, in the same personal style as my study of Schopenhauer. The working title is *The Consolation of Necessity: A Study of Spinoza's Philosophy*.

Richard Hayes

A focus of my efforts from 2003 until the end of 2005 was serving as a subject editor on two large encyclopedia projects. These two projects followed on the heels of a longer and more time consuming project as subject editor for Indian philosophy on the Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, which had been one of my main projects between 1991 and 1998.

Beginning in 2002, I served as editor for the subject of Indian Buddhism for the Encyclopedia of Buddhism published by Curzon-Routledge. As is usually the case for a subject editor, my task was to plan which articles would appear in the subject area concerned. Unlike the usual case, however, I was also charged with writing all the articles rather than seeking other authors for them. This project therefore involved writing seventeen articles of varying lengths, for a total of 18,000 words. The second editorial project, which began in 2003, was serving as consulting editor for the topic of Buddhism for second revised edition of Macmillan Encyclopedia of Philosophy. The Buddhism section of the second edition of this encyclopedia was considerably larger than in the first edition, both in number of articles and in geographical areas covered; whereas the first edition had covered only Indian Buddhism,

the second edition included East Asian Buddhism. My assignment was to decide which of the already existing articles could be left unrevised, which needed minor revisions, and which needed to be replaced, and then to decide which topics not covered in the first edition should be covered in the second edition. I was also charged with finding authors for all the articles in need of some work. I wrote two of the articles myself and commissioned all the others.

After the two encyclopedia projects were finished, I was able to return to devoting more time to several projects that had been set aside or had received less time and energy than before taking up the three encyclopedia assignments. The project to which most time was devoted was completing a collaborative project with Brendan Gillon of McGill University that involved translating a section of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika Svopajñāvr̥tti* from Sanskrit, with consultation of the Tibetan translation, and writing an extensive English commentary to the translation. This was the second stage of project the first installment of which had been published in 1991. The second installment was finally published in *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2008 after many delays.

A philosopher who preceded Dharmakīrti was Dignāga, on whom my first book was published in 1988. This previous work on Dignāga resulted in two invitations to contribution chapters to anthologies. Jay Garfield and William Edelglass are editing a reader entitled *Buddhist Philosophy* to which I have contributed a fresh translation of key passages from Dignāga's *Pramāṇasamuccaya*. My understanding is that this work is to be published in the autumn or winter of 2008. A second work is a collection of chapters on Indian philosophy edited by Matthew Kapstein, for which I have prepared a 7000-word chapter on the philosophy of Dignāga, with an emphasis on his philosophy of language. I do not know when that volume will be published.

There are two projects to which I plan to turn attention next. The first is a project started about ten years ago that has been completely laid aside but on which considerable progress was made before it was set aside. This is a translation and English commentary to the whole of Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika Pramāṇasiddhi* chapter. The second is a project for which I have written up and submitted a proposal at the invitation of Columbia University Press to develop a textbook on Buddhist philosophy. If that proposal is accepted, that project will be done in conjunction with the translation project.

Adrian Johnston

Over the course of the past several years, my research work has been organized around two larger-scale endeavors. The first main thread of my pursuits has been (and remains) bringing together three areas/components in a synthesized, systematic fashion: European philosophy from the end of the eighteenth-century up through the present (especially the philosophies of Kant, Schelling, Hegel, Marx, and their numerous and varied successors), psychoanalysis (particularly that of Freud, Lacan, and certain post-Lacanian analytic thinkers), and the natural sciences (with a focus on the neurosciences). My first two books (*Time Driven: Metapsychology and the Splitting of the Drive* [2005] and *Žižek's Ontology: A Transcendental Materialist Theory of Subjectivity* [2008], both published by Northwestern University Press) are products of this overarching research trajectory. The first book seeks to re-conceptualize the metapsychological model of drive (*Trieb*) central to psychoanalysis in light of specific philosophical depictions of

temporality, with an eye to delineating the consequences of this temporal recasting of drive theory for accounts of subjectivity (including ethical and political subjectivity). The second book, structured through an interpretation of Slavoj Žižek's combination of post-Kantian German idealism with Lacanian psychoanalytic metapsychology, strives to develop what I call a "transcendental materialist theory of subjectivity"—in short, an account of how more-than-material forms of subjectivity emerge from a corporeal being. In addition to the German idealists, Lacan, and Žižek, this project makes use of cutting-edge work in the neurosciences, calling into question reductive materialist notions of naturalist determinism through such recent scientific discoveries as neuroplasticity. Along these lines, I'm currently in the process of co-authoring a book with French philosopher Catherine Malabou bringing together psychoanalysis, the neurosciences, and philosophy in order to re-examine the forces and factors at work in human beings' emotional lives. At the broadest of levels here, I'm interested in continuing to develop an in-depth engagement with the natural sciences informed by the theoretical/conceptual resources of Continental European philosophical traditions. This engagement aims to formulate what I am tempted to characterize as a "materialist existentialism"—that is to say, a scientifically-informed materialist ontology nonetheless compatible with the affirmed existence of autonomous subjects arising from, but thereafter irreducible to, their "natural" material bases.

The second main thread of my ongoing research pursuits is reflected in my third book, entitled *Badiou, Žižek, and Political Transformations: The Cadence of Change* (to be released by Northwestern University Press in 2009). Both in this book and elsewhere, I'm concerned to inquire how leftist political thought rooted in Marxist and post-Marxist orientations can and must be (re-)evaluated in response to our present geo-political circumstances.

Brent Kalar

My research since my arrival at UNM in 2002 has focused on the intersection of aesthetics and ethics in classical German philosophy, centered on the two poles of the emergent Romantic tradition. The first of these poles is Kant, from whom the Romantic revolution arose. The second is Nietzsche, whom I have long regarded as the culmination of the classical Romantic tradition.

Kant is the single most important source of the Romantic notion of the aesthetic. My book published in 2006, *The Demands of Taste in Kant's Aesthetics* tackles central questions in Kant's aesthetic theory – questions about his conception of beauty and aesthetic judgment.

I always envisioned my study of the foundations of Kant's aesthetics as a run-up to tacking Nietzsche. For the last two years, I have been working on a project tentatively entitled "Young Nietzsche and the Kantian Revolution in Aesthetics." As the title suggests, the purpose of this study is to build upon my previous work on Kant by using it as a key to understanding the ethical and aesthetic perspective of the young Nietzsche – a perspective that I associate with the term "aestheticism." Broadly speaking, aestheticism is an ethical outlook that bases ideas of the good life on some independent ("autonomous") conception of the aesthetic. There are, however, many possible forms of

aestheticism. I have been occupied with working out a novel interpretation of what Nietzsche's aestheticism amounts to. My guiding hypothesis has been that Nietzsche developed his aestheticism in the course of an engagement with Kant's aesthetics and with the Romantic tradition that grew out of the revolution that Kant brought about in aesthetics. This revolution involved a new quasi-religious role for art in helping to accommodate the human being to a sometimes-hostile world. The first chapter of this study – an essay entitled “The Naïve and the Natural: Schiller's Influence on Nietzsche's Early Aesthetics” – is slated to be published this fall in *History of Philosophy Quarterly*. It argues that (1) Nietzsche has an autonomous conception of aesthetic value (which is the precondition of aestheticism) and that (2) this conception is a notion of “the natural” that originates in Schiller's notion of “the naïve” – a conception Schiller first lays out in his seminal essay “On Naïve and Sentimental Poetry.” I also argue in the paper that Nietzsche's reliance on Schiller raises an issue about the coherence of Nietzsche's concept of the natural, since Schiller's naïve is a thoroughly moralistic notion (which is the very opposite of aestheticism). In the subsequent chapters of the “Young Nietzsche” study, I intend to work out an explanation of how Nietzsche's conception of aesthetic value may not only be saved, but made the basis of a coherent aestheticist ethic. A second paper currently under review at *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* is conceived as part of this project. Entitled “Kant, the Poet-Philosophers, and the Romantic Unity of Form and Content,” it develops as a response to what I argue is a misinterpretation by a prominent contemporary philosopher of the key Romantic notion that art is (ideally) a unity of form and content. I believe that this notion is crucial for an understanding of Nietzsche's point of view. This paper provides a background to be developed in future work.

Paul Katsafanas

Over the past five years, my research has focused on two questions. First, how can we justify normative claims such as “murder is wrong” and “you should not steal”? Second, how should we understand the notion of reflective agency? I argue that these seemingly unrelated questions are, in fact, reciprocally illuminating. We can justify normative claims by deriving them from facts about the nature of reflective agency.

My dissertation develops and defends a strategy for moving from descriptive claims about the nature of agency to normative claims about what there is reason to do. The view that I defend is a version of constitutivism. According to constitutivism, there is a certain aim that is present in every instance of action. This aim generates a standard of success for action: actions are successful to the extent that they fulfill the aim. The standard of success, in turn, generates claims about reasons for action. Thus, by determining what action is, we can derive normative conclusions about which actions we should perform.

I show that this strategy, which has historical roots in the work of Kant, enjoys a number of advantages over other justificatory strategies in ethics. However, I argue that the current versions of constitutivism, developed by David Velleman and Christine Korsgaard, encounter insurmountable problems. These problems arise because the theories in question operate with inadequate conceptions of action. I argue that we can

generate a successful version of constitutivism by employing a more promising theory of action, which I develop by mining Nietzsche's work on agency.

Nietzsche's theory of agency focuses on the complex interactions that occur between conscious and non-conscious aspects of the mind during deliberation and action. I argue that this account yields a unique and philosophically fruitful theory of the conditions under which a reflective agent is in control of her action. The account captures the increasingly influential idea that reflection plays a central role in human agency, while maintaining a psychological realism: it does not require an excessively intellectualized conception of action, and it is consistent with empirical work on human psychology. Ultimately, I argue that the Nietzschean account of action yields a successful constitutivist theory. In particular, Nietzsche argues that facts about the nature of human motivation show that all human action manifests "will to power." I explain what Nietzsche means by will to power, and argue that power is the constitutive aim of action. I show how this notion generates normative conclusions concerning both what we should do and what values we should embrace.

