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Section A: Unit Assessment of Strengths and Weaknesses

A.1 Quality of the instruction, research, and service associated with the programs

The Georgia State University Department of Philosophy has high quality undergraduate and graduate programs, as indicated in sections D and E below. It has been a leader in both the Critical Thinking through Writing (CTW) and the Retention, Progression and Graduation (RPG) initiatives. Retention of both undergraduates and graduate students is solid, with M.A. graduates being accepted into some of the finest Ph.D. programs in the country. Its M.A. program is widely recognized to be one of the best in the country and, as Section F shows, the Department is by several objective measures preeminent in research. The Department also plays a major service role in the College and beyond; our Chair is currently chairing a Board of Regents Committee to review the core curriculum for the entire state; another member of the department directs the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics and serves on the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, three members are actively involved in the new Neuroscience Institute, another is on the College Curriculum Committee, and another is the Vice-Chair of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

Further progress needs to be made in retention to graduation at both the undergraduate and graduate level. The quality of instruction in the core is adversely affected by the large size of Phil 2010 classes. For both majors and M.A. students, the quality of instruction is adversely affected by the large difference in student preparation and ability that exists in our many cross-listed 4000-6000 level courses. While our research is exceptionally strong, we have not attained the goal we set in 2003 of being recognized as the best M.A. program in the country. While we are proud of our service to the College, the University, the University System and the State, the heavy service load is taking a toll on teaching and research.

A.2 Centrality of the programs to the university

The Philosophy Department at Georgia State clearly serves a genuine societal need. Both ethics and critical thinking are emphasized in Georgia State’s Strategic Plan, which states: “In the twenty-first century, Georgia State University’s curricular and co-curricular activities must prepare students who are critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices.” It is thus unsurprising that the Department has long played a central role in general education at Georgia State. Indeed, as was the case in 2003, we produce more credit hours per tenure track faculty member than any other department in the College of Arts and Sciences (with Philosophy at 1463 CH, only the Department of Communication comes close at 1451 CH; see Graph A-1 below).

In the 2007 calendar year 2812 Georgia State students enrolled in Phil 1010, Critical Thinking, in Area B of the core curriculum.\(^1\) In addition to honing reasoning skills that are applicable to any endeavor, Phil 1010 is a writing intensive course. Students develop the essential skill of writing lucid argumentative essays. In the last five years, this course has been redesigned to support the University’s CTW and RPG efforts by focusing on those critical thinking skills that students need to succeed in college courses. Phil 2010, Great Questions of Philosophy, in Area C of the core, enrolled 1648 in calendar year 2007.\(^2\) This course, as its title suggests, offers students the opportunity to confront important questions about knowledge.

---

meaning, and morality, and to learn what history’s most original thinkers have said about these issues. As noted above, this course suffers from large class size.

Graph A-1 Credit Hours Per Tenure Track Faculty Member, 2006-08

The Philosophy program currently has 165 majors, and this number has been growing. The number of Philosophy majors at Georgia State increased by 11.5% between FY2006 and FY2008.\(^3\) Much of this increase can be attributed to our new and popular pre-law concentration. The Department offers a wide variety of upper-division courses, all of which are well subscribed. The responses of the undergraduate alumni indicate that they are very satisfied overall with the Department’s efforts in educating its majors (see Appendix D5). However, we have not yet fully taken advantage of the new Neuroscience Institute. We are supporting the creation of a new B.S. degree in the Institute, which will include three philosophy courses (cross-listed with neuroscience) as electives in the major (area G). We are also considering the creation of a Neurophilosophy concentration in the philosophy major.

That Philosophy is central to the University’s educational mission is unsurprising. Philosophy has traditionally had a central role in the liberal arts. The works of philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, and Kant are among the greatest products of the human mind and are worth studying for their inherent value as well as for their impact on subsequent intellectual history.

Much philosophical work is concerned with fundamental questions: What is real? Can we know anything about the external world? Do we have free will? Are there objective moral truths? Although these issues may not appear to have immediate practical consequences, they inform the way we study the world and the way we live our lives. Of course, philosophy also examines more obviously practical issues, such as the nature of the good life, what constitutes a just society, and how the sciences obtain knowledge. In the last three decades there has been an explosion of activity in applied philosophy with the result that philosophers now work in numerous cross-disciplinary fields such as business ethics, medical ethics, philosophy of law,

\(^3\) Source: Institutional Research. Note: FY 2008 begins July 1, 2007 and ends June 30, 2008. We are now (Fall 2008) in FY 2009.
and philosophy of science. Georgia State’s Department of Philosophy is in the thick of this movement, with excellent faculty producing ground-breaking research in political philosophy, philosophy of law, applied ethics, and philosophy of mind and psychology.

Despite its wide range of applications, philosophy as currently practiced in the English-speaking world has one overarching theme: it is fundamentally concerned with good reasoning. Although philosophers by no means have a monopoly on logical argumentation, the systematic study of what distinguishes good arguments from bad is central to the philosophical enterprise. Consequently, those who teach philosophy are as much concerned with fostering critical thinking skills and clear argumentative writing as with imparting information.

A.3 Viability of programs

The Department offers the B.A. and M.A. degrees in Philosophy. The B.A. in Philosophy offers the option of a pre-law concentration. In the M.A. program, students choose from the following three tracks: traditional, neurophilosophy, and J.D./M.A. The traditional track is designed for those who plan to seek the Ph.D. in philosophy or have a general interest in philosophy. The Neurophilosophy track was developed three years ago in conjunction with the Brains & Behavior program, for students interested in the philosophical implications of current empirical work in neuroscience and psychology and who may seek a Ph.D. in philosophy or in one of the mind sciences. The J.D./M.A. track, offered in conjunction with the College of Law, allows students to receive the M.A. in philosophy and the J.D. in four years instead of the five that would normally be required. The Department also has successful exchange programs with Bielefeld University in Germany and The Sorbonne (University of Paris IV) in France.

There are currently 165 undergraduate majors and 50 graduate students in Philosophy at Georgia State. Overall, both the Philosophy B.A. program and the Philosophy M.A. are more than viable. They are thriving.

A.4 Strategic focus

The Department has focused its research in three areas of strength. The first, in Legal and Political Philosophy, has been built over the past fifteen years. We now have seven faculty members working in this area and house the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, which won the 2003 American Philosophical Association/Philosophy Documentation Center Prize for Excellence and Innovation in Philosophy Programs (see Appendix B5). The second area of strength, Neurophilosophy, is a more recent development, started three years ago in coordination with the Brains & Behavior Program. The Department now has three members (and plans to hire two more) who work in empirically informed philosophy of mind and who are active associate members of the University’s new Neuroscience Institute. The Institute fosters collaboration among more than sixty faculty members (from eight departments) interested in the neurobiology of cognition and behavior. Our third area of strength is Kant and post-Kantian German Philosophy. The Department has three faculty in this area. Their interests are united by a focus on metaphysics and epistemology in German philosophers.

A.5 Financial resource analysis

Current financial resources would be adequate if our goal were to tread water. However, our goals are to improve the quality of undergraduate and graduate learning and to improve and increase our research. Throughout this Report, we discuss what would be necessary for us to either become the premier philosophy M.A. program in the country or to institute a new Ph.D.
program in philosophy. At the request of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, we have put much effort into collectively considering both options. Financial resources are necessary for four critical needs, regardless of which option is approved.

1. We remain committed to completing our 2003 approved action plan. As of this writing, we have completed that action plan except for two junior hires in the area of our recent senior hire (George Graham). A search for one of the two is ongoing. In addition to completing the promise we made to Dr. Graham, we need these positions to fulfill our CTW obligations, meet the needs of our increasing undergraduate program, and enhance our research profile.

2. We need additional faculty to enable us to split our 4000 and 6000 level courses. Currently, our 4000 level courses meet concurrently with our 6000 level courses. There was a time when this was pedagogically adequate. That time has passed. The difference in motivation, preparation, and ability between our graduate students and our undergraduate majors has grown as the research profile of the Department has improved. We now recruit outstanding graduate students from across the U.S. and around the world. When a class is composed of these students and our undergraduate majors, the difference in level of background knowledge and philosophical skills is too much. One group must suffer; it is often the undergraduates who lose, but the graduate students also clearly suffer—and realize it (as indicated by recent surveys; see Section D.2 below and Appendix D5). Four additional tenure track faculty would allow us to split our 4000 and 6000 level courses and thus dramatically increase the quality of learning at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. Two additional tenure track faculty and one additional lecturer—or two additional lecturers—would also allow us to accomplish this.

3. We need resources to make our graduate stipends at least equal to the mean of the stipends offered by the other top-ten MA programs. As it is now, our first year standard funding packages are among the lowest in the top-ten, more than 40% below the mean of our peer programs (see Chart E-3, below). While our second year funding packages are monetarily similar to our peer programs, the work required by students to receive that funding (teaching 1 to 3 courses per semester) is far beyond what is required at those peer programs. In both cases, the differences are simply too large. We lose top-quality graduate students to other programs. Students who come are forced to take out large loans and/or work at part-time jobs; of necessity, the latter prevents some from fully devoting themselves to their studies.

