



CREATING OUR FUTURE, 2010-2020:

**THE STRATEGIC PLAN OF THE
COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES**

**PART II:
DEPARTMENT, PROGRAM, & OTHER UNIT PLANS**

April 2010

CAS Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

Part IIA: Academic Departments

Table of Contents

Anthropology
Archaeology
Art History
Astronomy
Biology
Chemistry
Classical Studies
Cognitive & Neural Systems
Computer Science
Earth Sciences
Economics
English
Geography & Environment
History
International Relations
Mathematics & Statistics
Modern Languages & Comparative Literature
Music
Philosophy
Physics
Political Sciences
Psychology
Religion
Romance Studies
Sociology

Department of Anthropology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Anthropology is the study of all aspects of human life—from our biological evolution to our modern societies, religions, and economies. Our productive and respected faculty excels in strategically chosen geographic and theoretical areas in social and biological anthropology. Our teaching offers the breadth and depth to prepare undergraduate majors for graduate programs, the NGO world, and professional careers. Graduate teaching guides students toward new findings and trains them to compete for top jobs in academics and applied fields of anthropology. We also offer students across the University a basis in cultural and biological comparison. We contribute to Boston University's missions to build global strength and develop interdisciplinary links.

B. The Present

1. Peer Group

We initially compared a group of 31 schools to BU as possible peers. We chose them based on relatively similar size of student body, similar size of anthropology faculty, presence of a biological anthropology program, and similar rankings from *U.S. News and World Report*. On this larger list, only four departments are smaller than we are, and all of those are at much smaller institutions. The average size is 28.3, roughly one-third larger than BU.

The six we chose to compare ourselves to represent both state and private schools, moderately close to us by all measures of size and coverage of anthropology. Of those, NYU Anthropology has had a large university investment, but nevertheless has pursued a strategy similar to ours—becoming exceptional at a few things rather than trying to cover all things the way far larger departments can do. We judge ourselves to be below the level of NYU at this point, but clearly above the University of Connecticut in both social and biological anthropology. We are very roughly comparable at this point to Santa Cruz, USC, Cornell (in biological but arguably not yet in social), and Colorado-Boulder (in biological, but arguably better in social). Very few measurable data are available for the comparison beyond these raw numbers. Note that only BU has a separate Archaeology Department.

2. Faculty

Publishing, grant, and citation expectations differ significantly between social and biological anthropology, and this plan will thus consider them separately. We have no research appointments and only one full-time lecturer as a temporary arrangement, so we limit discussion here to faculty at regular ranks.

Every single member of the faculty is research-active. In so far as can be judged, they are more successful bringing in grants, more productive in publishing, and better cited as a group than at comparable departments elsewhere. Among social anthropologists, for example, two books are normally expected for promotion to full professor at research universities, and most people orient publishing more toward books than articles. The average for our department's seven full professors is 9.1 (including edited books), far above the minimum expectation. In the last three years alone, our social anthropologists have published 13 books, and there is one further from a biological anthropologist. Most of these have appeared from the top academic presses, including Blackwell, Oxford, Princeton, and Yale. Members of our faculty, for instance, account for five of the seventeen books in Princeton's prestigious Studies in Muslim Politics series. Biological anthropologists instead publish primarily articles, and citation indexes are more useful for them. We currently have only three faculty members in this subfield. Two of them have been very actively cited in the last three years (382 for the most senior and 247 for the more junior in Web of Science); the third is only in his second year out of the PhD, but already has 15 citations. They have also published in some of the top peer-reviewed

journals in the field in the past three years, including *Proceedings of the Royal Academy B, Science and Journal of Human Evolution*.

Recent awards and honors recognizing faculty quality include Robert Hefner's election as President of the Association for Asian Studies, Tom Barfield's service as President of the American Institute of Afghanistan Studies, and Jenny White's presidencies of the Turkish Studies Association and of the Middle East Section of the AAA. Equally notable, Parker Shipton was awarded the Herskovits Prize by the Association for African Studies. In 2002, Fredrik Barth (now emeritus) was Distinguished Lecturer of the AAA.

Biological anthropologists tend to get more and larger grants than social anthropologists, and this has tended to be true so far, even though none of the current biological faculty has been here more than three years. Since 2006, biological anthropology has brought in \$1.1 million in grants (including those Knott brought from Harvard). Social anthropologists have been active as well, bringing in over \$900,000 in grants over the same period. Many grants are from prestigious sources, including two Guggenheims, two Fulbrights, five NSF's, and others. The total comes to about \$2 million, although not all these grants ran through the department.

One problem with these measures is that there are no comparable figures available from competing departments. Furthermore, the only regular ranking of anthropology departments is the NRC exercise, which has still not been completed as of this writing. Even after it appears, their next report will be more than a decade from now, which greatly limits its utility for planning. Nevertheless, on the basis of our experience of other departments, we feel that our per capita levels of grants and publications compare very well with our peers, although we are much smaller than comparable departments at the highest-ranked institutions.

Our strategy over two decades has been to build ourselves gradually into a top program in a few specialized areas rather than trying to cover everything in a more shallow way. Social anthropologists typically measure themselves along two lines: areas of ethnographic expertise and areas of theoretical significance. Ethnographically, the department has concentrated on developing three overlapping strengths: Africa, Asia broadly conceived, and the Islamic world. To an extent, of course, these specialties mesh with strengths of the entire University, and many of us have been closely involved in those developments. We compare well to other anthropology departments in all three of these areas, and certainly rank as one of the top few in the anthropology of Islam. Faculty research invokes a wide range of theoretical concerns, but we have a number of important synergies for which we are known. One is the study of religion and modernity. We are also known for work on problems of trust and civil society. Another concentration of energies is developing on issues of youth culture. In biological anthropology, the situation is still changing because we are in the midst of our plans to build up to five positions. Our three current faculty give us noteworthy strength in the study of primatology, great ape biology, and human evolution, utilizing multiple perspectives and techniques. With the addition of two more positions, we expect to have an outstanding program for a department of our size.

One major indicator of success in program development is the number of graduate applications specifically addressed to our areas of expertise. Applications clearly converge on main faculty strengths. Another measure is requests to come as one-year visiting scholars (usually with Fulbright or comparable funding). This has increased from essentially none two decades ago to a constant stream leading to two-to-three scholars in residence every year.

In teaching, performance is probably best measured by course evaluations. Here the department has maintained high expectations, while understanding that large introductory lecture courses may typically get lower evaluations. In general, we expect ratings of course and instructor to be around 4.0 or higher. Cases where they fall below 3.5 receive attention, including discussions about ways of improving. For this purpose, evaluations are supplemented by periodic peer reviews of classes. In anthropology, only a few courses have fallen much below our expectations, and we have been able to ameliorate by offering help or occasionally by staffing changes. We expect faculty to develop new courses every few years, but the main measure of teaching quality will continue to be the evaluations.