In sum, my dissertation defends the constitutivist strategy for justifying normative claims, argues that current versions of constitutivism are unsuccessful, and develops a new version of constitutivism by drawing on Nietzsche's theory of agency. The dissertation represents the bulk of my work over the past five years. Two of my published papers, "Nietzsche on Agency and Self-Ignorance," and "Nietzsche's Drive Psychology," discuss themes that emerge from one of the dissertation chapters. However, I have also published an independent paper on Nietzsche's theory of consciousness. In "Nietzsche's Theory of Mind: Consciousness and Conceptualization," I argue that Nietzsche associates conscious mental states with mental states that have conceptualized contents, and unconscious mental states with states that have non-conceptual contents. I argue that this reading makes sense of Nietzsche's otherwise puzzling claims about the falsifying and distorting effects of consciousness.

Paul Livingston

My research focuses on the history of twentieth-century philosophy, in both the analytic and the continental traditions, with thematic focus on the philosophy of mind, philosophy of language, and phenomenology. My first book, *Philosophical History and the Problem of Consciousness* (Cambridge, 2004), is an examination of the history of twentieth-century philosophy of mind, with a view to addressing the contemporary "hard problem" of explaining consciousness. In the book, I investigate the history of the analytic tradition's treatments of subjectivity, first-person experience, and consciousness from the Vienna Circle to the present, including discussion of Wittgenstein, Carnap, Schlick, Neurath, Husserl, Ryle, Place, Smart, Putnam, Fodor, Dennett, Chalmers, and others.

My second book, *Philosophy and the Vision of Language*, has just appeared from Routledge (April, 2008). The book examines the history and continuing implications of the transformative insight into language that marks the origin of the analytic tradition and still situates, as I argue in the book, its most significant results. Another aim of the book is to draw connections between the analytic tradition, in its turn to language, and parallel and related strands of continental philosophy in the traditions of phenomenology,

hermeneutics, critical theory, and deconstruction. Some of the philosophers treated in the book are: Frege, Wittgenstein, Schlick, Ryle, Sellars, Carnap, Quine, Adorno, Kant, Heidegger, Cavell, Brandom, Austin, and Davidson.

I am currently pursuing research under two separate (but closely related) headings. First, I am researching the history of appeals to logic and the concept of *logos* in the phenomenology of Husserl and Heidegger, including relationships between this appeal and the analytic tradition. For this project, I earned an Alexander von Humboldt research fellowship at Freiburg University in Germany, which I completed from January to August, 2007. This time at Freiburg allowed me to complete a significant amount of preliminary research, which I anticipate leading to publications and possibly a book. Second, I have been conducting research into appeals to language and logic in leading contemporary figures in continental philosophy, including Giorgio Agamben and Alain Badiou. This research has led to my (long) article “Agamben, Badiou, and Russell,” which documents the implications of both contemporary philosophers’ appeals to Russell’s paradox, and has just been accepted for publication in an upcoming issue of *Continental Philosophy Review*.

Rinita Mazumdar

My research interests are primarily in Feminist Theory and in the Philosophical Foundation of Economics. In particular, I am interested in issues that span the following three domains: philosophy, feminist theory, and economics. The interdisciplinary areas that interest me most are as follows: Malthusian theory of poverty, control of human sexuality versus individual liberty, ethics and eugenics. My broad research interest also includes such topics as the interconnection between poverty and gender and racial oppressions, poverty and violence, and alternative economic systems.

The style of research that I have found to be most affective in research pertaining to the philosophical foundation of economics may be termed “system-analysis”. An example of system analysis is as follows: Thomas Malthus gave us a theory of poverty in his book *On Population*. Malthus used empirical data to show that there is causal relationship between poverty and increased population. His conclusion was that population will exceed the resources needed to support it, until some natural events like famine or disease will reduce population to a point where the resources can the existing population. Following the method of “systems analysis” my research methodology is to find the foundational premises of this system and start questioning them. At the University of New Mexico I had the opportunity to do some collaborative research with upper-level under-graduate students. For me collaborative work is very useful for research because different people bring in different angles into the research. I also strongly believe in the synergy between student projects such as upper-level undergraduate independent study and my research. Another successful paradigm of research is social collaboration. This not only provides useful feedback to the directions of research, but also ensures a direct impact and quick use of research ideas in the real world. I have been able to gain some data for this kind of research through my work as the Project Coordinator of Asian Family Center.

In my book *A Short Introduction to Feminist Theory* I have talked about some of the problems in the foundation of both liberal and Marxist economics. Also, in my book

Feminine Sexuality, there is a small section where I talked about poverty, birth control, and eugenics. I am in the process of doing my research on a full-length book on feminist economics where I hope to bring bio-ethics, economics, and feminist theory together. During the Fall semester I teach a class on the Philosophical Foundation of Economics; this class and my class on Biomedical Ethics (sponsored by Central New Mexico Community College) and Feminist Theory contribute to my research in these areas. Further, I have directed two independent studies pertaining to the philosophical foundation of research. I shall be teaching an online course on Biomedical Ethics in the Fall of 2008. Based on the experience I gather in this course, I hope to develop a course on Philosophical Foundation of Economics, Poverty, and Ethics as an online course at the University of New Mexico in the future.

John Taber

My research has been concerned with the interpretation of classical Indian philosophical texts. I identify myself as a “historian of Indian philosophy.” That is to say, I approach Indian philosophical texts with an interest in comprehending the ideas and theories articulated therein as accurately as possible in their historical and social context, in all their complexity and profundity (and potential viability) as philosophical theories.

Of the diverse array of schools and movements of Indian philosophy I became fascinated early on with Mīmāṃsā. Relatively little work had been done on Mīmāṃsā, perhaps because some of its central teachings – the “intrinsic validity” of all cognitions, the authorlessness of the Veda, the “permanence” of language, and so forth – seem so implausible and its preoccupation with Vedic ritual and Dharma so peculiarly Brahmanical. Nevertheless, it was evident to me that there is more to Mīmāṃsā’s distinctive doctrines in epistemology, metaphysics, and philosophy of language than meets the eye. I also discerned in the seventh-century Mīmāṃsā author Kumārilabhaṭṭa one of the greatest philosophical minds I had ever encountered.

For about fifteen years, starting with the publication of “The Theory of the Sentence in Pūrva Mīmāṃsā and Western Philosophy,” I wrote articles on various aspects of Mīmāṃsā philosophy, especially Kumāriḷa. This work culminated in my second book, *A Hindu Critique of Buddhist Epistemology: Kumāriḷa on Perception*, which was published in 2005 with RoutledgeCurzon. This is a translation of a central chapter of Kumāriḷa’s *magnum opus*, the *Ślokavārttika*, concerning the nature of perception. It is essentially a response to the controversial views on perception of Dignāga (6th c.), who formulated the teachings of the Yogācāra and Sauntrāntika schools of Buddhism in brilliant and rigorously articulated logical, epistemological, and linguistic theories. Kumāriḷa’s chapter on perception is one of the main texts in the vast debate carried on between representatives of the Brahmanical and Buddhist traditions that defined the classical period. In addition to a translation of the text, which consists of about 250 verses, I composed an extensive commentary of my own, based on the classical Mīmāṃsā commentaries and an oral exposition given to me (in Sanskrit) by a noted Mīmāṃsā scholar in Chennai, India, in summer of 1997.

My research on Mīmāṃsā and Kumāriḷa led me to work increasingly with Buddhist materials, especially the writings of Dharmakīrti, the great seventh-century successor of Dignāga. Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa were probably contemporaries and

seem to be debating with each other in their writings – though this cannot be determined with certainty, since neither explicitly names nor quotes the other. In any case, one must be well acquainted with the views of the one in order to understand those of the other. Thus, I have explored aspects of Dharmakīrti’s thought in some of my writings, in particular, the articles “Much Ado About Nothing: Kumāriḷa, Śāntarakṣita, and Dharmakīrti on the Cognition of Non-being” and “Dharmakīrti Against Physicalism,” and, most recently, “Did Dharmakīrti Think the Buddha Had Desires?” In an article published in *Journal of Oriental Research* in 1991 I expressed skepticism about Erich Frauwallner’s views of the relationship Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa and the chronological sequence of Kumāriḷa’s works. This embroiled me in a debate, having ultimately to do with the proper interpretation of the theories of both Dharmakīrti and Kumāriḷa, which still continues, with several scholars (Japanese and Austrian) who have come to Frauwallner’s defense. Two more recent articles, “Much Ado About Nothing” and “Kumāriḷa the Vedāntin?,” are, among other things, responses to some of my critics in this debate.

Dharmakīrti’s logical theories have received a great deal of attention from modern scholars, so naturally, as I penetrated deeper into his thought, I became interested in issues of Indian logic for their own sake. Three of my publications, “Is Indian Logic Nonmonotonic?” and my of Oetke and Matilal (*The Character of Logic in India*) in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* reflect this endeavor. My article “Nāgārjuna’s So-Called Fallacies” also relates to this interest. Currently I am involved in a collaborative project, together with Helmut Krasser and Vincent Eltschinger of the Institute for the Culture and Intellectual History of Asia of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (Vienna), dedicated to translating the final section of Dharmakīrti’s *Pramāṇavārttika-svavṛtti*, in which he develops a trenchant (some would say “devastating”) critique of Mīmāṃsā theories of language and the authorlessness of the Veda. At the same time, I also recently written an article defending Kumāriḷa’s view of the eternality of the relation of word and meaning (“The Mīmāṃsā and the Eternality of Language”) on the grounds that Kumāriḷa considers language to be an abstract object.

Iain Thomson

My philosophical research focuses primarily on the work of Martin Heidegger. Heidegger is now widely recognized as one of the most influential and controversial philosophers of the twentieth century. Until the late 1960’s, this impact derived mainly from his early magnum opus, 1927’s *Being and Time*. Many of this century’s most significant continental thinkers—including Sartre, Merleau-Ponty, Arendt, Gadamer, Marcuse, Habermas, Bultmann, and Levinas—acknowledge profound conceptual debts to insights Heidegger elaborated in this text. *Being and Time* was never finished, however, and Heidegger continued to extend, develop, and in some places revolutionize his own thinking for another fifty years. This “later” Heidegger’s prolific body of work has decisively influenced the next generation of continental thinkers, shaping the concepts and concerns of important figures such as Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Blanchot, and Baudrillard. Despite this unparalleled impact, several basic aspects of Heidegger’s later philosophy remain shrouded in mystery, confusion, and controversy. The unifying

concern of my work as a whole has been to help clarify and critically appropriate a number of central, interrelated aspects of Heidegger’s later thought, such as his view of art’s central cultural role, his reading of Nietzsche and his influence on Derrida, his controversial understanding of metaphysics as ontotheology, his conception of “historicity” and his contributions to ecological philosophy, his appalling affiliation with Nazism, his critiques of technology and higher education and his suggested responses to their problems, as well as the internal tensions in and broader development of his thought as a whole. In the long run, my goal is to demonstrate the relevance of Heidegger’s thought (as I understand it) for helping us to make sense of ourselves and our contemporary world, thereby attempting to do for Heidegger’s later work what Hubert Dreyfus, William Blattner, and others have done so successfully for his early work.