4. To become the top-ranked M.A. program in the country, we need another senior hire. (See Section H for a discussion of these options.) As the data (see section F below) show, we are near the top of the top-ten M.A. programs in terms of research productivity. But we have to do more if we want to take the top spot away from Tufts and clearly separate ourselves from the other top programs. To build on our most significant strengths, we propose a search for one more senior person in either political or legal philosophy, philosophy of mind, or German philosophy. If we choose to become a quality unranked Ph.D. program, we would need a second senior hire on top of that. We would propose a senior search for a core analytic epistemologist or metaphysician.

5. As noted in our 2003 self-study, we need resources to lower the limit on Phil 2010 from 60 to 40. In the post-semester conversion credit hour crunch, the limit on this course was raised from 40 to 60. Phil 2010 is a much worse course because of the high limit. We had to essentially stop assigning papers and start giving multiple-choice exams. Sustained discussion with participation by most of the students is difficult or impossible and discussion is crucial to the philosophical project. The increased size of 2010 has had serious long-term negative effects on the department. Phil 2010 is a crucial philosophy course, the introduction to our major, a
major credit hour producer, and much of the teaching load of tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and visiting instructors. When it is at a high limit, we suffer in many ways.

(6) We also believe we should reinstate the 10% summer research stipends for faculty. This would allow us to keep our best faculty and to lure new faculty.

Section B: Historical and Current Contexts

B. Introductory Comments

The first philosophy courses were taught at what is now Georgia State University in 1933 and the “Department of Philosophy” first started in the 1948-49 school year. In 1974-75, the Department began offering the M.A. degree. In 2001, the Department began a joint J.D./M.A. program with the College of Law.

The Department began offering courses in religious studies in the mid-1980s and a distinct B.A. program in Religious Studies began in 1991. Though the philosophy faculty and religious studies faculty had an excellent relationship, as both programs grew, the Religious Studies faculty split off and, in 2005, formed a thriving Department of Religious Studies. The Philosophy Department continues to hold its colleagues in the Religious Studies Department in the highest regard and the two Departments continue to share some budget lines and to offer several cross-listed classes. While we will need to separate some budget lines (such as summer instruction), overall this budgetary model is efficient and works well.

B.1 Number of faculty by rank, tenure status, gender, and minority status

In FY 08 (the 2007-2008 Academic Year), the Department had 2 male full professors, one male associate professor, five male and three female assistant professors, one male and one female lecturer, five male and one female visiting instructor, and one male part time instructor. See Table B-1 in Appendix AA for further details.

B.2 Faculty research productivity 2005-2007

In the three-year period, 2005-2007, the fifteen regular members of the Department (Tenured, Tenure-Track, and Lecturers) published 24 refereed publications, 22 invited publications, and 6 scholarly books. This means they averaged 1.6 referred publications, 1.47 invited publications, and 0.4 scholarly books per member per year. In the same time, they brought in $285,997 of external funding and $143,500 of internal funding; these average $19,066 and $9,567 per member per year. They also gave 34 conference presentations and 28 other presentations in that time; this is an average of 2.27 and 1.87 per member per year. See Table B-2 in Appendix AA for further details.

B.3 Our Programs

In the three-year period covering FY 2006, FY 2007, and FY 2008, the Department averaged 157 majors per year, 131 in the traditional track and 26 in the pre-Law track. In the same time period, the Department averaged 52 M.A. students per year, almost all in the traditional track (one student was in the newly formed B&B track and one was in the J.D./M.A. track). See Table B-3 in Appendix AA for further details. See Table B-4 in Appendix AA for
details about our retention and graduation rates.

**B.4 Credit Hours**

As noted in Section A.2 (esp. Graph A-1) above, the Philosophy Department produces more credit hours per tenure track faculty member than any other department in Arts and Sciences. In the three-year period covering FY 2006, FY 2007, and FY 2008, the Department produced 46,808 credit hours—an average of more than 15,600 per year. See Tables B-5a, B-5b, and B5c in Appendix AA for further details.

**B.5 Summary**

With an average of 19 full time faculty members (11 tenured or tenure track) per year, the Department produces an annual average of 10,190 credit hours in the core, 451 in the lower division, 3273 in the upper division, and 1689 graduate credit hours. We nonetheless also publish an average of 1.6 refereed publications each per year and 0.4 books each per year. The Department is exceedingly productive. See Section F below and Table B-6 in Appendix AA for further details.

**B.6 Evidence of program relevance**

The philosophy faculty at Georgia State work in some of the most interesting areas in the discipline. This includes work on important thinkers in the history of philosophy as well as work in areas that have blossomed in the English speaking world in recent decades. That the work of the faculty is outstanding is shown by the high regard with which the Department is held and by the strong demand for entrance into our M.A. program. Moreover, the Department serves the College, the University, and the State in the ways specified above and by its support of the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, which encourages dialogue about morality amongst undergraduates, graduate students, University faculty from throughout the world, and Georgia citizens (via outreach programs). Topics of recent symposia sponsored by the Center include Just War Theory, the Ethics of Child Rearing, and Reproductive Freedom. Finally, graduates of our M.A. program have, with increasing success, been accepted into Ph.D. programs of the highest quality.

One measure of the interest in the Department’s research comes from the number of visiting scholars who come to the Department. Between 2004 and 2009, we have had (or are scheduled to have) visiting international scholars from China, Spain, Brazil, and the United Kingdom. One of the scholars from the United Kingdom was from Oxford University. In addition, we attract visiting domestic scholars from the top Ph.D. programs in the U.S. such as the University of Pittsburgh (the number 5 Ph.D. program in the Leiter Report).

While the Department has an impressive research record, its faculty are also thoroughly committed to teaching and to improving the experience of all its students, graduate and undergraduate. Providing a solid education in philosophy and philosophical thinking is one of the best ways to encourage our students to lead good lives and to encourage good citizenship. Moreover, we serve an important societal need by providing a “stepping-stone” to Ph.D. programs for those students with an interest and aptitude in philosophy who do their undergraduate studies at small colleges with few philosophy faculty, or whose undergraduate major is in another field.
Philosophical ideas matter. It is philosophers who specialize in analysis of the components of a good life. This has been the subject of moral and political philosophy since Ancient Greece. The Department has a specialty in this area of research. Contemporary philosophers do a great deal of inter-disciplinary work in applied ethics and also with psychologists and others interested in determining how we reason, how we decide what to do, and what makes us happy. The Department has a specialty in this area of research (empirically informed philosophy of mind or Neurophilosophy). Combined, we are in an unparalleled position to help students understand themselves, their place in the world, and how they should live.

Far from being “a luxury major, philosophy is being embraced … by a new generation of college students who are drawing modern-day lessons from the age-old discipline as they try to make sense of their world, from the morality of the war in Iraq to the latest political scandal. The economic downturn has done little, if anything, to dampen this enthusiasm among students, who say that what they learn in class can translate into practical skills and careers.” Many now see philosophy as “a pre-law track because it emphasizes the verbal and logic skills prized by law schools.” Importantly, it is increasingly recognized that “studying philosophy, with its emphasis on the big questions and alternative points of view, provide[s] good training for looking at larger societal questions, like global integration and technology” (New York Times, 4/6/2008).

Undergraduates taking philosophy classes in the core—i.e., Phil 1010 and Phil 2010—now have the chance to benefit from supplemental instruction funded by the University RPG program (see Appendix D9). The Department sponsors the Law and Society freshman learning community and has a thriving pre-law concentration for undergraduates. Moreover, undergraduate majors will soon benefit from improvements in the curriculum brought about by the CTW program, as they will be required to take Phil 3000 and Phil 4990. The first of these is an especially useful class as majors and potential majors will receive instruction in small classes geared toward improving their critical reasoning skills and writing abilities; the second allows them the opportunity to have a final “capstone” class experience in which their previous studies come together and provide a true philosophy seminar experience. All required courses are taught on a regular schedule posted on the Departmental web page, enabling students to plan their studies in advance.

New graduate students are given an extensive orientation covering all aspects of life in the Department and the University. As with undergraduate courses, all required courses are taught on a regular schedule posted on the Departmental web page so that students can plan their studies in advance. Graduate students who demonstrate their excellence in research earn their M.A. in Philosophy “with distinction.” Each year, the first graduate student who has a paper accepted at a regular (non-student) conference is awarded $500 in travel money, and the department regularly rents two hotel rooms for graduate students at the Eastern Division meeting of the American Philosophical Association. Graduate students who demonstrate their excellence

---

4 [http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/06/education/06philosophy.html?ex=1208145600&en=1c3585fc82773e7f&ei=5070&emc=eta1](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/04/06/education/06philosophy.html?ex=1208145600&en=1c3585fc82773e7f&ei=5070&emc=eta1). See also [http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2007/nov/20/choosingadegree.highereducation](http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2007/nov/20/choosingadegree.highereducation). There we are told that “Figures from the Higher Education Statistics Agency [in Britain] show philosophy graduates … are in growing demand from employers. The number of all graduates in full-time and part-time work six months after graduation has risen by 9% between 2002-03 and 2005-06; for philosophy graduates it has gone up by 13%.” Perhaps most surprising, they found that “It is in the fields of finance, property development, health, social work and the nebulous category of ‘business’ that those versed in Plato and Kant are most sought after. In ‘business’, property development, renting and research, 76% more philosophy graduates were employed in 2005-06 than in 2002-03. In health and social work, 9% more” (The Guardian, 11/20/2007).
in teaching earn the Certificate of Excellence in Teaching in Higher Education from the Center for Teaching and Learning.