The Anthropology Department has generally tried to have all faculty maintain a balance between larger and smaller classes, and between undergraduate and graduate teaching. No one teaches only graduate seminars; no one teaches only large undergraduate courses. Even faculty with administrative course releases continue to teach 100- and 200-level courses.

3. Academic Programs

Anthropology teaches students from across the University. Roughly 71% are CAS/GRS students; the next largest group by far comes from COM, with about 16%. These proportions have been steady for at least a decade. Total enrollments and majors, however, have increased gradually but consistently. The 10-year credit-hour data, for example, show a 14% increase over the decade. The department's longer-term data show a comparable pattern for the past 25 years. Numbers of major degrees awarded increased 45%, and minors awarded more than doubled over the previous decade.

Our undergraduate major is essentially comparable to those of our peer institutions, requiring general introductory material, some training in all four major subfields, and a split into tracks according to subfield. In our case, the main options are social or biological anthropology. This curriculum was last reviewed as a whole when we introduced the biological track more than a decade ago. The biological side was reworked considerably in 2008 with our new faculty. The social side, however, is due for further consideration. Current problems are largely the result of the growth in majors. Courses originally designed as capstone seminars, for instance, now have large enrollments, and we plan to give this serious attention over the next two years.

We have only very partial data on what students do after graduation, based on self-reporting of graduating seniors. The data that we have indicate that about 25% plan to go on to graduate programs in relevant fields like anthropology or public health. A few pursue professional degrees in medicine, law, or business. And about half plan to work in the development sector, at least for a few years, including Peace Corps, Teach for America, and various NGOs. We do not have data on diversity, but subjectively the department appears to reflect the ethnic structure of the University; in gender, there are considerably more women than men among majors and in most classes.

We have not actively recruited MA students for several years, and only one is currently enrolled. The program as designed no longer fits the department well, and its future will need careful consideration.

The PhD program is very small, enrolling just three-to-five students each year. Many highly qualified students, however, cannot enter due to a chronic lack of funding. The students who do come are generally excellent, but the small size of the program creates pedagogical problems. One measure of the quality of the program is the increasing number of applications over the past decade and longer, and the much greater selectivity the department uses in choosing applicants. Another is the success of our students in obtaining external funding to conduct dissertation research. Over the last three years, 80% of eligible students have obtained external funding to conduct their field research. This is a very high level of achievement and includes multiple grants from Fulbright, NSF, and others. Note, however, that of our comparison institutions we have by far the smallest number of graduate students with 33 (the next lowest has 59). This may partly reflect our efficiency in getting students through the program, but it also indicates how poorly funded the program is in relation to our peers. Several applicants every year report that they have gone elsewhere for better offers, even though we were their first choice.

The PhD curriculum last underwent a serious revision about a decade ago, although the core sequence of required courses is being reconsidered now. The program serves primarily to prepare students for academic jobs and for applied work in related fields. We currently graduate the average student in eight years. This has been moving down slightly over the last decade, and is slightly faster than the average for the field as a whole. Among students who graduated in the past three years (12 PhD, 1 MAAA), two have tenure-track jobs at good universities, five have post-docs or non-tenure-track teaching positions, and four are employed in related fields (health, media). We do not know about the remaining two, but presume they are not employed in the field. About 85% of recent graduates are thus appropriately employed—a very good rate in the current weak job market.

Anthropology is part of one interdisciplinary degree program, the major in Anthropology and Religion. This attracts a small number of students (typically graduating two-to-three each year), but it highlights one of the intellectual strengths of our program and does not involve teaching any extra courses.

International initiatives are central to our educational and research roles as anthropologists and all members of the department have extensive international experience and contacts. The department itself has an

exchange agreement with the Anthropology Department at Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou, and actively participates in various BU study abroad programs (especially in China, Japan, and Africa)—both sending large numbers of students and helping in program development.

4. *Facilities and Infrastructure*

Office space for anthropology should be adequate with the planned addition of new space on the fourth floor of 232 Bay State Road. We still lack a seminar room of adequate size and quality; the existing space is not acceptable for bringing outside speakers, and it seats only eleven. Other teaching needs are met by general CAS space and are subject to the same problems as that space, but are generally satisfactory.

Laboratory space, however, is extremely limited, and will be a problem as we move to our full staffing of five faculty in biological anthropology, many of whom will have postdoctoral students who also need space. With the growing focus on lab techniques in this subdiscipline, it is important to be able to offer new faculty and students the ability to use the latest tools to answer questions pertaining to primate and human evolution and behavior. The first important piece is having the physical space to put labs and equipment. Another important piece is that much lab-based work represent collaborations within the University between faculty, graduate students and post-docs. These people need places where they can work together on campus. Having offices or meeting spaces that facilitate this is an important part of building a successful program (as shown by the success of similar efforts in the BU Biology Department).

5. *Interdisciplinary Collaborations*

We are involved in a wide range of interdisciplinary collaborations across the University. In teaching, our courses are important parts of the Regional Politics and Cultural Anthropology track in the International Relations Department, and in the Behavioral Ecology track in the Biology Department. We also play important roles in the African Studies Center; the Center for the Study of Asia; the Center for the Study of Muslim Societies and Cultures; the Institute for Culture, Religion, and World Affairs; and Women's Studies. We currently supply directors for three of those programs. The department is also currently contributing two courses to the Core Curriculum.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. *Faculty Plans*

Anthropology intends to continue the gradual expansion of current strengths that has built the department through several decades. For social anthropology, this may mean expansion into Europe from our current base in Africa and Asia. This is a strategic opportunity for anthropology because Europe is a rapidly growing area of interest, but not one in which older departments have a long tradition of work. It also builds our strength in Islam because of Europe's large numbers of Muslim immigrants. In theoretical areas, we will continue to develop strength in religion, civil life, migration and identity, and youth culture. In biological anthropology, we still need breadth of coverage, particularly in the area of genetics. There is an ongoing search, as well as a future one that has been promised. We will use this to continue to build in great ape anatomy, ecology, and evolution while extending our breadth of coverage.

One important issue that we will face in the coming decade is the aging of the department, particularly on the social side. Nearly everyone falls into a narrow age range, and all will be near or beyond the age of 65 ten years from now. For this reason, we will hire with a careful eye on keeping an appropriate balance of ages and ranks.