Currently my central research project in a book, *Heidegger: A Philosophical Biography*, which seeks to restore Heidegger’s thinking to the concrete context from which it emerged and so render his full philosophical development and significance comprehensible to a broad intellectual audience. My guiding thesis here is that understanding Heidegger’s philosophical biography allows us to recognize his thinking as an evolving philosophical response to the tumultuous age through which he lived and so also as an enduring challenge to central aspects of our own technologically mediated self-understanding. (This book is under contract with Cambridge University Press.) Additionally, I have written three chapters of another book manuscript, tentatively titled *Thinking Death After Heidegger: Levinas, Derrida, Agamben*. I am also working on chapters for two volumes on Heidegger forthcoming from Cambridge University Press (a chapter on Heidegger’s thinking of “death” for a volume edited by Mark Wrathall and a chapter on “ontotheology” for the volume edited by Daniel Dahlstrom), as well as an entry for the Stanford University Encyclopedia of Philosophy on Heidegger’s thinking about art.

2. Part-Time Faculty

In addition to the sixteen full-time faculty discussed above the Department will hire 3-5 part-time faculty to cover lower-division courses (mostly Phil. 101 and 156) every semester. The following lists part-time faculty who have taught courses for the Department in the last five years (from F 03 – S 08):

Table 2: Recent UNM Philosophy Dept. Part-Time Faculty

Instructor	Degree	Institution	Courses taught
Anne Cacoullos	Ph.D.	Columbia	346
John DuFour	Ph.D.	Yale	101
Fred Goldberg	Ph.D.	Brandeis	101, 352,
William Hannaford	Ph.D.	Colorado-Boulder	245
Rinita Mazumdar	Ph.D.	Massachusetts- Amherst	101, 156, 341
Eric Meyer	Ph.D. English	Wisconsin-Madison	343
Jessica Posniak	Ph.D.	UNM	101, 156, 245, 334
Dan Primozić	Ph.D.	UNM	156

Cole Raison	M.A.	UNM	101, 156
Robert Reeves	Ph.D.	UNM	101, 201
Ely Van Mil	Ph.D.	Missouri	156
Aladdin Yaqub	Ph.D.	Wisconsin-Madison	356

The Philosophy Department strongly prefers part-time instructors who have Ph.D.'s in philosophy, especially for teaching 300-level courses and above, and has been fortunate to be able, for the most part, to staff its part-time sections with such highly-qualified instructors. Educational research suggests that academic performance tends to be lower among students who take courses from part-time instructors.²⁸ We suspect that that could have to do with the fact that fewer part-time instructors have Ph.D.'s in their fields than full-time professors and lecturers. By preferring part-time instructors with Ph.D.'s the Philosophy Department ensures that the quality of instruction is high in all of the courses it offers.

3. Faculty by Gender and Ethnicity

The following table represents the Department's full-time faculty by gender and ethnicity.

Table 3: Full-Time Faculty by Gender and Ethnicity

Faculty Member	Sex	Ethnicity
Becker	M	W
Burgess	M	W
Bussanich	M	W
Candelaria	M	H
Domski	F.	A
Gerber	F	W
Goodman	M	W
Hannan	F	W
Hayes	M	W
Johnston	M	W
Kalar	M	W
Katsafanas	M	W
Livingston	M	W
Mazumdar	F	A
Taber	M	W
Thomson	M	W

²⁸ "Impact of Full-Time Versus Part-Time Instructor Status on College Student Retention and Academic Performance in Sequential Courses," Larry A. Burgess and Carl Samuels, *Community College Journal of Research and Practice* 23.5 (1999): 487-498.

Four of sixteen current full-time faculty are women = 25%. Three are minority = 19%. Of the thirteen tenure-track faculty two are women = 15% and one minority = 8%.

The Department's relatively low percentage of female and minority faculty is the outcome of several factors: a shortage of women and minority Ph.D.'s in philosophy, the aspiration of UNM to hire the best scholars (which reduces the number of eligible candidates across all ethnic and gender categories), and chronic under-funding of the College of Arts and Sciences. As discussed in Sec. IV.3 only around 26.5 % of philosophy Ph.D.'s are earned by women according to the latest available statistics (which, however, are over ten years out of date), while only around 8 % are earned by minorities. This of course results in fierce competition for excellent women and minority candidates for philosophy positions – *a competition which is being won by the universities with the most resources*. Over the last four searches which the Department has conducted (one in 2004-05, which resulted in the hire of Mary Domski; another in 2005-06, which brought in Adrian Johnston; and two in 2007-08, which yielded Paul Katsafanas and Paul Livingston) eight out of fifteen finalists were women. Just this last year (2007-08) three of the initial finalists for our ethics position were women. Of those three, one withdrew, a second was considered uncompetitive, and the third declined our offer – which was \$20k less than an offer she had received from another university. Meanwhile, in the same search a superb Hispanic candidate (Ph.D. Columbia University; very strong publications and letters of recommendation) surfaced who was considered less desirable for the position than the finalists only because his area of specialization overlapped with those of current members of the department and he did not show particular strength in medical ethics, which was essential for the position (a joint appointment with the BA/MD Program). The Department therefore enthusiastically nominated him to the College as a potential “priority hire” for another line. Funding available through the Provost's Office for priority hires, however, is apparently limited.

4. Faculty Research Productivity

The following table summarizes the research productivity of the tenure-track faculty **for the last five years only**, from calendar year 2003 through 2008. Short CV's of tenure-track faculty focusing on this period are contained in Appendix VI.1. The following table counts only publications that have actually appeared in print.

Table 4: Tenure-Track Faculty Research Productivity 2003-08

	Books authored	Books edited²⁹	Articles³⁰	Chapters³¹	Reviews	Other³²	Presentations
Becker	1	0	4	0	0	0	6
Burgess	0	3	1	10	1	0	12
Bussanich	0	0	4	1	5	0	5
Domski	0	0 ³³	2	0	3	0	13
Goodman	0	2 ³⁴	2	8	1	5	14
Hannan	0 ³⁵	0	1	0	1	1	2
Hayes	0	0	1	0	4	22 ³⁶	3
Johnston	2 ³⁷	0	16	5	6	0	8
Kalar	1	0	0	0	1	0	5
Katsafanas	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Livingston	2	0	3	2	2	0	6
Taber	1	0	4	1	3	0	4
Thomson	1	0	6	12	1	4	17
Total	8	5	44	40	28	32	99

The table shows consistent productivity of *all* Philosophy faculty over the period question – with individual variations of course. This reflects an atmosphere of healthy competition among the faculty and a desire to raise the research profile of the Department nationally and internationally. One point in particular to be kept in mind is that quality, not quantity, of publications is emphasized in the field of philosophy. Philosophy is a highly theoretical discipline which can, and occasionally has been, revolutionized by a single article or monograph. The UNM Philosophy Department is proud that its faculty are publishing books with presses such as Oxford, Cambridge, Northwestern, and Routledge. The table also reveals, however, that different patterns of publishing are appropriate for different scholars, depending to a large extent on what stage of development they are in their careers. Some focus on getting articles accepted in high-prestige journals; others concentrate on writing original monographs; others, with already established reputations, are frequently invited to contribute chapters to anthologies on specific themes; others, also established scholars, feel the responsibility of serving their fields by editing such anthologies; others, who have worked in a particular field for a long time, feel it most productive to survey the achievements in their areas by writing encyclopedia articles. Most of our faculty are engaged in a combination of these activities.

²⁹ Including co-edited volumes.

³⁰ Peer-reviewed.

³¹ In most cases also peer-reviewed, especially conference proceedings.

³² Mostly encyclopedia articles, but also published interviews, etc.

³³ Edited volume (*Festschrift* for Michael Friedman) forthcoming with Open Court Press.

³⁴ Includes one edited work of four volumes.

³⁵ Book on Schopenhauer forthcoming with Oxford University Press.

³⁶ Encyclopedia articles.

³⁷ Third book on Badiou and Zizek forthcoming with Northwestern University Press.

5. Faculty Teaching Productivity

The normal course load of tenured and tenure-track Philosophy faculty is five courses per year. If a faculty member is actively engaged in research (a research plan must be submitted annually) the teaching load is reduced to four courses. The Graduate Director receives a one-course reduction, the Chair a two-course reduction. It is departmental policy that a tenured or tenure-track faculty member with a 2-2 load teach one lower-division or service course (e.g., a section of Phil. 101, 201 or a high-enrollment 300-level course of 35 students or more) and one upper-division course each semester. Normally, a faculty member will teach one seminar per year. Lecturers, who are shared with other departments, normally teach three courses in Philosophy per year. The following table shows which courses were taught by tenure-track faculty in AY 2007-08.

Table 5: Teaching Loads AY 2007-08

Name	Fall 07				Spring 08		
	Course 1	Course 2	Course 3	Overld.	Course 1	Course 2	Course 3
Becker	101	352	7		356	445/541	7
Burgess	Relig. 264	365	7	565	201	413/513	7
Bussanich	201	1	7	520	201	402/502	7
Domski	101	202	7		3	3	7
Goodman	332/532	541	7		441/541	480/580	7
Hannan	354/554	356	7		350/550	381/581	7
Hayes	336/536	541	7		331/531	354/554	7
Johnston	3	3	7		202	441/541	7
Kalar	201	442/542	7		344/544	367/567	7
Taber	101	1	7		531	1	7
Thomson	244	421/521	7		101	372/572	7

Codes

1=course reduction for administrative assignment, e.g., chair, graduate advisor

2=course buyout - funded

3=research semester, officially awarded, e.g., for junior faculty, sabbatical

4=swap; one course not taught this semester, extra course taught next (or last) semester

5=retirement or resignation

6=N/A due to less than 1.0 FTE appointment

7=has active research program, confirmed by chair, may be used for 1 column only each semester

The table below summarizes tenured and tenure-track faculty student mentoring for the period from Fall 20003 to Spring 2008.