The Department sponsors frequent colloquia featuring philosophers from other universities. It organizes the Neurophilosophy Forum, which brings researchers from various fields to speak to members of the Department and the Neuroscience Institute. In conjunction with the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, it sponsors a student essay competition and a student paper conference. The Department communicates regularly with its students and friends through listservs (one for majors, one for graduate students, and one for friends of the Department). These listserv pre-date and are more effective than the default listservs provided by the University. The Department also publishes a newsletter containing information and philosophical discussion and maintains one of the University’s most detailed and well-maintained websites aimed at current as well as prospective students (www.gsu.edu/philosophy). Finally, the Department also hosts regular social events, including a monthly pizza lunch and an annual party.

B.7 Information on peer programs (includes Appendix B1: Rationale for choices of peer programs)

In philosophy, the best way to choose peer programs is to look to the Philosophical Gourmet Report (http://www.philosophicalgourmet.com/, hosted by Blackwell Publishing and better know as “The Leiter Report”). The Report is edited by Brian Leiter (formerly of the University of Texas, currently of the University of Chicago Law School) and has become the most respected source of rankings and information about philosophy programs.

According to the 2006-2008 Gourmet Report, Tufts is ranked first, and Northern Illinois University (NIU), University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Virginia Tech are ranked together as 2-4. Georgia State is then ranked in the 5-8 group with the University of Missouri-St. Louis, Western Michigan University, and University of Houston. California State University-Los Angeles, Colorado State University, and Texas Tech University are grouped together as 9-11. However, in discussing likely changes in the next Gourmet Report, Brian Leiter recently commented that

GSU, with the major senior addition of Graham and the tenuring of Nahmias, has probably moved up to the next cluster with Wisconsin/Milwaukee, Virginia Tech, and Northern Illinois. Even among these, students would be well-served by looking closely at areas of strength. Tufts and Wisconsin/Milwaukee, for example, are admirably broad and deep, but GSU would be great for someone interested in experimental philosophy, philosophy of law, and Continental philosophy, among other areas (Leiter Reports, http://leiterreports.typepad.com/, 9/22/08).

Hence, it appears likely that Georgia State has moved from the top eight to the top five.

The goal of the Georgia State philosophy department is to either transform into a quality unranked Ph.D. program or to be the best M.A. program in philosophy in the country. We are poised to achieve the latter goal, as will be seen in sections D, E, and F below, which offer information comparing our program to the other programs in the Philosophical Gourmet’s list of top M.A. programs.
Section C: Progress Toward Goals and Objectives

In 2003, after completing its five-year self-study and undergoing external review, the Department had four goals: (A) to improve undergraduate education, (B) to improve graduate education, (C) to improve research, and (D) to improve service to the university, Atlanta and the broader philosophy community. Given these goals, the Department set four specific prioritized objectives:

Priority 1. Increase the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching philosophy courses from the 10 we had in the Spring of 2003 to 14 over the next five years and to hire a new distinguished full professor to anchor an area of concentration in a field of contemporary analytic philosophy.

The Mission Statement of the University clearly states that “The overarching aspiration of Georgia State University is to become one of the nation’s premiere research universities” (2005 Strategic Plan) and we have simultaneously made significant progress toward that goal and this first Departmental priority. Since the time of the Department’s last Self-Study, we have hired nine faculty members and they have been publishing—and in top journals (see Graphs F1-3 and Chart F4 below). Indeed, several have published books or have contracts to publish books with the top presses in the field and several have obtained significant external funding from prestigious national organizations. They have also excelled in the classroom and served on College, University, and Board of Regents committees. Indeed, the service load on the Department is so unusually high that it limits the quality and quantity of instruction and research.

Most of the hires since the 2003 self-study were replacements for faculty that either retired or took positions in Ph.D. programs. Still, we have made two of the new appointments approved in 2003 (one of which is the senior appointment, Dr. George Graham) and hope to make a third this coming spring. We are in need of this and the remaining position in order to meet the increased demand for core and upper level courses caused by the recent increases in the number of new students, to complete our CTW course offerings, to improve our undergraduate and graduate programs, to improve our research profile, and to complete the development of the area of strength planned upon the hire of Dr. Graham. In making these hires, the Department is committed to forwarding the College’s policy on the recruitment and retention of minority and female faculty.

Priority 2: Establish Religious Studies as a separate department “linked” to Philosophy.

We have completed this objective. The split cost less than $30,000 and faculty in both departments are thrilled with the new organization. Recruitment of faculty in both departments has clearly been improved because of the split.

Priority 3. As the M.A. program grows, (a) replace visiting instructors with graduate teaching assistants to decrease the number of visiting instructors to 24% of the faculty and (b) increase graduate student stipends.

We have largely succeeded in the first of these priorities, but have unfortunately made little progress in the second (the approved Action Plan did not provide funds for this purpose). We currently have 3 visiting instructors; down from a high of 12. This did not help us improve the funding packages our graduate students receive because the classes previously taught by the VIs had to be covered by Graduate Teaching Assistants (despite the name, “GTAs” are students
in the second year of their M.A. program who teach their own classes) at a college-established rate of $1,000/credit hour. (See Sections D.2 and E.2 below as well as Appendix D5).

**Priority 4.** Build on the success of the Bielefeld and Sorbonne agreements to develop more international programs for philosophy majors and graduate students.

We did not attain this objective. The events of 9/11/2001 greatly increased the complexity of exchange programs. We decided to focus on preserving and enhancing our relationships with the Sorbonne and Bielefeld. Our Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) with Bielefeld was renewed last year and we anticipate renewal of the Sorbonne MOU before the end of this academic year. We receive many students from the Sorbonne and Bielefeld but we need to work harder to overcome the financial barriers that prevent Georgia State students from going to the Sorbonne and Bielefeld.

**In addition to the above four priorities, the Department had other objectives:**

(a) Establish a program to give graduate students better preparation for careers in academia.

We have completed this objective; graduate students now have the opportunity to teach Phil 1010 and, as noted in Section D.1 below, we have developed a three-course sequence to help students become better teachers. The nature of academia is an explicit part of this sequence. We believe the M.A. students are being given an excellent opportunity to prepare for careers in academia.

(b) Improve the quality of undergraduate advising.

We have made significant progress towards this objective. Under the leadership of the Director of Undergraduate Studies (Eddy Nahmias) we have written a Handbook for majors and assigned each major a regular faculty member as a mentor/advisor (see Appendix D6a). However, improvement of advising is something that always requires attention.

(c) Improve the quality of graduate advising.

We have made significant progress towards this objective. The Department now offers workshops for graduate students to discuss how to successfully apply to Ph.D. programs and what to expect from a career in Philosophy, either inside or outside academia. We have also greatly improved on-line materials to provide ready access to important advice to all of the graduate students (see Appendix D6b). However, work remains in this area and graduate students will continue to need personalized advisement about careers.

(d) Return the limits for sections of Phil 1010 (Critical Thinking; previously Phil 2410) to 30 and return the limits for sections of Phil 2010 (Great Questions of Philosophy) to 40.

We did not complete this objective. The approved Action Plan did not provide funds to lower the limits in these courses. The limit on the writing intensive Phil 1010 remains at 35 and the limit on Phil 2010 remains at 60. We remain dissatisfied with this situation. In particular, the high limit in Phil 2010 effective precludes both the in-depth discussion and the sustained focus on writing that is the national norm for this course.
(e) Return summer research funding of research-productive faculty to 10%.

We did not attain this objective. Funds were not provided as part of the approved action plan and summer dollars per faculty member have continued to fall as we have added new faculty. The 10% summer stipend is crucial to the attraction of top-quality faculty and needs to be restored. The Philosophy Department plans to continue to make summer research stipends conditioned not only on research productivity but also on having applied to an external funding source within the previous year. This has been tremendously successful, as several department members—Andy Altman, Jessica Berry, Andrew I. Cohen, Christie Hartley, and Eddy Nahmias—have recently received prestigious grants.

Section D: Curricula Quality

D.1 Evidence of student learning

Each year, Phil 1010 and Phil 2010 prepare thousands of students to be “critical thinkers, creative problem solvers, and responsible citizens who make ethical choices” (Georgia State University Strategic Plan). The Department continually assesses the teaching of Phil 1010 to determine if students are sufficiently developing (1) writing ability, (2) philosophical skills, more particularly, the analysis of information and arguments by distinguishing arguments from non-arguments, identifying premises and conclusions, understanding the relation between main and subordinate arguments, critically evaluating the arguments of others, and constructing their own argumentative essays, and (3) the ability to apply the writing ability and philosophical skills to contemporary problems. While Phil 1010 is primarily a “skills” class, Phil 2010—like upper level philosophy classes—teaches students not only philosophical skills, but also content. The Department assesses the teaching of Phil 2010 to determine if students are sufficiently developing (1) mastery of content knowledge, more particularly, a basic understanding of central problems in metaphysics, epistemology, and ethics, how to apply ethical theory to practical ethical problems, and a basic familiarity with some classical and some contemporary authors, (2) philosophical skills, i.e., a basic ability to think and write philosophically, and (3) the ability to apply this knowledge and these skills to contemporary problems. The Department assesses how well majors learn (1) philosophical skills, i.e., an ability to think and write philosophically, (2) content (as above), (3) communication skills, and (4) the ability to participate in collaborative philosophical endeavors. Finally, the Department assesses how well graduate students learn (1) content (specifically, that of their thesis topics) as well as (2) philosophical skills. As indicated in the Assessment Reports included here (Appendix 7), we have been successful in imparting these skills and knowledge to our students at all levels.