We expect that the large administrative contributions of our faculty will continue. Currently, these include course releases for the directors of the Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations; the Institute for Culture, Religion, and World Affairs; and Women's Studies. We would also like to continue contributing significantly to the Core Curriculum and other interdisciplinary endeavors of the College and

University. Added to our rising enrollments, however, it is becoming very difficult to meet our curricular needs. We thus propose: (1) Continuing the current commitment to expanding the biological anthropology program to five lines over the next two years. The search for the fourth line is ongoing and the search for the fifth tentatively planned for 2011-12. (2) Adding one additional junior line in social anthropology in the next year, with a specialty in Europe. This will enable the department to maintain its commitment to the Core. (3) Considering a second new line later in the decade, depending on teaching demand.

2. Teaching, Curriculum and Collaboration

In undergraduate education, we expect a continuation of the gradual increases in enrollments and majors that we have seen over the last two decades. With the construction of a strong track in biological anthropology, we expect a further enhancement by attracting premedical students, as happens in most comparable departments. The main issue for the curriculum right now is adjusting to the larger size of the major. We plan to undertake a systematic review in 2010-11.

The PhD program is unlikely to increase in size without significant new funds for students. Like most departments, we feel strongly that BU has not taken this seriously enough in the past and we hope for new developments through the capital campaign. In addition to that, however, we also intend to explore external funding possibilities. This is most likely through the biological anthropology program. We are urging faculty to include graduate students in their grants, and we will explore possibilities of training grants like IGERT.

Over the next few years, we plan a major reconsideration of possible Master's programs. This will include revision (or possibly removal) of the current MAAA to address current department strengths. In biological anthropology, we are exploring the possibility of a joint degree with BUMC to train students to teach gross anatomy, although we recognize the current logistical difficulties of running a program across schools. In either case, we will proceed only if our studies show that there is (1) a potential market of interested students, (2) a suitable job market for graduates, (3) the possibility of running the program without committing significant new resources (faculty lines, labs), and (4) a strong commitment from relevant faculty.

We plan to continue our current extensive commitments to interdisciplinary and collaborative programs. In addition, we hope to establish stronger connections to the departments of Sociology and Archaeology, while continuing and building existing ties to Religion, Environmental Studies, International Relations, and Biology. Across schools, we are working to build tighter ties with BUMC and SPH, especially in biological and medical anthropology.

3. Facilities and Infrastructure

The main priority is laboratory space, as outlined above. For the short term, we are trying to maximize current space by moving the undergraduate teaching function out of the lab by hiring students to carry materials back and forth. For the long term, we will continue to work with the College to identify more space. Staffing is currently adequate, but we may need to consider a further staff position if growth continues.

4. Summary of New Resources Needed

- Maintaining the current commitment to a total of five lines in biological anthropology;
- Adding one additional line in social anthropology;
- Consideration of another new line toward the end of the decade, if warranted;
- Consideration of one additional staff member toward the end of the decade, to meet increasing teaching responsibilities and grant accounting needs;
- An additional laboratory for biological anthropology.

5. Measures for Evaluating Progress

- Faculty research productivity overall cannot reasonably be expected to rise, but should maintain its current level as measured above (books with quality publishers, articles in top journals, grants awarded).
- Teaching measured primarily through evaluations with the goal of roughly 4.0 for courses and instructors; supplemental information will come from peer evaluations.
- Quality of the graduate program can be measured through (1) an increasing number of applications received; (2) continued high levels of outside funding for dissertation projects (roughly 80% of eligible students); and (3) success placing students in the profession. Similar measures (except for dissertation funding) can be used for any Master's programs that are introduced.

6. Five-year Plan

For faculty recruitment, we plan to finish bringing the biological anthropology up to five lines in this period, and if possible to add one line in social anthropology, as described above. Hopefully, an additional line can be considered during the second five years.

In teaching, a major review of the entire curriculum, especially at the undergraduate level, will begin next year and the results will be in place by the end of the first five years. We will also study the possibility of new or greatly revised Master's programs during this period.

For facilities, the most important goal is additional lab space to accommodate both teaching and research functions in our expanded biological anthropology program. We will continue to work closely with the college on that issue.

Department of Archaeology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

In the Department of Archaeology, we view archaeology as a unified, interdisciplinary, and global discipline. We aim to provide an exceptional education in world archaeology. Our undergraduate curriculum will offer specialized training for our concentrators through direct engagement with a world-class faculty that is dedicated to teaching and active research. We also will serve the needs of the greater university community by enriching the liberal arts education of students in other departments and colleges through our offerings. Our graduate programs will deliver the highest level of scholarly and professional training in the recovery, analysis, interpretation, and management of archaeological resources.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

When it was created in 1982, the Department of Archaeology was the only stand-alone academic department of archaeology in the United States. Although archaeology departments are common in Europe and Canada, in the United States archaeology has traditionally been taught as a subdivision of another field (Anthropology for New World archaeology and world prehistory; Classics or Art History for Classical Archaeology; Near Eastern Studies for archaeology of the region generally from Egypt to Iran; Anthropology or History for historical archaeology, etc.). At the present time, we remain the only independent department of archaeology in the country, although a number of interdisciplinary archaeology programs have been developed elsewhere (most notably at Brown and UCLA) that use archaeology faculty who nevertheless retain their appointments in their individual departments.

We regard archaeology as an independent intellectual and academic discipline with a mature and robust tradition of methods, theory, and practice. Largely for historical reasons, other archaeology programs in the United States have not emerged out of their traditional disciplinary homes. That fact makes BU's Department of Archaeology unique in U.S. higher education, a distinction that we have emphasized and should continue to emphasize. Unfortunately, it also makes direct comparison with other programs and identification of peer groups difficult. No other department matches precisely our departmental structure, specializations, or commitment to world archaeology regardless of time period or region. Our current departmental areas of specialization include Asian (East, Southeast, South); Classical/Aegean; Archaeological Science (geoarchaeology, paleoethnobotany); Heritage Management; Historical; Mesoamerican; and Near Eastern, as well as a variety of technical and methodological areas (e.g., remote sensing, geographical information systems, method and theory).

While we cannot provide a single list of peer departments, we have developed peer rankings for the major archaeological specializations covered by our department: Classical, Historical, Mesoamerican, and Near Eastern. We exclude Asian because, although we added a faculty member in that area last year, it is premature to compare it with other academic programs; we expect a rapid rise to prominence in Asian archaeology, however, because of our strong partnership with the outstanding International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History (ICEAACH), whose director (Murowchick) is now a full-time faculty member in our department (see ICEAACH strategic plan). In addition, we offer peer comparisons for two of our other important specializations: Archaeological Heritage Management and Geoarchaeology. Programs in these two areas are so rare, and data about them so limited, that we cannot rank BU relative to them.

Classical Archaeology: Penn, Michigan, Berkeley, UCLA, Brown, Arizona, *Boston U*, Chicago, Harvard. Brown, UCLA, and Michigan have interdisciplinary programs; the others (except BU) are housed in Classics departments.