Table 6: Faculty Student Mentoring F 2003 to S 2008

	Honors	Indep.Studies	M.A. Commes.	M.A. Director	Ph.D. Commes.	Ph.D. Director
Becker	1	2	1	0	1	0

Burgess	5	16	0	5	1	0
Bussanich	0	5	4	1	0	3
Domski	0	2	1	1	1	0
Goodman	5	8	9	4	4	1
Hannan	3	6	5	0	4	3
Hayes	0	5	6	1	1	0
Johnston	2	3	0	0	3	0
Kalar	3	0	4	0	4	2
Taber	0	5	2	2	2	2
Thomson	4	1	7	4	4	4
Total	23	53	39	18	25	15

In addition, some of our faculty have served as mentors of McNair and Regents' Scholars and students in the PROFOUND program during this period.

Faculty also regularly conduct **study groups** for undergraduate and graduate students on a range of topics. In the case of graduate students these are primarily intended to help them pass their qualifying exams. The study groups usually extend over several weeks if not an entire semester. Since Fall 2005 the following study groups have been offered.

“Teaching Symposium for Graduate Students,” Fall 2005, Profs. Becker, Burgess, Domski, and Thomson

“Martin Heidegger’s *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*,” Spring 2006, Profs. Domski and Thomson

“Immanuel Kant’s *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*,” Summer 2006, Prof. Domski

“Immanuel Kant’s *Critique of Practical Reason*,” Fall 2006, Profs. Schueler and Domski

“Metalogic Study Group,” Spring 2007, Prof. Becker

“Hegel Study Group,” Spring – Summer 2007, Prof. Johnston

6. Grants

Philosophy is not a field in which there is a great deal of funded research. Most funding is sought primarily for time released from teaching and service responsibilities in order to focus on writing. Only a few foundations provide grants and fellowships for this purpose, the principal ones being the National Endowment for the Humanities, the American Council of Learned Societies, the Fulbright Program, the National Humanities Center, and the Stanford Humanities Center. Awards are few and competition is fierce. Of UNM Philosophy faculty who have won this type of award in the last five years, Prof.

Thomson received an NEH Research Fellowship in 2007-2008 and Prof. Johnston received the Dean's Summer Research Award of the College of Arts and Sciences in summer, 2007.

Meanwhile, in the last five years Prof. Goodman obtained grants for three **NEH Seminars on American philosophy**, which were hosted (all or in part) by the UNM Philosophy Department: "Ralph Waldo Emerson at 200: Literature, Philosophy, Democracy" (Summer, 2003), "Reading Emerson's Essays" (Summer, 2005), and "Pragmatism: A Living Tradition" (Summer, 2007). These seminars are attended by faculty from across the country working in the field of the seminar topic; distinguished senior scholars are invited to teach week-long sessions of the seminar. Besides contributing to the visibility of our program, these seminars have offered opportunities for our graduate students to participate in the life of the profession at a very high level. The budget for last year's seminar (total: \$126,856, found in Appendix VI.2) included two project assistants, who were selected from among our graduate students.

Finally, in 2007 Prof. Domski received a \$100k grant from **the National Science Foundation** (NSF Ethics Education in Science and Engineering Program) to conduct a pilot study for training graduate students in philosophy and engineering to teach Engineering Ethics courses in area colleges. A larger grant will hopefully follow upon successful completion of the pilot study. This will also provide valuable training for some of our graduate students selected as TA's for the project in innovative, interdisciplinary teaching methods. A detailed description of the project along with a budget is contained in Appendix VI.3.

7. Faculty Compensation

The following table shows the AY 2008-09 salaries of Philosophy Department tenured and tenure-track faculty at all ranks.

Table 5: Tenure-Track Faculty Salaries, AY 2008-09

	Rank	Yrs. Service	Base Salary
Becker	Assoc.	6	\$63,079
Burgess	Full	30	\$70,421
Bussanich	Full	22	\$80,350
Domski	Asst.	3	\$56,000
Goodman	Full	37	\$105,776
Hannan	Assoc.	16	\$60,303
Hayes	Assoc.	7	\$63,130
Johnston	Asst.	2	\$56,398
Kalar	Asst.	5	\$55,596

Katsafanas	Asst.	0	\$54,000
Livingston	Asst.	0	\$56,000
Taber	Full	21	\$81,769
Thomson	Assoc.	8	\$75,456

It is well known that UNM salaries are below those of other universities. In spring of 2007 the Interim Dean of Arts and Sciences provided the Philosophy Department with the average salaries of philosophy professors at different ranks at its NASULGC are peer institutions.³⁸ The average salaries for 2006-07 were:

Avg. Regional Peer Philosophy Salaries 2006-07

Professor	\$97,817
Associate	\$61,943
Assistant	\$51,018

Adjusting these for 4% raises in 2007-08 and 2008-09 one may estimate the average philosophy professor salaries at UNM regional peer universities for 2008-09 to be:

Estimated Avg. Regional Peer Philosophy Salaries 2008-09

Professor	\$104,781
Associate	\$66,997
Assistant	\$55,180

The average UNM Philosophy faculty salaries for 2008-09 at different ranks are:

Avg. UNM Philosophy Salaries 2008-09

Professor	\$84,579
Associate	\$65,492
Assistant	\$55,598

Thus, according to these estimates, UNM average Philosophy salaries are slightly ahead of the peer average for assistant professors, slightly behind for associate professors, and way behind for full professors. There are six professors at the associate and full professor level whose salaries are below the estimated peer averages. At the same time it must be kept in mind that average salaries for professors in the Mountain States region are

³⁸ NASULGC stands for The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. The twelve institutions included in the comparison group were: University of Arizona, Arizona State University, University of Utah, Utah State University, University of Colorado-Boulder, Colorado State University, University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, University of Texas-Austin, Texas A&M University, Texas Tech University, and University of Houston.

generally lower than for the rest of the country, in some cases much lower.³⁹ In a national market those individuals who are at or below the average at their rank are highly motivated to seek other positions. The salaries of associate and full professors – which reflect the relatively low annual raises approved by the New Mexico State Legislature over time – need to be brought up to or above the regional averages in order to retain individual faculty at those levels.

Clearly, there are also inequities within the Department at the senior and associate levels that also need to be addressed. Some faculty tend to be productive in spurts, thereby failing to benefit as much as others from consistent annual merit raises, even though their productivity overall may be comparable. The discrepancies become exaggerated over time, again due to low annual average raises; therefore they most evident in faculty with more years of service.

8. Other Faculty Support

In recent years the Department has received approximately \$1000 per faculty member from the College of Arts and Sciences for academic travel. Fortunately, the Department has been able to supplement this amount with earnings from the Gwen Barrett Endowment (see above, Sec. IV.7.b.i and ii). Thus, the Department has been able to offer fairly generous travel allotments to its faculty. In FY 07 the average amount was \$1570 per faculty member; in FY 08, \$1900 per faculty member. We anticipate being able to continue funding travel at this level for the foreseeable future, though we are nervous about how Barrett earnings will be affected by a weakening stock market; this academic year, moreover, the College contribution was reduced to \$800. These funds are used chiefly for travel to academic conferences, but occasionally for other research purposes, such as visiting libraries. There are of course other sources of travel funding in the University of which Philosophy faculty have availed themselves in the past (though not in the last five years), in particular grants through the Research Allocation Committee.

Entering faculty at this time receive \$7,000 in start-up funds, distributed over their first three years. These funds may be used for computers, travel to conferences, books, and other research expenses.

9. Future Hiring

The Philosophy Department has been fortunate to be able to keep replacing faculty in tenure-track lines over the years and has even grown from eleven lines to thirteen since its last review in 1995. *We cannot emphasize enough how crucial this has been for the continued success and growth of the Department.* Although thirteen faculty

³⁹ See *2007-2008 Report on the Economic Status of the Profession*, AAUP, Table 6.

is small for a philosophy department with a Ph.D. program (see Sec. VIII), we acknowledge that, given the current financial situation of the College of Arts and Sciences, it would be unrealistic to expect further lines in the immediate future. We are also unaware of any impending retirements in the Department. Our senior faculty still enjoy teaching and look forward to some of their most productive years of research. Thus, we feel it would be inappropriate to present a fixed hiring plan. What we offer instead is a “wish list” should more faculty positions be created in our department. Given the current configuration of fields – which we believe we should maintain – we would be delighted to have further positions in the following areas:

- **Core Analytic Philosophy** (metaphysics, epistemology, logic, or philosophy of science)
- **Ethics**
- **American Philosophy**
- **Indian Philosophy** (ideally, a philosopher who combines expertise in Sanskrit with strength in one or more areas of analytic philosophy)
- **Nineteenth-Century or Twentieth-Century Continental Philosophy**

We have not prioritized this list. Faculty in any of these areas would help the Department in significant ways; *ideally, we would add faculty in all of them*. Faculty in American philosophy, Indian philosophy, and nineteenth-century or twentieth-century continental philosophy would build on strengths we already have. The rationale for enhancing our existing areas of strength is developed in Section IX of this study. The addition of faculty in analytic philosophy would provide for a better balance of historical and non-historical perspectives in the Department and preserve its tradition of pluralism. It would also support our graduate program strengths in American philosophy and Indian philosophy and lighten the burden of those faculty (currently only two) charged with teaching the core analytic courses required for the major. Ethics would meet an apparently insatiable demand for ethics courses at all levels and also support *all* of our graduate program strengths, including nineteenth and twentieth-century continental philosophy. With so many diverse needs, the Department would conduct modified “open” searches that announce particular needs in two or three areas, allowing it to hire the best candidate available in any of those areas in a given year. It has been chiefly through such searches that the Department has assembled the strong and diverse cast of scholars it has now.

The Department particularly looks forward to advice from the outside review team on which areas it would be most advantageous to strengthen, given prevailing attitudes and values in the profession.