In addition to developing and continuously refining a set of assessment procedures and methods, the Department examined various ways of teaching Phil 1010 and 2010 in light of each of our pedagogical goals, outcomes and assessment measures. Through discussion, it reached agreement about which materials and methods best achieve the goals. This agreement prompted many changes to both courses. The results were recorded and circulated in “The Handbook for Teachers in the Department of Philosophy” (see Appendix D8). More recently, in order to support the University’s focus on retention and graduation, Philosophy 1010 was evaluated again and has been completely revised to serve as a course that directly helps students do better in all of their courses. Instead of talking about arguments from current affairs as is typical in this sort of class, students engage with the works of academics from throughout the discipline spectrum. Dr. George Rainbolt and Dr. Sandra Dwyer have written a textbook, Critical Thinking in
College, specifically with this goal in mind. They received contract offers from four publishers for this book and signed with Wadsworth.

The revisions to Phil 1010 also focused on reducing the workload of the GTAs teaching the course by standardizing the book, the syllabus, and the exams. Moreover, to increase the quality of GTA instruction, we introduced a three-course sequence of courses that teach the grad students how to teach. They take one of these courses (Phil 8970) before they teach their own course (as GTAs), a second (Phil 8980) the first semester they teach, and a third (Phil 8985) each subsequent semester they teach. In Phil 8970, students spend a semester attending a section of Phil 1010 taught by a permanent faculty member, helping ensure that they know the course content, and spend an hour each week discussing teaching techniques and other pedagogical issues. In Phil 8980, students receive close supervision as they teach for the first time. In Phil 8985, students are supported as they work to earn the Certificate of Excellence in Teaching in Higher Education from the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Finally, for the last three years, the Department has hired students to serve as Supplemental Instruction Leaders (“SILs”) for several sections of Phil 1010 and Phil 2010, our core classes that both have high DFW rates (the rates that students in those classes receive either “D” grades or Fail or Withdraw from the course). The SILs are paid with money from our RPG grant. In light of a rigorous and data-driven assessment plan, we have continually modified this program to improve how SILs are used, thereby improving student learning. With SILs, we have seen improved grades and improved DFW rates (see Appendix D9).

D.2 Evaluative statements about curricular quality based on surveys

As shown in Appendix D5, the responses from undergraduate and graduate students on our surveys are extremely positive. The undergraduates give the department a 3.86 for our course offerings, putting us in the 93rd percentile across the University. Most find the program academic challenging, and overwhelmingly, they recognize that our faculty are prepared for all classes (in the 89th percentile). Graduate students praise the Department even more strongly, putting us in better than the 80th percentile across the University in terms of our interest in their academic development, the degree to which the program is challenging, the degree to which faculty are prepared for classes, the degree to which we are preparing them for careers or further study, the academic and career advising they receive, the effectiveness of teaching, and more.

The comments the students offered are quite telling. Although they obviously appreciate the education they receive in philosophy at Georgia State, they clearly believe that this education can be improved in straightforward ways. One undergraduate alumna made it clear that in courses cross-listed with undergraduate and graduate students “the undergrads were smothered by the grad students.” Another agreed, “grad students often dominated class discussions” and also indicated that “Class sizes could be smaller for personal interaction between faculty and undergrads.” (Maximum enrollment for these cross-listed classes is 35.) Current graduate students and graduate student alumni clearly echoed this sentiment. One indicated that because of the less substantial preparation of the undergraduates relative to the graduate students, “grads feel compelled to keep more complex questions out of the discussion.” Another indicated that these “large classes dominated by undergraduates can be frustrating,” “pose a challenge,” and “are paced too slowly” or may end up without “enough depth for the graduates … so [that] the class is not beneficial.” Graduate students worry that in these classes, “the instructor has to spend class time going over basic concepts (sometimes repeatedly)” but also express concern that the situation is not good for undergrads either as they realize they “sometimes dominate the
class in a way that is bad for the undergraduates.” Many indicate that graduate level classes must be smaller (indeed both current graduate students and graduate student alumni rated the Department poorly in terms of class size suitability such that we were only in the 3rd percentile across the University). One said simply “Cross-listed classes significantly diminish the quality of the MA program at GSU.” (It is worth noting that many professors voluntarily schedule additional sessions for graduate students in these courses, but are not compensated for such sessions—which are also extremely difficult to schedule.)

In addition to the problem with 4000/6000 level classes, graduate students and graduate student alumni express much concern with the “woefully inadequate” stipends graduate students receive. One indicated that they were forced to take out large loans to supplement the “inadequate” stipend that comes with the assistantships. Another indicated that only their “family’s willingness to extend limited financial support” prevented them from seeking “extra employment to pay my bills.” Several others indicated “increasing the stipend for assistantships” as one of their top suggestions.

In a nutshell, there are two consistent suggestions for improving the curricula in Philosophy: discontinue the practice of having undergraduate-graduate cross-listed classes and reduce class size. For graduate students, there is also tremendous support for the view that the students could do better academic work and improve their learning if they were relieved of some of their anxiety related to the low levels of stipends.

Section E: Student Quality

E.1. Undergraduate Quality

The Department believes that the quality of philosophy majors is high. Within the last few years, a number of majors have made impressive accomplishments: one has been accepted to the Georgia State Law School, one has been in a Ph.D. program in philosophy for the past two years, three have been McNair Scholars, one has attended Ohio State University’s Summer Research Opportunities Program (a program for gifted students from groups under-represented in academia), and another won a research award from the Undergraduate Research Initiative at Stanford University.

Significantly, the faculty of the Department have resisted grade inflation pressures. For Spring 2008, the Department’s average grade awarded was 2.7. This is tied with the Department of Physics and Astronomy for the second lowest average grade awarded in the College of Arts and Sciences. (The Department of Mathematics and Statistics had an average of 2.5.) The average grade awarded at Georgia State was 3.1 and the average grade awarded in the College of Arts and Sciences was 3.0. In spite of the challenging nature of the major, the number of majors we attract is strong as compared to our peer group institutions (see Graph F-6 below). Our students are not seeking the easy A but looking for a challenging educational experience. As a result, they tend to be a pleasure to teach.

The Department has recently raised a new possibility based on the quality of our majors. We would like to have more citizens of Georgia earning M.A. degrees in Philosophy. While we are proud that our M.A. program draws applicants from across the country and around the globe, there are some years in which there are no successful M.A. applicants from Georgia. As we

5 Data from Statware, accessed 10/8/2008.
clearly have a special obligation to the citizens of Georgia, we would like to study the possibility of starting a program modeled on the Department of Modern and Classical Languages’ B.A/M.I.B. program. The idea would be to cultivate a small group of high-achieving undergraduates (perhaps working with the Honors Program) and develop a program by which, in five years, they could earn both a B.A. and an M.A. in philosophy. The goal would be to prepare them for prestigious fellowships and top-flight graduate programs. This idea raises many complex questions so we are not ready to commit to it at this time. But we do think it merits serious study.

E.2 Graduate Quality

The quality of the students entering the Philosophy M.A. program has steadily improved. Since Fall 2004 (after our last self-study), the mean Verbal GRE score for new matriculating graduate students has risen from 580 to 630, and the mean quantitative score has risen from 590 to 660 (see Graph E-1 below). The department’s improved placement record is probably responsible for much of the increase in quality.

Graph E-1 GRE Scores of Incoming M.A. Students, 2004-2008 (Source: Departmental Records)

The data used to construct Graph E-1 is from Departmental records and we believe it is the most accurate data available. Data from Institutional Research is different. That data is present in Table E-1 in Appendix AA (also available in Appendix AA is Table E-2, with data about the selection ratios of students entering our M.A. program). If that data is accurate, we have not seen improvement in GRE scores of entering M.A. students over the last three years. If this is the case, it is likely due to the fact that in each of the last three years we were given RPG money and that money has consistently not been awarded to the Department until the end of the Spring semester or over the Summer and by that late date, most students seeking entrance into M.A. or Ph.D. programs have made their decisions. We thus suspect we accepted some students who were less qualified than some we could have matriculated if we were able to have all of our
acceptances done earlier in the process. We hope that the RPG funds will be made a permanent 
part of our budget so that we can make these decisions earlier.

Most applicants hear about our M.A. program through the Philosophical Gourmet Report, 
which ranks it as one of the top 8 terminal philosophy M.A. programs in the country. Most 
applicants hope to use the M.A. as a stepping-stone to doctoral work in philosophy or a related 
field. About half of Georgia State’s M.A. graduates apply for doctoral study. In the past 3 years, 
all of our doctoral applicants have been accepted into a doctoral program, with all but one now 
attending one. We have continued to place our students in reputable philosophy Ph.D. programs, 
but a new development in the past 3 years is that we have started placing students in programs 
that are ranked in the top-20 by the Philosophical Gourmet Report (Brown, UNC-Chapel Hill 
and UT-Austin), and a majority of our students attending philosophy Ph.D. programs attend 
programs ranked in the top 50 (see Chart E-2 below) and we have placed two of our 
Neurophilosophy Track students in top science programs. Seeing this placement record on our 
webpage helps impress potential applicants. Increasing the number of students we place in top 
programs is an important goal.