Historical Archaeology: Penn, Brown, Chicago, Berkeley, *Boston U*, William and Mary. All are

housed in Anthropology departments, except BU, of course, and Brown, where historical archaeology is taught in Anthropology combined with an interdisciplinary program.

Mesoamerican Archaeology: Arizona State, Michigan, Arizona, Harvard, *Boston U*, UCLA, Tulane, Berkeley, Penn. UCLA and Brown have interdisciplinary programs; Arizona State in School of Human Evolution and Social Change; all others (except BU) in Anthropology departments.

Near Eastern Archaeology: Chicago, Harvard, Penn, Brown, Johns Hopkins, *Boston U*, Yale, NYU, Berkeley. Chicago, Harvard, Penn, Johns Hopkins, Yale, and Berkeley all are in departments of Near Eastern languages and civilization.

Archaeological Heritage Management (AHM): BU offers a specialized MA in AHM with a PhD possible; Michigan Technological U offers a PhD in industrial archaeology and heritage; Montana has MA and PhD options (Anthro. Dept.); NW State U of Louisiana has a BA and MA in Heritage Resources; Sonoma State has an MA in Cultural Resource Management; U of Georgia has an MS in Archaeological Resource Management.

Geoarchaeology: BU has a specialized MA in Geoarchaeology. Geoarchaeology is also taught (but not in specific MA programs) at Arizona (Anthro. Dept.), Kansas (Geography and Anthro. depts.), Calgary (Archaeology, Geography, Geology, Geophysics depts.), Washington U, St. Louis (Anthro, Classics), Texas A&M (Geography and Environment dept.), Washington State U, Pullman (Anthro. Dept.).

In terms of ranking our department in an overall sense, it is important to note that all the peer departments and programs listed above represent the best in the country in their various specializations. Thus, in all of our major areas of specialization, we rank in the top seven nationally (number seven in Classical, five in Historical, five in Mesoamerican, and six in Near Eastern). In addition, no other program combines undergraduate and graduate archaeology education in a comprehensive, systematic, global, and unitary way, and in that sense we are literally without peer. None of the schools and programs listed above, with the exception of UCLA, embraces a holistic approach to archaeology regardless of time period or region of the world, and none offers a full suite of BA, MA, and PhD degrees in archaeology.

2. Faculty Assessment

Currently 12 full-time faculty, one part-time. Seven tenured faculty, four tenure-track, two non-tenured (one full-, one part-time). All faculty engage in undergraduate and graduate teaching, advising, and research.

a. Scholarly/research quality (aggregate, 2006/7–2008/9):

1. *Refereed scholarly publications:* 14 faculty: 12 books (all single- or multiple-authored except two edited volumes; one Egyptology textbook, no catalogs), 50 book chapters, 51 articles.
2. *"High quality" journal articles:* 14 faculty: 40 refereed articles (21 in high-quality journals).
3. *Research grant activity:* 12 faculty: 21 grants in 2006/7–2008/9 totaling \$3,793,592 (avg. 1.75 grants/\$316,133 per faculty).
4. *Rankings:* None are available.
5. *Awards:* Numerous awards from national and international organizations.
6. *Citations:* No comprehensive citation indices exist for archaeology.

b. Scholarly/research quality (subfields): Our faculty specialize in several areas: Archaeological Science (Borojevic, Goldberg); Classical/Aegean (Kleiner, Runnels, Roosevelt); Mesoamerica (Coggins, Hammond, Saturno); E, SE, and S Asian (Mughal, Murowchick); Heritage Management (Elia, Mughal); Historical (Beaudry); and Near Eastern (Bard, Danti, Roosevelt). Peer rankings, grants, and publications indicate high productivity and reputation in across our specializations.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (aggregate):

1. *Course evaluations:* We consider scores of 4 and above as excellent; 3 to 3.5 as needing improvement; and below 3 as needing serious improvement. Average faculty scores for 2007/7–2008/9 are: Overall course (undergraduate), 3.92; overall instructor (undergraduate),

4.07; overall course (graduate), 4.31; overall instructor (graduate), 4.5.

3. *Participation in academic enhancement activities:* We offer field schools in Spain and Guatemala. Many students work on lab, field research, and publications with faculty; three per year do IWD.

4. *Curricular and pedagogical innovation:* Our undergraduate Archaeology major is unique in the United States, as is our field school requirement for majors. BU also innovated the semester-long field study in archaeology program, offering students learning through “total immersion” in major research projects in Belize and Guatemala. We created MA programs in Heritage Management and Geoarchaeology.

d. *Educational/pedagogical contributions (field):*

2. *Share of enrollments:* Undergraduate majors do not specialize in any one area. Sixty-two current graduate students specialize in Archaeological Science (2), Asia (4), Classical/Aegean (20), Heritage (3), Historical (12), Mesoamerica (12), and Near East (9).

3. Academic Programs

a. *Assessment of undergraduate education*

1. *Mission: goals and purposes:* The department offers the only comprehensive, holistic undergraduate major in world Archaeology in the country. Students may also minor. Several courses serve to enhance the liberal arts education of non-majors, including five divisional courses.

2. *Vitality and quality:* We are currently reviewing the undergraduate curriculum and expect to make improvements in course titles, numbers, and content.

3. *Analysis of enrollment history:* Total undergraduate credit hours: 5338 in 06/07, 4775 in 07/08, 5040 in 08/09. Majors: 90 in 06/07, 99 in 07/08, 99 in 08/09.

4. *Student outcomes:* 34 majors graduated in 2006/7–2008/9 and reported, 8 are in PhD programs, 17 in MA programs, and 5 in archaeology-related jobs. Students went to Columbia, Penn, Arizona, Cincinnati, NYU, University College London, So. Florida, Sheffield, N. Carolina, GWU, Buffalo.

5. *Student diversity:* We do not track diversity.

b. *Assessment of doctoral programs*

1. *Mission: goals and purposes:* We aim to be the best PhD program in archaeology, providing professional training in the areas of Asian, Classical/Aegean, Archaeological Science, Heritage Management, Historical, Mesoamerican, and Near Eastern archaeology. We emphasize the holistic and interdisciplinary nature of the field, as well as meaningful engagement with the discipline and the public.

2. *Vitality and quality:* The last (partial) review of PhD program was in 2005. A new review is warranted. Recently, we have added new courses, including AR 504 Preserving World Heritage; AR702 Contemporary Theory; AR727 Archaeology of Colonialism; AR790 Archaeology of Southeast Asia; AR 795 Politics, Nationalism, and Archaeology; AR808 Archaeological Survey and Landscape; and AR 815 Plunder and Preservation: Cultural Heritage in Armed Conflict. Our graduate students are active researchers who greatly benefit from regular interaction with their BU colleagues and faculty who are working throughout the world, unlike most graduate students in other programs who study in single disciplines.