Section VII: Facilities and Resources

1. Space

The Philosophy Department occupies the west wing of the fifth floor of the Humanities Building. Its facilities consist of the following areas:

- sixteen faculty offices
- departmental library
- departmental lounge
- departmental seminar room (Hum. 518, in center of building opposite the elevators)
- front reception area (with work station for Administrative Assistant)
- Departmental Administrator's office
- mail room (with faculty mailboxes and storage space)
- copy room (with copy machine, fax machine, and storage closets)
- storage room
- student computer pod
- rest rooms (in center of building, shared with Linguistics)

The faculty offices are adequate in size, ranging from 114.5 sq. ft. to 147 sq. ft. Several have fine views of the Sandia and Manzano Mountains. The lounge has picture windows looking out on the Sandias, with access to a spacious balcony. In Spring 2005 the Department received a grant of \$100,000 from the New Mexico State Legislature for renovation and repair of the departmental facilities and computer equipment. Currently the public areas of the Department – the lounge, library, and reception areas – are attractive and in good repair, with new paint and carpeting. Carpeting in the faculty offices, however, is over ten years old and needs to be replaced.

Almost all rooms on the exterior of the building have doors that open out to balconies. This pleasant feature of the design of the Humanities Building is, however, actually a disadvantage during the summer months. When it rains heavily water builds up on the balconies, which do not drain properly, and seeps under the doors flooding the offices. UNM's Physical Plant has never figured out how to fix this chronic problem. The skylight in the library also leaks around the edges in heavy rainstorms. We suspect that this has to do with improper flashing and will only be remedied when the (tar-and-gravel) roof of the Humanities Building is replaced. Also, the skylight itself appears to be developing cracks.

The main concern of the Department with regard to its facilities, however, is lack of offices for faculty. Currently, each of our twelve full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty has his or her own office, leaving only four offices to be shared by nine Philosophy TA's, five part-time instructors, and four graders. (Our lecturers, fortunately, are housed in other departments, though we cannot count on that always being the case;

we have no offices available anywhere for visiting faculty.) When Prof. Livingston joins the Department next spring there will be only three offices for the TA's, PTI's, and graders. That is clearly inadequate. We doubt that there are very many other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences that have a higher occupancy density. The Department hopes to convince the Linguistics Department, which holds both the west wing of the fifth floor of the Humanities Building and the west side of the ground floor of the building, to loan it one or two offices in the spring. A long-term solution to the problem is not on the horizon. Mathematics is supposed to vacate the entire fourth floor and part of the third floor of the Humanities Building when it moves to the new Math-Science Learning Center, but no date for that has been announced, nor any plan for reallocating the offices and classrooms in Mathematics to other departments.

Another crucial space need of the Department is for a mid-size classroom. The Department currently has use of a seminar room, Humanities 518, which seats only 15-18 students comfortably. This is adequate for a 440/500-level seminar. It would be of great benefit if the Department also had disposal of a larger classroom to schedule for 300-level courses with up to forty students. Classrooms for courses that size are often not available during peak teaching hours – from 9 am to 1 pm TR and MWF – through the University Scheduling Office.

The student computer pod has three computers (purchased in Fall 2005) available for use by all graduate students. Four computers are distributed among the four offices currently being used by TA's, PTI's, and graders. All full-time faculty have their own computers, which are purchased either by the Department or the College of Arts and Sciences. They are replaced every two to three years.

2. Staff Support

The Philosophy Department has been fortunate to be administered by superb staff personnel over the years. Our current Administrator is Theresa Lopez, who joined the Department in August, 2007; our Departmental Assistant is Rikk Murphy, who has been with the Department since 2002.

The Administrator oversees and coordinates the fiscal activity of the department, including the development and management of operating budgets, contracts and grants, inventory, payroll, faculty travel, and purchasing. She reviews and reconciles monthly ledgers and reports for unit accounts and assists with departmental fiscal planning. She is in charge of daily operations of the Department, including responding to diverse questions and requests from student and faculty and supervising and training subordinate employees. She assists with departmental personnel planning, especially the hiring of part-time instructors, processes employment documents, and provides information on administrative procedures to prospective faculty, staff, post doctoral fellows, and students. She coordinates special department activities, including conferences, workshops, convocations, and other similar functions. Finally, she serves as advisor to

the chair. This, however, is by no means a complete list of all the things the Department Administrator does.

The Departmental Assistant is chiefly responsible for the administrative end of our graduate program. He processes all graduate applications and tracks all our current graduate students, keeping them aware of the various rules, regulations, and deadlines of both the department and the university. He also performs a variety of clerical duties including acting as the department's receptionist, maintaining the department's website, keeping track of inventory, ordering supplies, and assisting the Chair, Department Administrator, Graduate Director, and Undergraduate Advisor when needed. He plays a key role in managing departmental job searches. Again, this is not a complete list.

3. Library Holdings

UNM University Libraries is a member of the Association of Research Libraries. In 2005/2006 UNM UL ranked 79th out of 113 member libraries. The UL is composed of four separate branch facilities: Zimmerman Library, the Education, Social Sciences and Humanities Library which was renovated after a fire in 2006; Centennial Science and Engineering Library; Parish Business and Economics Memorial Library; and the Fine Arts and Design Library, which opened in a new building in 2008. In addition to the University Libraries, students and faculty also have access on north campus to the Health Sciences Library & Informatics Center and the Law Library. The UL has over 2 million volumes, 200 online databases and 35,000 current journals.

Borrowing of materials not held at UNM is done through the Inter-library Loan system. UNM belongs to a consortium of libraries which delivers most journal articles to user's computer accounts within 24 hours and books within 4 days. This is a free service to students, faculty and staff. This service is especially effective in providing articles and chapters of materials; the electronic files are often delivered to the users within hours of the request.

Philosophy Resources

JOURNALS: The UL has approximately 250 journals directly related to philosophy. Of these, approximately 100 journals have full-text content available. In addition to the major journals in the field, articles about philosophy are found in many other subject areas.

BOOKS: The major classification numbers for philosophy are B through BD and BH through BJ. The UL has approximately 600 shelves of books in those areas, with the majority of the shelves holding 30 books, for an approximate count of 18,000 print books. Additional materials in these areas are located in other libraries and collections including reference collections. Many materials related to philosophy are found in other

areas; for example, much political philosophy is found in the H and J classification numbers.

ELECTRONIC RESOURCES: The growth of electronic resources over the past decade has transformed research and libraries. Many works of major philosophers are freely available on the Internet, ranging from classical Greek and Roman texts to the works of modern philosophers. In addition to such developments indexes have become available as online databases and journals and reference tools are online with full-text articles. The UL purchases extensive electronic resources relating to philosophy, including: *The Philosopher's Index*, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, *Academic Search Complete*, *Humanities International Complete*, *JSTOR*, *Project Muse*, *American Periodicals*, *Early English Books Online*, etc.

Philosophy Acquisitions

Acquisitions by UL in the various subject areas has been curtailed in recent years due to cutbacks in the overall Library budget; currently, the overall UL annual acquisition budget is several million dollars less than its peer institutions.⁴⁰ In philosophy, the “discretionary budget” for purchasing philosophy books, i.e., the amount available to faculty for special orders and targeted purchasing by Library staff (the Philosophy Department is assigned a “selector” who works closely with the faculty), was \$5,900 (down from \$6,500 in FY 2007). Another \$14,008 was spent on philosophy books through the U.S. automatic purchase fund, which automatically selects for U.S. libraries the most prominent books published in most subject areas.⁴¹ Thus, a total of \$19,908 was spent on philosophy books in FY 08 from these two sources, which purchased a total of 572 works in call numbers B through BD and BH through BJ. Meanwhile, approx. \$22,000 was spent on journals. This means that the Library is able to purchase the most prominent books that appear in the various sub-disciplines of philosophy in a given year (of which there are some thirty: history of philosophy, which itself includes many periods, ethics, metaphysics, epistemology, logic, philosophy of science, cognitive science, feminist philosophy, etc., etc.). More specialized monographs, Festschriften, books in series, and works in foreign languages, including translations, however, tend to be a lower priority, though the Library is very responsive in special ordering materials to be used in scheduled courses.

In general, the Library is adequate for undergraduate teaching. Some Philosophy faculty find it less than ideal for their own research. Not only more recent scholarly monographs but important editions and periodicals are lacking (even given all the online resources) in certain areas. Although the Interlibrary Loan department of Zimmerman Library is courteous and efficient in delivering needed materials – certainly, the research *can* be carried out – the disadvantages of being heavily dependent on interlibrary loan are well known to scholars. (One can only order specific items through ILL, yet even

⁴⁰ Source: personal communication with library staff.

⁴¹ Some philosophy materials are purchased with other funds, including general humanities, social sciences, fine arts, science, and reference funds.

experienced researchers do not always know exactly what they need, and so on.) Moreover, students, especially graduate students, do not have the opportunity to explore and learn about the literature of their discipline by browsing stacks and reference works.

In 1997 University Library was fortunate to receive a gift (thanks to the efforts of Prof. Burgess) that allowed it to purchase the private collection of books in classical Indian religion and philosophy of the retired Sanskrit scholar Steven Goodwin. This collection contained over 700 titles, approximately a third of which were in Sanskrit language, including standard editions of Indian religious and philosophical classics. These now form the background of a respectable collection of texts in Indian philosophy available to Philosophy Ph.D. students specializing in Indian philosophy.

4. Extramural Support

Barrett Endowment

In 1991 the Department learned that a former student, Gwen J. Barrett, had left a several hundred thousand dollar estate to the Philosophy Department, with the hope that it could be used to create an endowed chair in Philosophy. When it became evident that the funds were insufficient to do that, the department decided that it would determine annually how to allocate the yield from the endowment for the support of students and faculty. The Gwen J. Barrett Dissertation Fellowship is funded out of this endowment. Every year, usually at its Fall Retreat, the faculty approve a budget for that fiscal year. The budget for AY 2008 is summarized below.

total income	\$20,173.50
est. carry forward	\$7,228.56
est. starting balance	\$27,401
Barrett Fellowship	\$7,100
tuition for Barrett Fellow	\$600
other student support	\$2,000
supplemental faculty travel	\$8,600
O'Neil Lecture supplement (inc. advertising and honorarium for S. Zizek)	\$3500
outcomes assessment	\$750
travel: colloquium speakers	\$2850
new student reception, convocation	\$2000
total budgeted expenditures	\$27,400

State Grant

In March, 2005, the Philosophy Department received a grant from the New Mexico Legislature of \$100,000 for the renovation and repair of the Department and purchase of equipment. The funds are encumbered until June 30, 2009. They have been primarily spent on new computer equipment for faculty, students, and staff and renovation of the public areas of the Department, including in particular the front reception area and library. To date, \$43,674 has been spent on equipment and \$35,175 on renovation.