### Chart E-2 Graduation and Placement Record of Georgia State MA students 2004-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of Graduates</th>
<th># who Applied to one or more PhD Programs</th>
<th># Accepted to one or more PhD Programs</th>
<th>Names of Program Students Attending (Gourmet Report Rank of Philosophy Program*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Texas (13), Western Ontario (35**), Florida State (44), Rice (50), St. Louis University (NR), Iowa Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNC-Chapel Hill (10), UC-Riverside (31), Johns Hopkins (35), Bowling Green (NR), Memphis (NR), Arizona Psychology, Emory Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Brown (16), UI-Chicago (35), Boston U (50), Claremont (NR), Vanderbilt (NR), St. Louis University Health Care Ethics (7th declined funded offers from NR programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UC-Riverside (31), U Washington (35), Rice (50), Ave Maria University Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UMass-Amherst (24), (2nd declined funded offer from NR program)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Section B.7 above or F.1 below for explanation.

**Western Ontario ranks second on the Canada list. It would be tied for 35th if it were in the U.S.

Starting in Fall 2005, the Department began offering two Neurophilosophy Fellowships 
each year to incoming students. These lucrative fellowships (two years of support at 
$15,000/year with no teaching duties) attracted very impressive students who have excelled in 
the Philosophy program as well as the B&B program. As importantly, almost every high-quality 
student who applied for but did not receive the fellowship still enrolled in the M.A. program’s 
Neurophilosophy Track—some despite receiving better funding packages to other programs. 
These fellowships have thus been extremely effective in attracting excellent students to the 
program.

Inspired by the success of these fellowships, in Fall 2008 the Department began offering 
one scholarship for $15,000/year in each of our other two areas of strength, Legal and Political 
Philosophy and Kant and post-Kantian German Philosophy. (The funding for the scholarships is
from the department, and budget constraints force us to have Scholars teach in order to receive funding after their second semester.)

However, our standard funding package—$6000 in the first year and $10,000 in the second year, with extremely heavy teaching duties in the second year—remains subpar. Many of our peer institutions offer $10,000 a year or more for two years (see Chart E-3 below). Every year, we ask students who decline our offer where they are going, and many decide to accept more attractive offers from places like Virginia Tech and Northern Illinois University, which also are located in areas with lower costs of living, but whose research quantity and quality is likely below ours (see Section F below).

Chart E-3 Comparison of Standard Financial Support for, and Non-Course Work load of, M.A. Students at Georgia State and Peer Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding*</td>
<td>Duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(not</td>
<td>or Breakout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching)</td>
<td>sections per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIU (2-4)</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Tech (2-4)</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWM (2-4)</td>
<td>$7,509</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH (5-8)</td>
<td>$11-12,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMSL (5-8)</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMU (5-8)</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU-LA (9-11)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech (9-11)</td>
<td>$10,850</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: e-mail survey, departmental websites.

*Unless otherwise noted, in addition to the dollar amount indicated, grad students receive a tuition waiver and some support for health insurance.

Cells with ‘?’ mean that no information was available.
Cells with ‘N?’ mean that websites specified that students did that sort of work but did not specify a quantity.
Note 1: UMSL does not offer standard 2-year packages to incoming students. Students assist in or teach 1 or 2 courses per semester, at $1,250-$2,000 per course, with possible duties of grading, leading discussion sections, or teaching distance learning classes. Those assisting in or teaching 1 class pay in-state tuition; those with 2 receive a tuition waiver.
Note 2: CSU-LA has no money to offer 1st-year students. They said they have ‘some’ graduate assistantships to offer to 2nd-year students, but did not specify the duties or pay.

An explanation of graduate student funding in the department is complicated by two factors. The first is that a large proportion of our funds are “soft” funds that we cannot count on continuing, as opposed to “hard” money in our base budget. The largest source of “soft” funding is our participation in the RPG Program that provides us $40,000/year. The second complication is that the Philosophy and Religious Studies graduate programs operate on a combined budget. Ignoring these complexities, our major expense is employing graduate students as instructors (GTAs) of Phil 1010: Critical Thinking, at $2000 per section. All graduate students (except Neurophilosophy Fellows) past their first year who receive funding do so as instructors, usually of Phil 1010. The standard load for graduate students offered an aid package is 5 sections over the course of their second academic year for $10,000/year. However, many voluntarily elect to
forgo some of the sections (and money) because they quite wisely feel the load is too high. Teaching 3 sections of 1010 in a given semester makes it extremely difficult for students to work effectively on their M.A. theses and coursework (and in many cases, apply to PhD programs).

Remaining funds are used to attract and support first year M.A. students. Currently, we support 19 first year students, but 10 of these slots are funded through the RPG grant; without it, we would be able to fund only 9 students—and we do not know if RPG funds will continue. As indicated, our two most lucrative packages (the Neurophilosophy Fellowships) are funded by the Neuroscience Institute. From our base budget, we would have about $60,000/year to fund first year students. This would allow us to support two ‘scholars’ and 6 assistantships at the substandard rate of $6000/year each. This would not be enough to produce an incoming class sufficiently large to staff Phil 1010 in the second year.

The facts are straightforward: (1) our standard first-year offer of $6000/year is far lower than our peer M.A. programs and pitiful by any standard (see Chart E-3 above); (2) the dollar amount of our second-year funding is at the mean for our peer M.A. programs, but the work required for the grad students is much higher than that of second year students at any of those programs (see Chart E-3 above); (3) even this mediocre state of affairs is only possible because of “soft” money. We also have solid evidence that better packages make a huge difference to attracting better M.A. students and clear reason to believe that if the graduate students could teach less in their second year, they could learn more philosophy, write better theses, and put more energy into applications to Ph.D. programs.

Section F: Faculty Quality

1. Faculty Research (Quantity and Quality)

Faculty members in the Department of Philosophy at Georgia State have extremely active and productive research programs. The tenured and tenure-track faculty regularly publish scholarly monographs, articles and chapters in highly regarded presses and journals. Many have received external grants to further their work. In just the past few years, Andy Altman and Jessica Berry have received support from the National Endowment for the Humanities, Eddy Nahmias received a Wisdom Grant, Andrew I. Cohen received a Page Fellowship, and Christie Hartley received a grant from the American Association of University Women. The Department’s research record compares very favorably to its peer M.A. programs. Indeed, the data presented below on the quantity and quality of faculty publications strongly suggest that Georgia State’s faculty is producing a greater number of research publications than any of our ten peer programs except for the top-ranked Tufts, and more importantly, that the quality of these publications is greater than any of the other programs ranked behind Tufts and substantially greater than almost all of the other top-ten M.A. programs. Indeed, considering the promise shown by the department’s junior faculty, Tufts is not out of range. Becoming the top research M.A. philosophy program would be even more likely if Georgia State were able to hire another productive senior faculty member (with productivity similar to that of Andy Altman and George Graham).

As is shown in Graph F-1 below, Georgia State’s department is comparable in size to the other ten programs. When comparing the numbers of tenured and tenure-track faculty members teaching philosophy in the departments, Georgia State’s faculty size is 12, while the mean for the
group is 11.4 (however, many other programs have a larger number of senior faculty than Georgia State).

**Graph F-1 Number of Faculty in Programs, Fall 2008**

![Graph showing number of faculty in various programs]

Source: Department websites. Only full, associate, and assistant professors housed in philosophy are included (i.e., no emeritus, lecturers, visiting, adjunct, or affiliated faculty in other departments are included).

Georgia State faculty members have produced more articles over the past seven years than any top M.A. program other than Tufts. Graph F-2 below shows the number of scholarly monographs and articles published from 2002 to 2008 by each programs’ full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Included are all journal articles and book chapters (hereafter “articles”), excluding book reviews and encyclopedia entries, and all scholarly monographs, i.e., excluding textbooks and edited volumes (hereafter “books”). Georgia State faculty members have produced nearly twice the number of articles and books as the average produced by the other nine programs ranked below Tufts.

Georgia State not only produces a large quantity of philosophical work; it also produces work of superior quality. Graph F-3 below shows the total quality point value of each program’s articles and books published from 2002 to 2008. Quality point values are based on the journal and press rankings as determined by an external panel of distinguished philosophers who were asked to rank them for use in the promotion and tenure process in Georgia State’s Philosophy Department. The data show that Georgia State’s philosophy faculty produce research of a higher quality than any program other than Tufts, with a quality point total double the average of all of the other programs ranked 2-11, and roughly double the points of the currently higher-ranked programs at NIU and Virginia Tech. (See Appendix F5 for details.)
Graph F-2 Total Publications of Faculty in GA State and Peer Programs, 2002-08

Source: Faculty members’ up-to-date (2008) CVs where available online; using GoogleScholar to check or supplement CV if incomplete or not up-to-date. Philosophers’ Index also used to double check information

Graph F-3 Total Quality Points of Publications of Faculty in GA State and Peer Programs, 2002-08

Source: See Graph F-2 above
As important as the past productivity of Georgia State philosophy faculty is the future potential for productivity. And the future looks very bright. Georgia State faculty members have five books in press or contracted to be published in the next few years, four by a press ranked excellent (Oxford University Press) and one very good (MIT); and they have 24 articles forthcoming (18 of which are in journals ranked excellent or very good). These forthcoming publications total 106 quality points, more than most of the other MA programs have for the past seven years (see Appendix F5).