3. *Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment:* In 2006/7–2008/9, 260 students applied, and 25 were enrolled. 2006/07–2008/09 admit rate: 39%, accept rate 11%. Average SAT scores: verbal—admitted students, 595.7 (79.9 percentile), enrolled students, 592.2 (77.8%); quantitative—admitted students, 649.5 (60.2), enrolled 633.8 (57.3); analytical (out of 6)—admitted students, 4.7 (60.9%), enrolled, 4.8 (59.9%). Currently, we have 39 PhD students and 14 MA/PhD students. Our graduate program ranks 14th in GRS in enrolled students. GRS credit hours in Archaeology: 2006/7, 444; 2007/8, 484; 2008/9, 342. We regularly lose

our top 4–5 students each year to other schools, usually because of better funding elsewhere. At several peer institutions (e.g., Brown, Michigan), all graduate students are fully funded with tuition, fees, and stipend (the stipend at Brown is \$25K). The lack of graduate funding—we can fund two incoming graduate students per year out of an average eight or nine—causes delay and hardship among our students.

4. *Student outcomes*: Nine students received the PhD in 2007–2009. Time to completion: post BA, 9.3 yrs; post MA, 10 yrs. Outcomes: one is tenure-track at UNH; one is currently visiting asst. prof. in our dept.; one is adjunct at UNC; one is visiting asst. professor at U Illinois Urbana; one is lecturer at Framingham State; one is director of CRM research unit in Texas; one is senior curatorial asst., Peabody Museum, Harvard; one is conducting research with Smithsonian funding; one is taking second PhD.; one is Project Archaeologist, Fiske Center for Archaeological Research at UMass Boston.

5. *Available peer rankings*: None are available.

6. *Student diversity*: We do not track; five are international students.

c. *Assessment of masters programs*:

1. *Mission: goals and purposes*: We offer three MA programs: one in general archaeology; one in Archaeological Heritage Management (AHM), and one in Geoarchaeology (GEO). The latter two offer marketable skills in public archaeology (AHM, GEO) and archaeological science (GEO).

2. *Vitality and quality*: 2006/07–2008/09 general MA: admit rate, 29%; enroll rate 9%. AHM admit rate 32%; enroll rate 5%. GEO admit rate 7%; enroll rate 0%. Both AHM and GEO programs have been revised in the last three years. Currently, we have 4 MA-only students, 14 in combined MA/PhD, 1 in AHM, and 1 in GEO. One MA/PhD student is doing the AHM masters program. In general, the MA programs have had disappointing enrollments, and greater efforts need to be made to revive them. The small number of faculty teaching in the programs and competing obligations make it difficult to grow the programs.

3. *Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment*: There are about 10 MA programs in AHM and none in GEO at other U.S. schools. The lack of funding for MA students deters many applicants.

4. *Student outcomes*: two general MA students, one GEO, and one AHM student graduated in the last three years. We have information on three: one general MA grad is Museum Specialist, Nat'l Park Service; the GEO student is working for a private CRM firm; and the AHM student is employed by the Chinese State Administration of Cultural Heritage, Beijing. Average time to completion: 2.2 yrs.

5. *Available peer rankings*: None.

6. *Student diversity*: We do not track. One AHM student is international (China).

e. *Interdisciplinary initiatives*: Faculty regularly work with colleagues in several departments. Cross appointments include Kleiner and Coggins (Art History), Beaudry (Anthropology), and Murowchick (Anthropology). Murowchick and the International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History participate in the BU Center for the Study of Asia (BUCSA).

f. *International/global initiatives*: Our work is inherently global in scope. Our faculty and students have research projects in Egypt, Turkey, Syria, Montserrat, Guatemala, Italy, Spain, China, Indonesia, Pakistan, Greece, and Serbia. We have signed cooperative agreements with Bermuda National Trust and Archaeology Department of Kyushu University (Japan). We host archaeological field schools in Spain and Guatemala. We are developing an archaeological certificate program that will allow foreign students and professionals to take courses in the department.

g. *Outreach initiatives*: Faculty and graduate students regularly participate in outreach activities, e.g., lecturing to school and public groups and engaging in media interviews and news stories. Our faculty is also actively engaged in public policy and advocacy issues relating to archaeology. The graduate

students organize and staff an open house each year for the public during Massachusetts Archaeology Week. The department's International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History hosts regular outreach events as part of its programming.

4. *Facilities*

a. Adequacy of facilities: Like many departments in CAS, we are bursting at the seams in terms of space needs. Our space in the Stone building is inadequate and its quality is also problematic in terms of ventilation, heating, and air quality. Our departmental mission is being hampered by lack of teaching rooms within the department, laboratory space for our active faculty research projects, and office space for our graduate students. The Gabel Museum, which provides hands-on opportunities for students to study artifacts, needs a part-time curatorial position as well as additional storage space for artifacts and archives that we have ethical and legal responsibilities to curate.

b. Plans for addressing issues: We continue to work with CAS to upgrade our existing space and to find additional space. Our ideal situation—and one that would dramatically increase our department's visibility—would be to revamp and expand our existing space as part of future University plans to build a new building or substantially renovate the existing space. This would include physically bringing our vibrant International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History into the department (it is currently housed in Kenmore Square). Ultimately, we need our own building or part of one, a prospect that could only be accomplished by very aggressive fundraising.

5. *Collaboration with other academic units and institutions*

We regularly collaborate with Anthropology, Art History, Classical Studies, American Studies, International Programs, Muslim Studies, Latin American Studies, BUCSA, and the MLA Gastronomy program in MET. We have strong affiliations with the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA) and the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR), both of which have their headquarters in BU space. Faculty also are affiliated with the International Council on Monuments and Sites.

C. **Strategic Plan for the Future**

1. *Ten-year Plan*

a. Summary: In 2020, we envision a thriving, vibrant Department of Archaeology that is recognized as the top archaeology program in the country, if not the world. Although several of our tenured faculty may have retired by that time, we expect that our junior faculty will have moved into leadership positions with a determination to continue our mission of providing first-rate undergraduate and graduate education in a department that is dedicated to the notion that archaeology is an independent intellectual and academic discipline, concerned with the past experience of humans worldwide, and committed to active and responsible contemporary engagement with research, the discipline, and the public. We also expect that our traditional areas of faculty expertise—Archaeological Science, Classical/Aegean, Heritage Management, Historical, Mesoamerican, Near Eastern—and our newest area, Asia, will continue to be specialties of the department and indeed will be strengthened.

b. 10-Year Goals:

1. Faculty: In the short term, we will hire a Classical archaeologist to hold the James R. Wiseman Chair and a Mesoamerican archaeologist (searches ongoing). We also need to hire another junior faculty member in Classical Archaeology as soon as practical. We plan to improve on existing strengths and especially to build our capacity in Heritage Management and Asian archaeology. Although we own the distinction of being the only stand-alone department of archaeology in the country, we cannot match the faculty depth of most of our

peer institutions that concentrate in only one or two fields. We need *at least* 2–3 faculty members in each area of specialization in order to be able to carry out our mission and improve our standing relative to peer departments and programs; currently Historical and Asian only have one faculty in each. Our faculty strength has remained at around 12 for the past 15 years. Given the normal cycle of faculty LOAs and sabbaticals, and the need to cover Chair, DGS, DUS, DGA, and *JFA* Editor positions, as well as semester-long field schools abroad, our faculty is barely able to meet its obligations to our grad students, majors and minors, and to the College and wider University (e.g., Writing Program, Honors College). In order to have adequate depth and breadth as a department of global archaeology, our faculty size should be around 20. Assuming that current faculty numbers in existing specializations remain steady, we would like to add 1 Classical, 1 Asian, 1 Historical, and 1 Heritage faculty in the next 5 years. That would bring us to 16; the remaining 4 positions would either be used to add a new area or to bolster existing strengths (e.g., archaeological science). In 2010, we are a very good department. With the additional lines, we would be able to improve our teaching capabilities, increase our research and scholarly productivity, and become, by 2020, a great department.

2. *Undergraduate education:* Our concentration is the best in the country. We will improve our course offerings to attract new majors and to serve the wider college and university community.

3. *Doctoral education:* We have a primary and central commitment to PhD education. We desperately need to find adequate funding for our PhD students. Lack of graduate funding contributes to the excessive time to complete their degrees. It is difficult to add more PhD students each year given our current faculty strength.

4. *Masters education:* We will work to attract more students to the MA programs, especially AHM and GEO. These are relatively unique offerings and we need to do a better job promoting them.

5. *Other academic programs:* We will develop a certificate program for international students and professionals to provide them training in heritage management, GIS, remote sensing, and other skills.

7. *Facilities:* Any expansion of faculty and graduate students will require additional space. A comprehensive departmental plan should be developed to assess our needs over the next decade.

9. *Collaborations:* We will expand our collaborative efforts throughout the University and see potential for strategic partnerships with International Relations (heritage-related topics), the Center for Remote Sensing, and the Dept. of Geography & Environment.

c. *Resources Needed to Accomplish Goals:* To achieve our 10-year goals of becoming the best Archaeology program, we realistically need funding for new faculty positions and graduate support. We need one additional full-time administrator and substantial additional office, lab, and storage space.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

a. *Indicators to measure progress:* Numbers of new faculty positions; successful retentions of current faculty; tenure achieved by junior faculty; placement of undergraduates in top grad schools and PhDs in top schools; additional space; increased graduate funding.

b. *Resources/infrastructure needed to collect and analyze data:* No additional resources needed.

3. Five-year Goals

a. *Expectations for progress in 5 years:* 4 new faculty lines (1 from Prof. Wiseman's half salary and faculty line); 1–3 new TFs for graduate funding; 4 new faculty offices; additional lab and museum

storage space.

b. Steps needed to achieve the 5-year goals: Develop a departmental plan with CAS for staffing and facilities expansion/improvement. Continue mentoring program for junior faculty. Conduct a review of our graduate program. Create fundraising effort within the department to identify potential donors and coordinate with CAS and the University (capital campaign).

c. Indications of progress/realigning emphasis: Reevaluation of 10-yr goals will be made based on 5-yr progress and any unanticipated events (e.g., faculty leaving, retiring, etc.).

Department of Art History
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The faculty of the Art History Department seek to play a central role in the general education of undergraduates in all of the University's colleges and schools by offering courses that span all periods of the history of art from prehistory to the present and worldwide; to prepare CAS Art History majors for admission to leading graduate programs or for careers in museums and galleries; to train MA and PhD candidates as college and university professors and/or museum and gallery curators; and to contribute to the development of the discipline and the humanities in general through research and publication. Because we consider all of these goals as complementary and mutually reinforcing, we do not regard any one of them as our primary function. We believe that we cannot achieve overall excellence if our curriculum and research do not encompass the full chronological range of the history of art, all artistic media as well as architecture, and a multiplicity of methodological approaches. We celebrate the diversity of our faculty's interests and means of pursuing them, and we believe that mutual respect for that diversity of interests and methods sets the best possible example for our students at all levels.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. *Academic Peer Group*

Overall Ranking: 1) Harvard University; 2) Columbia University; 3) Institute of Fine Arts, New York University; 4) Yale University; 5) Boston University; 6) University of California at Los Angeles; 7) University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; 8) University of Delaware; 9) Northwestern University.

The overall numerical ranking is a composite score based on 14 individual comparative analyses of the strengths and weaknesses of each program in each of the following fields: Antiquity, Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque/18th Century, 19th Century, 20th Century/Contemporary, American, Architectural History, African, Islamic, Asian, Pre-Columbian, Photography, and Museum Studies. While in some cases the strongest departments overall are among the weakest in a given field, and some of the weaker programs score high in some specialized areas, the composite score accurately reflects the relative excellence—and reputation—of the nine programs. The four programs ranked higher than BU have been the premier art history programs for the past half-century. They are, not coincidentally, the four institutions where most of our professors earned their PhDs (an indirect testimony to the quality of the AH faculty). We believe we have a small edge over UCLA and Michigan, two comparable programs, both at major state universities, and that we are clearly stronger than Delaware and Northwestern.

What the leading programs all have in common are 1) large faculties and coverage of a wide range of fields, both Western and non-Western; 2) a preponderance of senior faculty with major reputations as research scholars, many hired from outside as full professors (often with named chairs) rather than promoted from within; 3) major research libraries; 4) excellent facilities, in some cases including their own art museums; and 5) full funding for several years of every student accepted into their PhD programs. We can never equal the schools in this top group in some of these categories, although we do have a gallery and close ties with the Museum of Fine Arts, and in some fields, such as American and Photography, we rank very high. But we can definitely narrow the gap with the top programs—and have already done so over the past decade. We can also open up a gap between us and our two peer institutions and widen the gap between BU and the two lower-ranked schools by accelerating the rate of publication of our faculty, further increasing the breadth of our curriculum, improving our facilities, and offering richer financial aid packages to attract better graduate students (see Part C, below). It is especially noteworthy that in terms of graduate funding, BU is at present last in this ranking, with fewer scholarships and fellowships to offer applicants than even the weakest schools in this peer group.