The Philosophy Fund

The Philosophy Department also receives occasional donations from friends of the Philosophy Department, usually completely unsolicited. Every year, however, in the letter the Department sends out to announce the annual O'Neil Lectures, recipients are also invited to make donations to the Department, which are deposited in this account. Currently, the balance in this fund is \$2043 (as of 8/29/08). The Department tentatively plans to use this money for outside speakers and graduate student support in AY 08-09.

Section VIII: Program Comparisons

1. Basis of Comparisons

For the sake of comparing the Department of Philosophy of the University of New Mexico with other philosophy departments, the philosophy departments of universities in two neighboring states have been chosen, namely, Arizona State University and University of Oklahoma. These state universities have departments that are roughly comparable in size to our department. The philosophy departments at University of Texas at Austin, University of Colorado, and University of Arizona are much larger in size than the one at UNM, and the philosophy departments at University of Texas in El Paso and New Mexico State University are much smaller than ours.

In addition to the two departments already mentioned in neighboring states, one other philosophy department was chosen for comparative purposes. Vanderbilt University has a philosophy department slightly larger than the one at UNM. It has strengths in contemporary continental philosophy, one of the areas of strength of the UNM department.

For comparison with the graduate programs of other universities, one further university was added to the three universities mentioned. University of Hawaii and Manoa has a department the same size as the one of UNM, and like the UNM department it is one of the few programs in the world where one can specialize at the graduate level in Indian philosophy.

For the purpose of comparing the quality of UNM's faculty with the faculty of a nationally ranked program, we have chosen the Philosophy Department at the University of Colorado, Boulder, as the basis of comparison (Sec. VIII.7).

2. Comparison of Faculty, Students and Teaching load

The data presented in Table 1 was gathered by writing to the programs compared and soliciting data on

1. the number of full-time faculty members
2. the breakdown of academic rank among those full-time faculty,
3. the numbers of lecturers and temporary part-time faculty,
4. the numbers of undergraduate philosophy majors, M.A. students and Ph.D. students currently in the programs.

Those data are found in Table 1 for Arizona State University (ASU), University of Oklahoma (UO), UNM and Vanderbilt University (VU).

Table 1: Numbers and instructors of students

	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
Full-time faculty	15	13	14	16
Assistant	6%	38%	36%	19%

	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
Associate	38%	31%	36%	31%
Professor	56%	31%	28%	50%
Lecturers	2	2.5	1	2
Temp part-time	5	5	2	0
Majors	155	113	90	104
M.A.	12	8	11	2
Ph.D	21	15	22	47

Several salient facts emerge from the comparison of the UNM Department with these other programs:

- The UNM Philosophy Department has the fewest number of full-time faculty.
- The UNM Philosophy Department has the highest percentage of untenured faculty.
- The UNM Philosophy Department has the second highest number of majors.
- The UNM Philosophy Department has the smallest total number of graduate students.

As regards the distribution of full-time faculty at different ranks, UNM is at present closer to the profile at University of Oklahoma than to that of Arizona State and Vanderbilt. Given that several of our assistant professors and two of our associate professors are expected to apply for promotion in the 2008–2009 academic year and in the two subsequent years, it is likely that, barring new hires or retirements, the profile at UNM will be closer to that Arizona State profile within the next three years.

Also solicited from each of the comparable universities was the number of credit hours for all philosophy courses taught in the Spring 2007 and Fall 2007 semesters. That figure is arrived at by multiplying the number of students enrolled by three. Adding the Spring and Fall total credit hours together gives the total credit hours for 2007. That figure is then divided by the total number of instructors (full-time faculty, lecturers, and temporary faculty) to arrive at credits per instructor. That figure is divided by six to arrive at an estimate of the number of students taught per instructor per year. All these data are shown in table 2.

Table 2: Total credit hours taught and estimate of teaching loads

<i>Credits</i>	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
Spring 2007	5420	4264	3276	2862
Fall 2007	6417	4749	3267	2757

<i>Credits</i>	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
Total 2007	11837	9013	6543	5617
Credits per instructor 2007	538	439	385	312
Students per instructor 2007	89	73	64	52

Significantly, the UNM Philosophy Department has the second-highest credit hour total and the second-highest ratios of credit hours per instructor and students per instructor of the group, after ASU.

3. Comparison of Graduate Programs

The information in the following tables was gathered from the web site phds.org; the exact URL is graduate-schools.phds.org/masters/philosophy. This web site offers statistics on graduate school outcomes under various headings. In the following tables, the statistics chosen for comparison are the following: the number of M.A. and Ph.D degrees awarded in the years 2001–2005; the median of the number of years taken to complete a Ph.D degree; the percentage of Ph.D candidates having confirmed offers of employment at the time of graduation; the percentage of those with confirmed employment offers working in the field of education; and the percentage of students receiving financial support in the form of Teaching Assistanceships. On the web site in question, the statistics for the percentage of UNM philosophy Ph.D students receiving TAships was not available. For the purposes of comparison a figure for UNM was generated by dividing the total number of available TAships (9.5) by the current number of Ph.D students in the program (15). It is not known how this particular statistic was generated for the other universities. It should be borne in mind that 100% of Ph.D students at UNM receive support in the form of Teaching Assistanceships during their first years of study.

Table 3: Comparisons of graduate programs

	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UH</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
M.A. degrees 2001-2005	21	35	20	17	27
PhD degrees 2001-2005	2	22	5	11	26
Median years to complete	7.2	8.2	5.2	6.9	6.3

	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UH</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
PhD					
Pct of PhDs graduating with job offers	66%	53%	66%	69%	56%
Pct employed in education	94%	82%	94%	95%	81%
Pct PhD students with TA support	43%	37%	63%	69%	8%

To make the comparison of the UNM Department of Philosophy with the other four philosophy departments more clear, the following table shows how UNM's statistics compare with the mean and the median of the five programs compared. As will be seen on that table, the UNM Department of Philosophy is close to the departments of philosophy at comparable universities in all areas but one; the number of Ph.D degrees granted between 2001 and 2005 is significantly lower at UNM than at the other universities. The relatively low number of graduates is probably a reflection of the department's policy not to admit students more students into the Ph.D program than can be given financial support in the form of Teaching Assistanceships in their first five years of study. This policy may be a factor in why students complete their doctorates in fewer years at UNM than at comparable universities.

Table 4: UNM compared with averages from Table 3

	<i>Mean from Table 3</i>	<i>Median from Table 3</i>	<i>UNM</i>
M.A. degrees 2001-2005	24	21	20
PhD degrees 2001-2005	13.2	11	5
Median years to complete PhD	6.8	6.9	5.2
Pct of PhDs graduating with job offers	62%	66%	66%
Pct employed in education	89%	94%	94%
Pct PhD students with TA support	44%	43%	63%

Table 5: Gender, ethnic and citizenship diversity

	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UH</i>	<i>UNM</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
Sex					
Men	50% (48)	60% (41)	60% (42)	85% (48)	93% (45)
Women	50% (52)	40% (59)	40% (58)	15% (52)	7% (55)
Race/Ethnicity					
White	50% (58)	75% (42)	100% (60)	90% (78)	100% (72)
Asians	50% (4)	8% (52)	0% (3)	0% (4)	0% (3)
Under-represented minorities	0%	8%	0%	10%	0%
Citizenship					
US	100% (82)	63% (86)	100% (90)	85% (85)	81% (80)
Visa holders & permanent residents	0% (18)	37% (14)	0% (10)	15% (15)	18% (20)

The phds.org website has demographic data gathered for all students awarded a Ph.D degree between 2000 and 2004. Those data are presented in Table 5. The percentages given outside parentheses are for Ph.D recipients, while the figures in parentheses are corresponding figures for the student population at the university as a whole. It is striking that in all the universities being compared, the percentage of males receiving Ph.D degrees is significantly higher than the percentage of males in the student population as whole at the same university. The one exception is Arizona State University, but its data are skewed by the fact that there were only two students graduating with a Ph.D degree in the period under consideration. If Arizona State University is not taken into account, the average difference between male Ph.D recipients and overall male student population is on average 32% more. At UNM the percentage of male Ph.D recipients is 18% higher than the percentage of males in the student population as a whole. So in an academic discipline that is still on the whole more dominated by males than is the case in other academic disciplines, male domination among Ph.D recipients was less pronounced at UNM than at the other departments being compared between 2000 and 2004.

Also striking in looking at the data in Table 5 is that philosophy is an academic discipline in which the percentage of white students earning Ph.D degrees is higher than the percentage of white students in the student population of the university granting the degree. Again discounting ASU, the percentage of white Ph.D recipients is on average 32% higher than the percentage of white students as a whole; at UNM the difference in the years in question was 40%. In both gender and ethnic diversity the current demographic makeup of students working toward graduate degrees is promising, in that the dominance of white males is slowly waning compared to the situation between 2000 and 2004.

4. Comparison of Graduate Program Requirements

M.A. program

Vanderbilt University does not have an M.A. program, so the UNM program is here compared with the programs at Arizona State University, University of Hawaii and University of Oklahoma. Among those universities, Hawaii does not offer a thesis-based M.A. Rather than submitting a thesis, an M.A. candidate at UH is required to submit a portfolio containing three revised versions of papers originally submitted for courses, along with the originals of those papers; in an oral examination the papers are discussed, and the student is asked to comment on the revisions made in them. ASU has a similar portfolio-based M.A. as an alternative to its thesis-based program. The M.A. programs of ASU and UNM are the only two of those compared that have distribution requirements. In the ASU program, a candidate is required to take at least one course in each of four areas: epistemology, history of philosophy, metaphysics and value theory. At UNM M.A. candidates must take at least four course in five areas: history of ancient philosophy, history of modern philosophy, history of philosophy in general, ethics, metaphysics, or epistemology. University of Hawaii is the only M.A. program among the four to have a language requirement; in that program a student must take at least four semesters of a “philosophically relevant” language, namely, Greek, Latin, French, German, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Sanskrit or Pali. The M.A. program of University of Oklahoma is the only one of the four being compared that has a requirement in advanced logic. The number of credit hours required in all four programs is around 30. The UNM program requires 32-hours of course work (with the distribution requirements specified above), a thesis of no more than 12,000 words and an oral defense of the thesis. With those requirements the M.A. program at UNM is comparable with those of the other universities that have this degree program.