Chart F-4 below includes a summary of the information displayed in Graphs F-1, F-2, and F-3. It also includes the number of faculty who were “research inactive” during the seven-year period examined—that is, the number of faculty who did not publish any books or articles during that period—and the percentage of research active faculty as a proportion of the total faculty. (Georgia State’s one “inactive” faculty member is a young assistant professor who has articles forthcoming.)

Chart F-4 Summary of Publications for GA State and Peer Programs, 2002-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank by Quality Points</th>
<th>Program (Current Gourmet Ranking)</th>
<th># of Books</th>
<th>Book Quality Points</th>
<th># of Articles</th>
<th>Article Quality Points</th>
<th>Total Quality Points</th>
<th># Faculty By Rank (Prof + Assoc + Asst = Total)</th>
<th>Inactive Faculty / % of active faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tufts (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5+4+2=11</td>
<td>0 / 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>GA State (5-8)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3+3+6=12</td>
<td>1 / 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Missouri (5-8)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2+3+4=9</td>
<td>0 / 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wisconsin (2-4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>7+2+6=15</td>
<td>2 / 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>W. MI (5-8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4+2+2=8</td>
<td>1 / 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VA Tech(2-4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3+2+7=12</td>
<td>2 / 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NIU (2-4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3+5+3=11</td>
<td>4 / 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CO State (9-11)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>7+3+6=16</td>
<td>4 / 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CSU-LA(9-11)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5+2+3=10</td>
<td>1 / 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Houston (5-8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6+1+4=11</td>
<td>3 / 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TX Tech (9-11)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2+3+5=10</td>
<td>5 / 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Faculty Teaching (Undergraduate and Graduate)

It is difficult to compare the quality of teaching offered by the various programs. For present purposes, we compare data on the number of sections of courses offered, the number of undergraduate majors, and the number of M.A. students in each of the programs from which we could obtain the relevant information.

Graph F-5 below shows that Georgia State taught far more sections of philosophy in the spring semester of 2008 than any of the other eight departments whose data was available. Georgia State’s department teaches over twice as many sections as the average of the other eight. It is reasonable to assume that these numbers are representative of other semesters.
Graph F-5 Sections of Courses Taught at GA State and Peer Programs in Spring 2008

![Bar chart showing sections of courses taught at various institutions.]

Source: Websites of the universities. Omitted departments that did not report this information.

Graph F-6 below shows the number of philosophy majors at each of the 4 departments who offered this information in response to our email request. Georgia State tops the others here too. With 165 majors, Georgia State has significantly more than twice as many majors as the average for this group (and the average student body of the other schools in this group is 30,000, similar to Georgia State).

Graph F-6 Undergraduate Majors in GA State and Peer Programs, Fall 2008

![Bar chart showing undergraduate majors at various institutions.]

Sources: For GA State: Institutional Research. For other programs: An e-mail survey of the departments.

Finally, Graph F-7 below shows the number of Philosophy M.A. students currently enrolled at each of the top ten M.A. programs. These numbers were obtained from either the department’s response to our email request or the list of graduate students at the department’s websites. With 50 M.A. students, Georgia State has far more than the average of 29.4 for the other departments. The large number of M.A. students contributes to the Department’s philosophical atmosphere, increases credit hours, and demonstrates how attractive the program is for undergraduates seeking further education in philosophy.
3. Summary

Among the top philosophy departments offering the M.A. as the highest degree, Georgia State’s department ranks highly on all of the following criteria (compared to programs where the relevant information was available):

• second behind only Tufts in research productivity, in terms of both quality and quantity
• first in number of sections taught
• first in number of majors
• tied for first in number of M.A. students

The superiority of Georgia State in research quantity and quality to the other programs ranked below Tufts is particularly noteworthy given that several departments are actually ranked higher on the Gourmet Report in terms of faculty quality. The gap between Georgia State’s Philosophy Department and the other departments in the teaching categories is even more impressive given that Georgia State has roughly the same number of regular faculty who teach in the department.

Section G: Resource Adequacy

Over the last 15 years, Georgia State in general and the College of Arts and Sciences in particular have made major strides in ensuring that departments and faculty have the resources they need to provide high-quality instruction and carry out research that is competitive at the national level. The Department of Philosophy has benefited from these advances. However, there are critical resource needs that must be met if the Department is to maintain its current success and move forward.

G.1 Faculty Resources

The members of the Georgia State Department of Philosophy are exceptionally productive in both teaching and research. (See Sections B.2 and F.) However, to move forward in both teaching and research, the department needs to have additional faculty. This is the philosophy program’s priority. Additional faculty will bring both higher-quality teachers and more productive researchers. It is the single best way to advance the fundamental goals of the
department—to serve a societal need with improved teaching and more productive research. Moreover, only with additional faculty resources can we hope to become a quality unranked Ph.D. program. As explained in Section A.5 above and Section H below, depending on whether our final goal is to be the premier M.A. program in the country or a quality-unranked Ph.D. program, we propose to do either one of two searches for senior persons. As also indicated in Section A.5 above and Section H below, we also need to hire two junior tenure track faculty to complete our 2003 Action Plan, four tenure track faculty members (or two tenure track faculty and one lecturer or two lecturers) to separate our 4000 and 6000 level classes, and two additional lecturers to reduce the caps in Phil 2010. (For information about student/faculty ratios, please see Table G-1 in Appendix AA.)

G.2 Administrative Resources

Shared with Religious Studies and the Jean Beer Blumenfeld Center for Ethics, we currently have 3 full time administrative staff personnel. This is satisfactory for our needs. If we move forward to become a quality unranked Ph.D. program, additional personnel will be needed in order to deal with the increased demand on their time by (a) faculty who are in high demand not only by students and colleagues within the University, but also by others from throughout the country and world and (b) Ph.D. students, especially as they send applications for positions upon receiving their degrees.

G.3 Technological Resources

We now have a Graduate Research Assistant working part-time as a dedicated computer support technician for the Philosophy and Religious Studies Departments, under the direction of a full time staff person. This has been highly effective. Given the nature of our discipline, the resources are acceptable—though a more technologically equipped conference room would enable us to provide better equipment for visiting speakers and to better teach our seminars.

G.4 Space Resources

Space resources are now adequate for full time faculty. However, as we add faculty, we will need more space. If we add senior faculty to build a new quality unranked Ph.D. program, we will need more spacious and luxurious offices than the average faculty offices available to us. This is something that is important to high-quality senior faculty. Moreover, our GTAs are currently all sharing space. While they do have a large computer room for their own work, they do not have adequate space for office hours in which to meet with students in the classes they teach. This makes it difficult to meet with students and discuss the sometimes sensitive subjects raised in philosophy courses (e.g., belief in the existence of God, the arguments for and against homosexuality) or to simply explain material the student is struggling with. While we are not advocating for individual offices for each GTA, we do believe having several additional offices available for them to hold office hours in would be beneficial.

G.5 Laboratory Resources

The discipline of philosophy does not use laboratory space so this section is not relevant.

G.6 Georgia State Foundation Resources

The legal restrictions placed on Fund Code 10 money mean that the Department always has a need for Foundation money. Currently, Foundation money barely covers the costs of the
minimal community- and morale-building activities listed above. Current Foundation resources are inadequate for broader and more effective community building. In 2008, the David C. Blumenfeld Philosophy Faculty Support Endowment was fully funded with a donation of $25,000. For the first time, the Department has some non-State resources to support faculty with such common things as reimbursements for dinners with job candidates. But at $120 per faculty member, the income from the endowment is not sufficient. We need to work hard to seek more external foundations funds.

G.7 Library Resources
The staff at Pullen Library has done a remarkable job to see that philosophy faculty have most of the materials needed for teaching and research. Although stronger collections are always desirable, the department feels that maintaining the current acquisition practices is sufficient for the department’s needs. (See Appendix G2.)

Section H: Goals and Objectives
As noted in Section A.5 above, at the request of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, we have put much effort into collectively considering both what we would need to become the premier philosophy M.A. program in the country and what we would need to institute a new quality unranked Ph.D. program in philosophy. Either of these involves two central goals:

A. Teaching and Learning Goal: To improve the quality of teaching and learning at both the undergraduate and graduate level in order to better satisfy the societal need for “critical thinkers” and “responsible citizens” (2005-2010 Strategic Plan).

B. Research Goal: To improve the quality and quantity of research produced in the Department sufficiently to become either the recognized leader among all philosophy M.A. programs in the United States or to institute a quality unranked Ph.D. program and thus contribute to the Georgia State University’s “overarching aspiration … to become one of the nation's premier research universities” (2005-2010 Strategic Plan).

Question: Should Georgia State University offer a Ph.D. in philosophy?
In 2006, we studied what would be necessary to become a top-35 Ph.D. program. We determined that the resources needed to attain this goal are beyond what it is reasonable to expect from the University. To see this, consider that a program ranked near the bottom of the Leiter Report’s top 50 programs, Florida State University (tied for 44), has 16 faculty, and during the 2002-08 period, they produced 12 books (all but one ranked excellent) and 142 articles, totaling 385 quality points, which is more than double Georgia State's 169 quality points during that period. While we have 3 full professors, FSU has 10 full professors, many of which have eminent international reputations. Competing with such ranked programs (and hence competing for students, hires, and job placements) would require the resources to hire several productive and well-regarded senior scholars (see Appendix F5 for further information). We have thus decided to consider whether our goal of improving the quality and quantity of research produced

---

6 Information available upon request.
in the Department is better served by seeking to become the recognized leader among all philosophy M.A. programs in the United States or by instituting a quality unranked Ph.D. program. We did research on four programs, three that converted from M.A. to Ph.D. and the only public institution in Georgia that offers a Ph.D. in philosophy.