2. Faculty Assessment

The Art History faculty consists of 16 full-time professors (4 full, 7 associate, 5 assistant) plus one professor shared with Archaeology (Coggins), another with AMNESP (Sewell), and one half-time appointment (Hall). As is true of our peer departments, the full professors have published the most and have the highest profiles in their respective fields. In a discipline that places the greatest emphasis on books, Hills, Morgan, and Redford have each published a book, and Kleiner three, during the past three years. The fact that full professors make up less than 25% of our faculty is a major reason why we do not have as high a reputation in scholarship as the top four departments in our peer group. At the assistant professor level, Scrivano and Tseng have already published books, and Sewell, Westervelt, and Williams have their first books in press. This bodes well for the future. The one area of concern is at the associate professor level; with the exception of Cranston, whose second book appeared in February 2010, no one has published a book since earning tenure and no one has been promoted to full professor in the past 16 years.

The three leading peer-reviewed journals in our field are *Art Bulletin*, *Art History*, and *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*. Only Tseng has published in any of these in the past three years, but several others have published in these journals earlier in their careers. Often, however, it is more important to publish in the best journals in the various sub-fields, as have recently Becker, in *African Arts*, and Fetvaci, in *Muqarnas*. But our record is not good measured by these criteria. The *sine qua non* for closing the gap with the top departments is for the BU faculty to publish more books as well as more articles in the best journals.

On other grounds, we fare much better. Space does not permit an enumeration of all the offices and other positions our faculty hold in professional organizations or the awards and grants won, but it is noteworthy how many of our youngest faculty are very active in their fields: for example, Becker in the American Institute of Maghreb Studies, Fetvaci in the Historians of Islamic Art Association, Sewell in the American Studies Association and New England Society of Architectural Historians, Tseng in the Japan Art History Forum, Williams in Apex Art. During the past three years, we have also won a number of significant external research grants and other awards. Some highlights: Fulbright-Hays Fellowship (Becker), Radcliffe Institute Fellowship (Becker), W.E.B. Du Bois Institute Fellowship (Hills), Organization of American Historians grant (Morgan), Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada grant (Scrivano), Humboldt Foundation Fellowship (Sichel), J. Paul Getty Postdoctoral Fellowship (Tseng, Williams); book awards (Becker, for *Amazigh Arts in Morocco*; Kleiner, for *A History of Roman Art*); awards for scholarly articles (Fetvaci, from the Historians of Islamic Art Association); and election to honorary societies (Hall, Kahn, and Kleiner, Society of Antiquaries of London; Morgan, Phi Beta Kappa). Within BU, the outstanding faculty honors during the past three years include Fetvaci's appointment as Peter Paul Development Professor and the award of Humanities Foundation fellowships to Kahn, Ribner, Scrivano, and Zell.

Keeping in mind that we regard undergraduate education as a key part of our mission, it is noteworthy how many of our faculty have won Boston University awards for teaching and advising over the course of their careers if not during the past three years (Kleiner, Metcalf; Morgan and Zell, CAS teaching prizes; Kleiner and Morgan, CAS Honors Program teaching awards; Kleiner and Ribner, CAS advising awards). Student evaluations of faculty teaching are especially strong, with instructor ratings almost without exception falling in the 4.35 to 4.75 range out of a possible 5.0. We are also active in curricular development and academic enhancement activities. One recent highlight: a new course in "green architecture" that will attract students from many departments and several colleges.

3. Academic Programs

Especially noteworthy has been the reevaluation during the past several years of every aspect of our curriculum and degree programs arising from the addition of new lines in African and Islamic Art and in Modern Architecture. As a result, we have introduced new undergraduate major and minor tracks in non-Western art and architecture and revised our requirements for graduate degrees as well. The culmination of all of these curricular revisions will be the "re-branding" of the Art History Department as the Department of History of Art and Architecture. We have taken all of these actions solely because we believe—consistent with

our mission statement—that we cannot adequately serve the larger university community nor properly train future professional art historians without offering a rigorous curriculum that embraces every period of the history of art worldwide and that encompasses painting, sculpture, photography, the so-called minor arts, architecture, and material culture, as well as a multiplicity of methodological approaches. Today, no art history department can hope to achieve national prominence by teaching and conducting research solely on the traditional canon of Western art, as we did until fairly recently. The reason we can begin to talk about narrowing the gap with Harvard, Columbia, NYU, and Yale is that we now have a larger faculty offering courses and publishing in more fields. We still have more progress to make on this front, however, both in terms of faculty lines and especially in increasing the number of books and articles we write.

Within that broad curriculum, for distribution purposes in the Art History major, we define four groups beyond the introductory level: Ancient, Medieval, and Ancient American (Group A); African, Asian, and Islamic (Group B); Renaissance, Baroque, and 18th Century (Group C); Modern and American (Group D). Our largest enrollments, of course, are in our introductory courses, with the AH 111/112 survey being the biggest draw (200+) and the training ground for all of our teaching fellows. These courses and AH 205, Introduction to Architecture, are all taught by senior faculty, all of whom are deeply committed to introducing our discipline to a wide undergraduate audience. Of the four groups required for the major, Modern and American has the largest number of faculty and also the most students; lecture course enrollments in those subjects commonly reach 60 to 80, although courses in Classical, Renaissance, and Baroque art are also very popular, and there is steadily growing interest in all of our non-Western fields, especially the introductory courses in African, Asian, and Islamic art. It is noteworthy, although not surprising, that our expansion of the curriculum into these areas has also significantly broadened the ethnic, racial, national, and religious backgrounds of the students enrolled in art history courses compared to the typical student population in traditional Western-canon courses. The same is true, but to a lesser extent, of our faculty; notably, we do not have any African American or Hispanic colleagues.

Since our undergraduate and graduate faculties are identical, our MA and PhD course offerings are as broad as at the BA level, and with the expansion of our curriculum into non-Western art, we have also attracted a greater diversity of graduate students than in the past. We have had good success in job placement (duly recorded in successive departmental annual reports), although those headed for college teaching careers are, for the most part, landing jobs at lesser institutions. Those on the curatorial/museum studies track, in contrast, have been placed at many of the great museums here and abroad. (Several of our graduates hold major positions at the Museum of Fine Arts and other area museums, extending our reach into the community.) As is true throughout GRS, we have great difficulty competing for the best students because of 1) the lesser prestige of a BU degree vs. one from the top institutions in our comparison group—and several others not listed; 2) a weaker library; and especially 3) non-competitive financial-aid offers. We receive as many applications for admission as the top departments do, but we have a higher acceptance rate (roughly 1/3) because of our abysmal yield (roughly 1/5). Students frequently turn down our offers of admission and go to comparably or lower-ranked universities because of better financial aid packages. On the positive side, our close association with many other programs (e.g., Archaeology, American Studies, African Studies, and African American Studies) is a lure as is our connection with the Museum of Fine Arts. Our most attractive program is the MA in Art History with a certificate in Museum Studies. Far more students are willing to pay tuition for that combined program than are students seeking a PhD and a teaching career. (Many Museum Studies certificate students are simultaneously pursuing degrees in other departments and other colleges.) And it is especially noteworthy that in the one field where we have been most successful in raising private funds for fellowships (American art), we are attracting some of the strongest graduate students in the country. This encourages us to think that increased funding, whether from private or university sources, will have an immediate and meaningful impact on our ability to compete for the best graduate students.