Ph.D program

All the programs compared have, in effect, the same number of credit hours of required course work, all at around 30. (Vanderbilt admits students directly into its Ph.D program, for which it requires 60 credits of course work, but up to 30 can be transferred from an M.A. program at another university. Oklahoma requires 90 credits for the Ph.D, but 30 of these are for the dissertation, and 30 can be transferred from an M.A. program in philosophy.) All programs have minimum distribution requirements, which are shown in the following table.

Table 6: Ph.D distribution requirements

UNM

- three courses in history of philosophy
- one course in ethics
- one course in metaphysics or epistemology

ASU

- two courses in history of philosophy
- two courses in value theory
- four courses in metaphysics and epistemology
- one course in advanced symbolic logic

OH

- three courses in history of philosophy
- three courses in ethics
- three courses in metaphysics and epistemology
- one course in advanced symbolic logic

UH

- three courses in history of philosophy
- one course in metaphysics, epistemology, political philosophy, ethics, social theory, or aesthetics

VU

- one course in each of five areas of history of philosophy: ancient, medieval, modern, 19th and 20th-century
- one course in symbolic logic
- candidate must take courses from eight different tenured or tenure-track instructors

All the programs but that of Arizona State have some kind of language requirement. UNM requires candidate to take an examination in French, German or a classical language. University of Oklahoma requires that a student demonstrate foreign language proficiency only if the candidate's dissertation topic is in an area in proficiency in one or more languages is necessary to do the required research; this decision is made by the candidate's committee. University of Hawaii requires that a student demonstrate ability to read philosophical texts written in one of the philosophical relevant languages (Greek, Latin, French, German, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Sanskrit or Pali). Vanderbilt University has a two-stage language requirement. The first stage is to demonstrate a reading knowledge of a language other than English by translating a passage from a philosophical text in a timed examination, which is evaluated in a double-blind process; the second stage is to demonstrate an ability to do philosophical research in a language relevant to the candidate's thesis topic.

All the Ph.D programs being compared have some form of comprehensive examination that a candidate must pass before passing to the dissertation-writing stage. Those requirements are shown in tabular form below.

Table 7: Comprehensive examination requirements

UNM: written or oral examination of philosophical readings on a list determined by the department; all students are responsible for the same texts.

ASU: written **and** oral examination of a list of readings compiled by the student and approved by the student’s advisory committee.

OH: written **and** oral examination of key writings in the student’s chosen area of specialization.

UH: written **and** oral examination on a reading list compiled by the faculty, on contemporary issues in philosophy.

VU: two papers based on a reading list constructed by the candidate and approved by the candidate’s committee: on paper on the history of philosophy and one paper on philosophical issues.

5. Areas of Specialization Represented by Faculty Members

Finally, in this section the breadth and depth of philosophical specializations of the full-time faculty is compared. This material has been gathered from the websites of each of the departments compared.

Table 8: Faculty specialization

	<i>UNM</i>	<i>ASU</i>	<i>UH</i>	<i>UO</i>	<i>VU</i>
History of philosophy	8	2	2	5	8
Continental philosophy	5	0	2	0	6
Non-Western/Asian	3	0	5	2	2
Metaphysics and epistemology	2	7	7	5	6
Ethics	1	6	1	5	3

6. The Utilization of Program Comparisons

The Philosophy Department is constantly reassessing both its undergraduate and graduate programs. Comparisons with other programs assist the Department in gauging its success in several areas: credit hours, recruitment of majors, and time to degree (for Ph.D. students). (We seem to be doing well in all these categories.) Comparison of size of graduate programs (number of students) can be helpful in making decisions about whether to increase or shrink the size of our program. (We have in fact decided to increase the number of students admitted to the M.A.) Comparison of degree requirements allows us to gauge whether our program's requirements are too burdensome for students, perhaps discouraging prospective applicants from applying or unnecessarily extending the time it takes students to graduate. (At the present time, this appears *not* to be the case. We have taken this into account, however, in the past in streamlining our graduate program, specifically, in revising our language and comprehensive exam requirements.) Staffing comparisons confirm our belief that the Department needs more full-time, tenure-track faculty to cover the most important sub-disciplines and provide our students a well-rounded philosophical education.

7. Quality Comparison with the University of Colorado, Boulder, Philosophy Department

For the purpose of assessing the quality of UNM's Philosophy faculty we have chosen the University of Colorado, Boulder, Philosophy Department as a standard of comparison, for the following three reasons: 1) UC, Boulder, is among UNM's regional peers. 2) Information about UC's Philosophy faculty is readily available. The website of the UC, Boulder, Philosophy Department has links to CV's of twenty-one of its twenty-four faculty. Other departments we looked at had far fewer links. The Philosophy Department at UT, Austin, which we would also like to compare ourselves to, did not respond to a request for information. 3) The UC, Boulder, department is ranked 32nd in the Leiter Report.

Here, a word about the Leiter Report or "The Philosophical Gourmet" (<http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/default.asp>) is in order. This is an influential yet controversial ranking of philosophy graduate programs in the English-speaking world. It is edited by Brian Leiter, currently Professor of Law at the University of Chicago, formerly Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas, Austin. The rankings are based on an online survey of about 270 philosophers selected by Prof. Leiter (presumably in consultation with his Advisory Board) in which the participants are asked to give grades to 99 programs – also selected by Prof. Leiter – solely on the basis of their faculty lists. No data of any kind about the programs (not even their names) is provided. The Report is strictly a reputational ranking conducted by a select group of philosophers, most of whom work in analytic philosophy or history of philosophy.

The UNM Philosophy Program does not appear in the overall rankings in the Leiter Report; we doubt that it has ever even been included in the list of 99 programs put

up for consideration. Nor is it listed in the specialty rankings for “20th-century continental philosophy,” which we believe tend to favor larger programs that have strength in analytic as well as continental philosophy. Because the UNM Department has consciously chosen to devote its (limited) resources in recent years to building areas of strength in 20th-century continental philosophy and Indian philosophy, as opposed to the history of philosophy and analytic philosophy, and because its faculty in the former area of strength are younger scholars in the process of establishing their reputations, the UNM department is does not have the kind of profile at this time that would attract the attention of the Leiter Report. The Department is, however, mentioned in the Report as one among four programs “rated by the Advisory Board” in Indian philosophy.

The UC, Boulder, Philosophy Department is rated by the Leiter Report as particularly strong in philosophy of mind, metaphysics, ethics, political philosophy, and 19th-century philosophy. Besides these areas, the UC, Boulder, website (<http://www.colorado.edu/philosophy/index.shtml>) lists as “areas of specialty” in the department: philosophy of language, philosophy of science, logic, feminist philosophy, environmental ethics, bioethics, and even Buddhism, along with almost every area of the history of philosophy, including Nietzsche, Husserl, and Heidegger. The following table summarizes the research productivity of the faculty of the UNM and UC, Boulder, philosophy departments.

Table 9: Average number of publications per faculty: UNM and UC, Boulder⁴²

Program	Books	Edited volumes	Articles⁴³	Reviews
UC, Boulder	.62	.095	6.62	1.8 ⁴⁴
UNM	.615	.38	6.46	2.15

Number of publications, however, is emphasized less in the field of philosophy than quality. There are, however, no commonly recognized measures of quality other than venue of publication. (Otherwise, tenure and promotion are occasions when the quality of a faculty member’s work is rigorously assessed, both by his/her colleagues and outside reviewers, *on the basis of a close examination of his/her publications.*) The top publishers in philosophy are generally recognized as being Oxford, Cambridge, Harvard, Princeton, Routledge, Blackwell, and MIT. Each area of specialization has journals that are generally recognized as highly ranked. A perusal of the CV’s of the UC, Boulder, faculty indicates that they *consistently* publish books with top publishers and peer-reviewed articles in top and highly-ranked journals such as: *Philosophical Review, Nous, Mind, Philosophical Studies, Journal of Philosophy, European Journal of Philosophy,*

⁴² Source: Table 4, Sec. VI, above and CV’s of 21 of 24 UC, Boulder, Philosophy faculty, available through <http://www.colorado.edu/philosophy/index.shtml>. The averages are based on publications that have actually appeared since 2003.

⁴³ Includes both peer-reviewed articles and book chapters.

⁴⁴ Book reviews may be under-reported by UC, Boulder, Philosophy faculty on CV’s.

Analysis, Australasian Journal of Philosophy, Phronesis, Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy, Journal of the History of Philosophy, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research, British Journal for the Philosophy of Science, and Faith and Philosophy. The UNM faculty have *consistently* published books with top or highly-ranked academic publishers such as Cambridge, Routledge, Oxford, and Northwestern University in the last five years and *frequently* published articles in top and highly ranked journals such as: *Journal of Philosophy, Philosophical Studies, American Philosophical Quarterly, Journal of the History of Philosophy, History of Philosophy Quarterly, Ancient Philosophy, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Philosophy of Science, Synthese, Inquiry, European Journal of Philosophy, Journal of Indian Philosophy, Continental Philosophy Review, Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology, Idealistic Studies, and Philosophy Today.*

IX. Future Direction of the UNM Philosophy Department

1. The Department's Vision

During the last five years the Philosophy Department has engaged in an intensive discussion of the future of the philosophical profession and of our own distinctive place within this evolving tradition. At the end of the twentieth century many leading departments in the English speaking world seemed to have embraced Anglo-analytic philosophy as if it were the sole legitimate form of professional philosophy. The Philosophy Department at UNM bucked this national trend by reaffirming the Department's longstanding commitment to philosophical pluralism, and in this way we have begun to carve out a distinctive niche for ourselves in the national landscape. Our department is thus committed to maintaining its research strengths not only in contemporary analytic philosophy and in the history of Western philosophy, but also in American philosophy, Asian Philosophy, and Continental philosophy, the latter traditions being much less well represented on the national scene. We are in the process of revising and updating our course offerings at the undergraduate and graduate levels so as to reflect the distinctive strengths of our department, better serve and guide our students, and help convey the philosophical distinctiveness on which we pride ourselves.