TAMU: The philosophy program that has most recently gone from being a top-ten M.A. program to being a Ph.D. program is at Texas A&M University (TAMU). Up until 2002, Texas A&M was in the top-ten in the M.A. rankings; it is now an unranked Ph.D. program. M.A. programs are only ranked in the Philosophical Gourmet report if the offering Department does not also grant Ph.D.s. Hence, while TAMU continues to have an M.A. program, it is no longer ranked. TAMU has 21 tenured or tenure track faculty members, 4 visiting professors, 2 lecturers and 1 instructor (by comparison, we have 12 tenured or tenure track faculty, 3 lecturers, and 3 visiting instructors).

TAMU has graduated 4 Ph.D. students and 2 have tenure-track jobs (at New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary and Greenville College, Illinois). TAMU did not report the number of Ph.D. students they enroll per year so we cannot calculate the percentage of Ph.D students who receive the Ph.D. or gain tenure-track jobs. If they enrolled 5 new Ph.D. students per year, 40% of these students earned the Ph.D. and 20% obtained a tenure-track job.

TAMU reports that they continue to place their M.A. graduates into Ph.D. programs. Since instituting their Ph.D. program in 2002, they have had M.A. students accepted into the following ranked programs (Leiter ranking in parens): Michigan (4), Stanford (6), Arizona (13), Irvine (20), Cornell (21), Southern California (21), Indiana (27), Riverside (31), Syracuse (32), Colorado (32), UVA (39), Santa Barbara (39), Washington University (39), Johns Hopkins (47), Connecticut (48), Rice (50), and Missouri (53). They have also placed M.A. students in the following unranked programs: Baylor, Duke Divinity, Duquesne, Saint Louis, Southern Illinois University, and Kentucky.7

Several years before TAMU instituted their Ph.D. program, two other programs with terminal M.A. programs instituted Ph.D. programs: the University of Kentucky and the University of South Carolina. The Leiter Report did not exist when they started their Ph.D. programs so we do not know the ranking of these M.A. programs at the time of conversion.

KY: The Department of Philosophy at the University of Kentucky has 15 tenured or tenure-track faculty and 10 adjuncts. They granted 18 Ph.D.s between 2002 and 2007. Of those, 8 have been able to secure tenure-track positions (at Lorain County Community College, University of the Incarnate Word, Mt. Angel Seminary, Bluegrass Community and Technical College, McKendree College, Indiana University Southeast, Montana State University, and Rollins College). They enroll an average of 7 new students into their program per year, approximately 43% of their entering students receive the Ph.D. and approximately 20% obtain tenure-track positions.8

SC: The Department of Philosophy at the University of South Carolina has 18 tenured or tenure-track faculty, 4 instructors and 4 adjunct faculty. They granted 16 Ph.D.s between 2002 and 2007. Of those, 5 have tenure-track positions (at Universidad Nacional del Sur (Argentina), San Antonio College, Ottawa University (Kansas), Bethel College, and College of the Canyons). They did not report the number of Ph.D. students they enroll per year so we cannot calculate the percentage of Ph.D students receive the Ph.D. or gain tenure-track jobs. If they had 5 incoming

7 Source: Texas A&M Departmental Website.
8 Information about numbers of incoming students received by email; information about graduates and faculty from Departmental website. Calculations are our own.
students per year, they would have a 53% graduation rate with 17% of their students obtaining tenure-track positions.\(^9\)

UGA: The only public institution in Georgia that offers the Ph.D. in philosophy is the University of Georgia. They have an unranked philosophy Ph.D. program with 12 tenured or tenure track faculty, 3 “distinguished teaching professors,” 1 visiting professor, and 1 lecturer. They granted 9 Ph.D.s between 2002 and 2007. Of those, 4 obtained tenure-track positions (at West Chester University, Tarrant County College, Fort Hays State University, and Wofford College). They enroll an average of 6 new students per year, approximately 25% of their students earn the Ph.D. and 17% obtain tenure-track jobs.\(^{10}\) (See Appendix H1 for further placement information for Texas A&M, University of Kentucky, and University of South Carolina.)

The Case for Starting a Ph.D. Program

Georgia State University aspires to be one of the top 100 research universities in the United States as measured by The Center for Measuring University Performance. Every year, the Center produces its *The Top American Research Universities* report. One of the nine indicators used to compile this ranking is the number of doctorates awarded. If the Department of Philosophy were to start a Ph.D. program, we would be contributing to Georgia State’s attainment of a top 100 ranking.

More importantly, successful philosophy Ph.D. students would contribute to Georgia State University’s “overarching aspiration … to become one of the nation's premiere research universities” by helping add to the store of human knowledge at other research universities. Some Georgia State philosophy Ph.D. students would go on to teach at colleges and universities that have no research mission, but part of being a research university is producing the faculty at non-research institutions.

From the perspective of the Department, there is an economic advantage to having a Ph.D. program. The University sometimes gives preference to Ph.D. programs over M.A. programs when it comes to the distribution of resources. If the Department of Philosophy had a Ph.D. program, it would be in a better position to make a case for resources from the University.

Ph.D. programs are also often able to better compete for the best faculty. With a Ph.D. program, we may be more able to attract the best philosophers to work at Georgia State. The reasons faculty prefer to work in Ph.D. granting Departments are straightforward: the faculty are likely to have Teaching Assistants that can help with grading and they are likely to get graduate students they can work with for longer periods of time, thus improving their own research.

These are clear attractions for all of us in the Department.

The Case for Not Starting a Ph.D. Program

As noted above, M.A. programs are only ranked in the Philosophical Gourmet report if the offering Department does not grant Ph.D.s. This means that should we become a Ph.D. granting program, we will fall off of the rankings and only be able to reenter rankings as a PhD. Program. This means that we would no longer be able to attract high quality students via our standing in the rankings. There is a good possibility that the quality of the Ph.D. students we attract would be lower than the M.A. students we now attract. This would be a tremendous
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\(^9\) Information from Departmental Website. Calculations are our own.

\(^{10}\) Information about numbers of incoming students received by phone; information about graduates and faculty from Departmental website. Calculations are our own.
setback both because we would not have the higher quality students that are pleasurable to teach and that help us improve our own research and because it might damage the quality of the instruction provided in Phil 1010.

Working with high-quality graduate students is frequently a joy. Working with lower quality graduate students is not. It is far more burdensome to guide a mediocre student in writing a (lengthier) dissertation than to guide a good student in writing a (shorter) thesis. Moreover, helping even the best new Ph.D.s from ranked programs obtain a position is difficult. Helping a less talented new Ph.D. is far worse—and counseling someone to seek a different career path after spending 5 to 8 years working on his or her degree is extremely disheartening.

For these reasons, a shift to a quality unranked Ph.D. program may decrease the quality of faculty we could attract and retain. In the past fifteen years, we have lost only one faculty member to an unranked Ph.D. program; we have also hired one member of the faculty away from an unranked Ph.D. program and another was hired away from a ranked Ph.D. program.

As a top-ranked M.A. program, the Department currently serves an important societal need in providing a route to the Ph.D. for students who attended small colleges or who did not major in philosophy. The most important objection to starting a philosophy Ph.D. program at Georgia State is that there is simply no societal need for another philosophy Ph.D. program. The data above about TAMU, KY, SC, and UGA confirm what all philosophers know. Unranked Ph.D. programs have very low graduation rates and even lower success rates at placing new Ph.D.s in tenure-track positions (and only a small fraction of those are at high-quality institutions). Of the 19 individuals placed by the four Ph.D. programs we studied, only 2 got tenure-track positions at institutions ranked “national” by US News and World Report (Montana State University and Wofford College).

Leaving the Question Open

The question posed above is clearly crucial to the Department. We have attempted to make the case for both options and we are looking for input from the external reviewers as to which option we should pursue.

Objectives

Each of the objectives below contributes to both our Teaching and Learning Goal and our Research Goal. To some extent, the road to being the recognized leader among all philosophy M.A. programs in the United States follows the same path as the road to instituting a quality unranked Ph.D. program. However, in some cases, the bar for starting a Ph.D. program is higher than the bar for being a preeminent M.A. program. As we have not yet decided whether to start a Ph.D. program, some of the objectives below are split in two.

Objective 1: Complete the hires approved in our 2003 Action Plan.

We need these positions to fulfill our CTW obligations and to meet the needs of our increasing undergraduate program. We also need them to enhance our research profile and complete the promise we made to Dr. Graham. The former, obviously, improves the education of all of our students—helping us attain our first goal. The latter is crucial to our second goal—whether we are to become the premier M.A. program in the country or a quality unranked Ph.D. program.
Objective 2: Separate 4000 and 6000 level classes.

The difference in motivation, preparation, and ability between our graduate students and our undergraduate majors has grown as the research profile of the Department has improved. We recruit outstanding graduate students from across the U.S. and around the world. When a class is composed of these students and our undergraduate majors, the difference in level is too much. One group must suffer; it is often the undergraduates who lose, but the graduate students also clearly suffer—and realize it (as indicated by recent surveys; see Section D.2 above and Appendix D5). Four additional tenure-track faculty (or two additional tenure track faculty and one lecturer or two additional lecturers) would allow us to split our 4000 and 6000 level courses and thus dramatically increase the quality of learning at both the undergraduate and the graduate level. It is thus vital to achieving our first goal.

Importantly, after splitting our 6000 level classes from the 4000 level classes, faculty teaching the former would be able to do higher level work with their classes, thus likely improving their research. For the same reason, splitting these classes is likely to make it easier for us to attract quality faculty members to the Department when we do searches. Moreover, as graduate education improves, we increase the number of our students who go on to produce research, expanding human knowledge to the benefit of everyone in society. Thus this objective contributes to our becoming the premier M.A. program in the country or a quality unranked Ph.D. program (our second goal).

Objective 3: Increase graduate stipends.

Of the 25 current first year graduate students, 19 are receiving financial assistance plus tuition waivers. Of those, 15 receive either a mere $6000/year or an even lower $4000/year. Of the 25 graduate students beyond their first year, 20 are GTAs (2 others are Neurophilosophy Fellows and 3 receive no financial package from the Department). The vast majority of these teach between 1 and 3 sections per semester of Phil 1010 for $2000 per section; two GTAs teach 1 or 2 sections of Business Ethics at $3000 per section. The quality of instruction in core courses taught by graduate students and the quality of research that our graduate students go on to produce are both adversely affected by this pitiful situation. (See Chart E-3 above.) Stipend levels are affected by the decision regarding a Ph.D. program so we outline two different scenarios.

Scenario A (premier M.A. program): If we are to become the premier M.A. program in the country, we need to increase graduate student stipends to be at the mean of the other top-ten M.A. programs. In the first year they should be $10,000 for grading and assisting in research. In the second year they should be $10,000 for teaching no more than 4 courses in an academic year. The low level of our normal funding packages is worse now, relative to our peer programs, than it was in 2003. This simply must be improved.

Our current funding for first-year M.A. students is enough to fund our 2 Scholars (our best students) at $15,000/year ($3000 of which is from summer teaching funds), 6 students at $6000/year (our current standard package), and 10 students at $4000/year (from an RPG grant). We also have 2 Neurophilosophy Fellows, funded by the Neuroscience Institute. The current funding for first year students is thus $100,000. To fund 20 first year students at a minimum of $10,000 each/year, we need an additional $84,000. This would allow us to fund 16 students at $10,000 rather than $4000 or $6000 and continue funding our 2 Scholars at $15,000 ($3000 each from summer teaching funds), with the funding for the remaining 2 students supplied by the NI. (This assumes the $40,000 from the RPG grant is made permanent.)
Our second year students currently receive funding only for teaching. In their second year, our GTAs typically teach 5 sections of Critical Thinking each year at the University standard of $1000 per credit ($2000 per section) in order to give them a $10,000 annual assistantship. We will need to give each of the 16 non-Scholar M.A. students a $2000 research assistantship so that they will need to teach only 2 sections per semester. The 2 Scholars would also need an additional $2,000 each in order to receive their second-year compensation of $15,000 while teaching only 4 sections instead of 5. Teaching 3 sections in a single semester, with a total of over 100 students, in a writing intensive course, is onerous and makes it difficult for M.A. candidates to put in the time needed to excel in their studies, complete their M.A. theses in a timely fashion, and for many, apply to Ph.D. programs. Reducing the teaching load by one section would cost an additional $36,000.

With a total of $120,000 of new funds, and assuming that the RPG funding is made permanent, the funding and duties of our graduate studies would be at the mean of the other top-ten M.A. programs.

**Scenario B (quality unranked Ph.D. program):** If we are to institute a small quality unranked Ph.D. program alongside our terminal M.A. program, the annual stipends for Ph.D. students must be $15,000/year. Texas A&M currently offers its doctoral students $13,000/year, but College Station has a much lower cost of living than Atlanta. UGA also offers its doctoral students $15,000, and Athens also has a lower cost of living than Atlanta.

The standard funding package is guaranteed for 5 years, although most Ph.D. students take longer than that. We envision enrolling 4 new Ph.D. students each year. Funding a total of 20 graduate students at $15,000/year would cost $300,000. Ph.D. students would be involved in non-teaching assistantship duties their first 2 years, would teach 4 sections of Critical Thinking a year in their third and fourth years, and would then move on to teach 2 sections of one of our 3 credit hour 2000 or 3000 level courses (such as Great Questions of Philosophy, Business Ethics, or Environmental Ethics) in their fifth year. This would allow Ph.D. students to concentrate on their coursework their first two years, acquire extensive teaching experience while starting their dissertations, and broaden their teaching range at the end, making them more attractive job candidates.

In this scenario, we would continue to enroll M.A. students with funding of a minimum of $10,000 per year, as per Scenario A. The $300,000 for Ph.D. students is thus $300,000 on top of the funding that would be needed to fund Scenario A. That additional cost for Ph.D. students would, though, be defrayed to some extent by (i) admitting fewer M.A. students and (ii) cutting a Visiting Instructor position. Since there would be 8 Ph.D. students in their third and fourth years teaching Critical Thinking, we could admit (and fund) 8 fewer M.A. students each year than in Scenario A. 16 fewer M.A. students at $10,000 each would mean the funding for M.A. students would be $160,000 less than in Scenario A. And since the 4 Ph.D. students in their fifth year would be covering the classes now taught by a Visiting Instructor, we would save an additional $27,500. With $187,500 of the Ph.D. funding defrayed by these two cuts, instituting a small quality unranked Ph.D. program would cost $112,500 more in graduate funding than Scenario A, and so $232,500 more than our current level of graduate funding.

**Objective 4:** Hire additional senior faculty members.

As the data (see section F above) show, we are near the top of the top-ten M.A. programs in terms of research productivity. If we want to become the premier M.A. program in the country, we need one more senior hire in one of our strengths: Legal or Political Philosophy,
Philosophy of Mind, or German Philosophy. If we want to become a quality unranked Ph.D. program, we will need to make at least one additional senior hire on top of that. We would then seek to hire a senior person in either epistemology or metaphysics. A Ph.D. program must have faculty working in at least one of these core fields.

**Objective 5:** Lower class size in Great Questions of Philosophy.

We need resources to lower the limit on Phil 2010 from 60 back to 40. As already indicated, Phil 2010 is a worse course now than it was before the University converted to the semester system because the limit on the course was raised from 40 to 60. We had to essentially stop assigning papers and start giving multiple-choice exams. Discussion is difficult or impossible, and discussion is the center of philosophy. This has had serious long-term negative effects on the department. Phil 2010 is a crucial philosophy course, the introduction to our major, a major credit hour producer, and much of the teaching load of tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty, lecturers, and visiting instructors. When it is has a high limit, we suffer in many ways. We thus need two additional lecturers in order to reduce the limits on Phil 2010. This will obviously help us to improve the quality of the instruction the students receive and we would expect to see tremendous improvements in student learning. It would also help us improve our research as we would have more enjoyable classes and would generate students more interested in philosophy—both of which would allow us to better concentrate on research.

**Objective 6:** Return summer research funding of research-productive faculty to 10%.

The 10% summer stipend is crucial to the attraction of top-quality faculty and needs to be restored. The Philosophy Department plans to continue to make summer research stipends conditioned not only on research productivity but also on having applied to an external funding source within the previous year. This has been tremendously successful, as several department members—Andy Altman, Jessica Berry, Andrew I. Cohen, Christie Hartley, and Eddy Nahmias—have recently received prestigious grants. It cannot be stressed enough, though, that if we are to attract senior star-quality faculty members to become a Ph.D. Department, we must be able to offer summer research funding.

**CONCLUSION**

The Philosophy Department at Georgia State University is truly an exciting and dynamic department. Our faculty are producing ground-breaking research that contributes to the store of human knowledge in areas that can potentially aid Georgia, the US, and the world. We are producing M.A. graduates who are going on to top-ranked Ph.D. programs, and B.A. students who are good critical thinkers and responsible citizens. The Department recognizes that it has benefited from Georgia State’s transition to a research university and appreciates the University’s support. We seek now to become even better. By splitting our 4000 and 6000 level classes, increasing our faculty size, improving graduate student stipends, and reducing class sizes, we can become the single best terminal philosophy M.A. program or we can offer a quality Ph.D. as an unranked department. Either would contribute to the University goal of becoming “one of the nation’s premiere research universities.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Complete?</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Str &amp; Weaknesses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 (quality)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 (centrality)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 (viability)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 (strategic focus)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 (fin. res. analysis)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Context</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 (history)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 (3 yr prior)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B-1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Appendix AA, in second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Appendix AA, in second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B-3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Appendix AA, in second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B-4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Appendix AA, in second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table B-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In Appendix AA, in second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (relevance &amp; need)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (comp. prgms)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. B1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. B3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. B4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. B5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Progress Toward Goals &amp; Objectives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (progress)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. C1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: Curriculum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 (outcomes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 (survey info)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. D1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App D2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App D3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. D4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App D5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App D6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Student</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 (input)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 (output)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F: Faculty</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. F1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. F2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. F3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. F4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>G: Resources</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 (fac. res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2 (admin res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G3 (tech res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G4 (space res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G5 (lab res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G6 (gsuf res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 (lib res)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. G1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. G2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In second document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H: Goals &amp; Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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