Indeed, the UNM Philosophy Department's highly distinctive combination of philosophical strengths makes it virtually unique nationally. In our teaching and research, we believe that we can continue to articulate and develop the contributions the major philosophical traditions have made and can continue to make to humanity's ongoing attempt to understand ourselves, our place in the history of the world, and the numerous philosophical questions that now press in upon us from our increasingly globally-interconnected future. These questions include ethical decision-making in medicine and engineering, the nature and function of science and technology, and the role of the different religions in humanity's increasingly interconnected future. The State of New Mexico has a growing reputation as a place where different traditions come together to contribute and combine their best insights and ideas about how to solve the problems we face. The Philosophy Department at the University of New Mexico is likewise committed to developing our reputation as one of the leading sites for advancing the discussion between different philosophical traditions on the subjects of ultimate concern to us all. We would like to be recognized nationally as a rigorous philosophical community in which the love of wisdom is celebrated in an open-ended dialogue between our discipline's most diverse and important traditions.

We believe that our department is well poised to flourish during the first decades of the twenty-first century, as philosophical dialogue becomes increasingly diverse, international, and inclusive. Our optimism stems from the fact that our distinctive departmental profile combines excellence in several important traditions whose popularity with students and the broader educated public far outstrips their representation

within other mainstream philosophy departments. This disproportion between diversity of interests and narrowness of representation is particularly acute in three of our distinctive areas of strength: American, Asian, and continental philosophy. There is widespread and growing interest, both among students and the general public, in these areas in which we are strong, and most American departments give these areas short shrift. Because these areas are intrinsically interesting and important and yet remain neglected by other departments, we believe that the best opportunity for our department to continue to rise in national prominence is to continue to develop these distinctive areas of strength while still preserving a balance of traditions and methodologies, for in this way we can surpass even the considerably larger departments typical of many of our peer institutions.

Various initiatives will contribute to this development. In order better to compete with larger peer institutions and so best serve the professional development of our graduate students and the research profile of the University, the addition of tenure-track lines would be of the greatest consequence. Adding scholars in American philosophy and in Eastern thought would cement our position at the forefront of these important fields, and adding another scholar working in continental philosophy would allow us to take advantage of the ongoing collapse of “the continental underground” (that is, programs which chose to focus almost exclusively on continental philosophy and ended up highly-marginalized within the profession). At the same time, we cannot neglect analytic philosophy and ethics, which, besides being rich and important areas of study in their own right, support these strengths and are also the focus of courses required for our majors and graduate degrees.

The current situation provides a rare opportunity for a genuinely pluralistic department like our own—one that is recognized for giving its students a rigorous and well-rounded philosophical training—to quickly rise in national prominence in its distinctive fields of research. The size of our faculty has grown only slightly over the last twenty years, despite the steady surge of undergraduate enrollment in our courses. We have now reached the point where the popularity of our core courses is undermining our ability to have these important courses taught by fully-trained, tenure-track faculty. An increase in tenure-track faculty appointments would thus be in the best interests of our educational mission to our students, our commitment to the College of Arts and Sciences, and our place within the University of New Mexico as a whole, as well as being crucial to our department’s future efforts to help raise the University’s national profile.

At the same time, the Department must acknowledge that the creation of new faculty lines across the University has stalled in recent years due to slow growth of funding for the University, especially the College of Arts and Sciences. There are several important initiatives the Philosophy Department can undertake on its own that will contribute to continuing to carry out our mission and realizing our vision. These fall in the categories of enhancing the teaching of writing and critical thinking for undergraduates, increasing opportunities for more diverse educational experiences for our graduate students, and providing more opportunities of support for faculty research.

These form the heart of our three-year strategic plan, the goals and objectives of which follow.

2. Strategic Objectives and Goals

Objective 1: Student Success: Provide effective instruction that enhances the reading, writing, and critical thinking skills of UNM undergraduates.

Goal: The heart of the mission of the Philosophy Department remains that of giving students the experience of thinking about complex problems of ethics, society, and human existence – problems for which there are no clear-cut answers but about which it is everyone’s responsibility, simply as a member of the human race, to have an informed and thoughtful opinion. We believe that this skill is essential to being a good citizen of a democratic society; moreover, we believe that it is the basis, insofar as it involves the development of abilities of oral and written expression, of being an effective member of the work force. (This, we believe, should never be the principal aim of higher education, but it is invariably one of its results when higher education stays true to its highest principles.) The Philosophy Department has an established program in Reasoning and Critical Thinking (Philosophy 156), which is part of the University core. Sections of 156 are usually taught by Philosophy TA’s, who are trained and supervised by the faculty of the Philosophy Department. Right now, this course, which emphasizes the study of informal logic and writing philosophical essays, can be used to satisfy the undergraduate writing requirement, if students use it to assemble a portfolio of papers which they can submit for approval by the English Department. We believe (and English so far has been supportive of this) that it would provide undergraduates a greater variety of options for satisfying the writing requirement if more sections of Phil. 156 were offered, *requiring more Philosophy TA-ships, or transferring of TA-ships from English to Philosophy*, and if Phil. 156 were formally recognized as a possible substitute for English 102.

Plan:

Year 1: Explore with English Department, College of Arts and Sciences, and Faculty Senate Undergraduate and Curriculum Committees the feasibility of changing the writing and speaking requirement in the core curriculum (see 2007-08 UNM Catalogue, p. 31) to read: “English 101 and either English 102 or Philosophy 156 plus an additional course chosen from....” Initiate appropriate paperwork (Form C?) for approval of change.

Year 2: In the fall, work with College of Arts and Sciences and English Department to add at least two additional Philosophy TA-ships for additional sections of Phil. 156 in the coming fall. These could either be new TA-ships funded by the College or TA-ships transferred from English to Philosophy. Coordinate with the English Department in redesigning curriculum of Phil. 156 to place greater emphasis on teaching of writing and to interface with English 101. Map out expanded and revised training for all Philosophy 156 TA’s. Obtain funding from College for expanded training, including SAC and/or course reduction for a Philosophy 156 Advisor. Select at least two additional Philosophy TA’s in spring to begin teaching extra sections of Phil. 156 in fall.

Year 3: Implement expanded training and guidance for all 156 TA's and initiate new sections. Redesign learning outcomes for Phil. 156 and monitor student success with instruments developed for Phil. 156 outcomes assessment.

Objective 2: Excellence in research: Further increase national and international recognition of UNM Philosophy Department as a center for study of history of philosophy, American philosophy, continental philosophy, and Asian (specifically, Indian) philosophy.

Goal: The UNM Philosophy Department is noted for its collection of bright, dynamic faculty with ambitious research programs. In order to compete with other philosophy departments across the country in retaining and recruiting high-caliber faculty, the Philosophy Department and College need to provide more ways to support faculty in their research. Right now, the Philosophy Department is able to offer incoming faculty a research semester prior to coming up for tenure. Similar support, however, is not available for tenured faculty at this time. The Philosophy Department, therefore, will seek to raise endowment funds, in connection with the planned University capital drive, to provide for one, possibly two, semesters of research leave within the department for senior faculty every year. This would be tantamount to raising endowment that would yield sufficient annual income to “buy out” the courses normally taught by the faculty on leave, that is, roughly \$10,000 - \$20,000 per year. A “Senior Philosophy Faculty Research Leave Award” would be established, which would be awarded competitively to the faculty member(s) with the strongest research proposal(s) in a given year.

Plan:

Year 1: Initiate consultations with College and University endowment officers to explore process of establishing an endowment for Philosophy faculty research and identify potential donors. Assemble an accurate alumni mailing list. Redesign the departmental website to include information about the department's strategic plan and how to make gifts to the department. Begin designing first departmental newsletter.

Year 2: Send out newsletter in fall. Approach identified donors in coordination with University Development Office. Set up procedure for selection of winners of Senior Research Leave Award.

Year 3: Continue fundraising efforts. Select first recipient of award for either spring or following fall term.

Objective 3: Diversity: Provide opportunities for graduate students specializing in Indian philosophy to broaden and diversify their training in reading Indian philosophical texts.

Goal: There are many definitions of “diversity.” In philosophy, one of the main connotations of diversity is openness to different traditions of thought. The UNM Philosophy Department encourages and supports diversity in this sense – we also boast a diverse student population – by offering a broad range of courses in both Western and

Asian philosophy, and in Western philosophy, in both the analytical and continental movements. One of the strengths of the Department's graduate program is Indian philosophy, which derives from a long, continuous history of teaching courses in Asian philosophy extending back to 1948 when Prof. Archie Bahm joined the Department. The amount of resources the Department is able to dedicate to the Indian philosophy program is, however, limited, given the need to support other graduate program strengths as well as the undergraduate program. The UNM program emphasizes learning to read Indian philosophical materials in their original languages (primarily, Sanskrit), chiefly focusing on the presentation of philosophical problems in those texts. With only two specialists fully in Indian philosophy, it would be advantageous for our students if they could be exposed to a broader range of South Asian literature (including not only Sanskrit but possibly also Tibetan texts) and a more historically and philologically oriented methodology. One way to provide this would be through an exchange with a leading Indological program. Certain specialists in Indian philosophy in the Philosophy Department have strong ties with the Institut für Südasiens-, Tibet-, und Buddhismuskunde (Department of South Asian, Tibetan, and Buddhist Studies) of the University of Vienna, Austria. We would like to explore setting up a graduate exchange program in Indian philosophy between our department and the ISTB, where many students also specialize in Indian philosophy and would benefit in turn from greater exposure to contemporary philosophical literature and methodologies at UNM.

Plan:

Year 1: Conduct initial discussions with the ISTB as well as the College of Arts and Sciences and International Programs regarding feasibility of an exchange, including ways of supporting Austrian students while at UNM and, vice versa, UNM students while in Vienna. (All UNM Philosophy Ph.D. students have TA-ships. Would it be possible to reassign one of these TA-ships to an Austrian student, with modified teaching duties?)

Years 2 and 3: Carry out necessary administrative steps to establish exchange and arrange for funding. Develop selection procedures for UNM and University of Vienna recipients of scholarships.