With regard to facilities and infrastructure: Classrooms meet minimal pedagogical requirements but are unattractive and cramped. Our seminar rooms (CAS 303A and 311) need ceiling-mounted projectors and all rooms on Commonwealth Avenue have noise problems. Air circulation is often a problem as well because even if we open windows and let in noise, we have to cover those windows with curtains in order to project images for our lectures in darkened rooms. Our major problem, however, is woefully inadequate faculty

offices. Some members of the faculty occupy tiny windowless offices that were literally once storerooms. And we have reached the point where any new faculty line would require the acquisition of more “real estate” that is not available because our neighbors have space problems as well. We have proposed a realistic solution, namely the reconfiguration of the Visual Resources Center in CAS 306 as a smaller facility that no longer houses a huge slide collection and the construction of several new faculty offices and teaching fellow carrels in the freed space—but funding has not yet been provided. More and better office space is a prerequisite for expanding the Art History faculty as outlined in Part C.

Finally, mention should be made of what the Chair refers to as the department’s many and long tentacles. The Art History Department as a unit and all faculty individually are firmly committed to interdisciplinary research and teaching and have close programmatic and personal ties to many other units both within and without CAS. A complete list, not possible here, includes joint programs and cross-listed courses with Archaeology, AMNESP, Preservation Studies, Classics, African Studies, African American Studies, Italian Studies, History, International Relations, Religion, the Core Curriculum, the new Muslim Institute, and the Colleges of Fine Arts, Communication, Engineering, and MET’s Arts Administration program. A characteristic recent initiative is the new interdisciplinary undergraduate program in architectural studies, taught in part by colleagues in CFA and ENG to prepare students for graduate programs in architecture. We also recently developed a course in contemporary art since 1980 specifically for the CFA Visual Studies program. With CFA we also share responsibility for the Boston University Art Gallery, which does double duty as an exhibition space (and our leading community-outreach endeavor along with internships at area museums, galleries, and historic houses) and as the “laboratory” for our museum studies graduate program.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year Plan

Self-study and long-range planning have been ongoing activities of the Art History faculty for many years, and the plan submitted here for the next decade does not represent a new departure for us but rather a continuation of an evolutionary process set in motion earlier in this decade. Ten years from now, if granted additional faculty lines as part of the overall expansion of the CAS faculty, we hope to broaden our non-Western curriculum and strengthen our core offerings in Western art, while working in concert with colleagues in other programs, especially Archaeology, Preservation Studies, English, and African American Studies, as well as new programs in Film and Latin American Studies to expand their faculties in areas of interest to Art History. Specifically, we will seek funding for the following new faculty lines (in priority order): 1) Latin American art and architecture (a position that we know will have the backing of AMNESP, History, Archaeology, Romance Studies, and Latin American Studies); 2) South Asian art and architecture (also of interest to Archaeology as well as Religion and other departments); and 3) Northern Renaissance art (the one major lacuna in our Western-canon offerings). We would also like to “share” a new appointment in African American and African Diaspora art. Film Studies would not require a new AH faculty line. A search is planned in English, and we would like to offer an appointment in CAS to Associate Professor Roy Grundmann of COM to teach cross-listed courses in this area. All of these appointments would enrich the curriculum on both the undergraduate and graduate levels (and some are opportunities for diversity hires), but, unlike recent appointments, would not lead to a revision of degree requirements at all levels because the curricular framework we have already developed can easily accommodate these new fields now that the critical mass in non-Western art is in place. Some of these new positions might also be attractive areas for friends of the University wishing to endow chairs in fields of personal interest to them, for example, Latin American and South Asian as well as African American. Fundraising for named chairs in existing sub-fields would also release funds from the basic operating budget that might be recycled into new lines.

Absolutely critical to our teaching and outreach missions is the successful conclusion of the search now in progress in collaboration with our colleagues in CFA for a new Director and Chief Curator of the Boston University Art Gallery. An offer has been extended to the top candidate, who will become an adjunct assistant professor in the CAS Art History Department if s/he accepts the offer. The new director will

regularly offer a curatorial seminar in our Museum Studies program as well as supervise Art History interns in the gallery-laboratory.

Another area in which we seek curricular enrichment is not on the Charles River Campus but abroad. We already have very successful internship programs in London and Paris. This year is the initial year of our new partnership with the Courtauld Institute of Art of the University of London, which also opened up “multilateral conversations” between Fred Kleiner and Ben de Winter in Boston, Michael Peplar in London, and Carla Rachman in Geneva about new summer programs in art history at various European facilities in which CRC faculty may participate.

We also hope that before long renovations at 725 Commonwealth Avenue will create new faculty offices that are a prerequisite for the desired searches enumerated above. By the end of the decade, at the latest, our long-term project of digitizing our immense slide collection will also have been completed, further reducing the space needed to house the present Visual Resources Center.

An investment will also be necessary in graduate financial aid in the form of scholarships and especially teaching fellowships if we are to compete with our peer group of institutions and enhance our national standing in the field at large. Additional teaching fellowships will have a very positive impact not only on our graduate program but also on our undergraduate programs, especially in the introductory courses that serve the wider university community. At present, only AH 111 and 112 have discussion sections in addition to the lecture sections. Additional teaching fellowships will enhance the undergraduate experience at the same time that they will bring more highly qualified PhD candidates to our graduate program.

All of the above desiderata require the investment of new funds, but new lines, facilities, and teaching fellowships, and an expanded curriculum and new director of the art gallery will not close the gap with the top departments in our comparison group unless the current faculty achieves a higher national and international profile in research and publication. Most, perhaps all, of the current full professors will have retired or will be considering phased retirement a decade from now. It is essential that our tenured associate professors publish second and third books and important articles in the most prestigious scholarly journals and replace the retiring faculty as widely published authorities in their respective fields. If this does not occur, all other efforts will have a minimal effect on our national ranking. As a result of collecting data for this study, the current Chair is now convinced that we need to put as great an effort into nurturing our associate professors as we do in mentoring our tenure-track assistant professors. For the past quarter century, associate professors have taken on the greatest share of departmental administration. We have too few full professors to fill the positions of Chair, DGS, and DGA exclusively with full professors, but we must find ways to relieve our associate professors from heavy administrative roles so that they can focus more on research and publication.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

It is easy to measure progress by counting new lines, searches successfully completed, books and peer-reviewed articles in leading journals, as well as the number of teaching fellowships, new offices, graduates landing prestigious jobs, etc. Finding the funds to achieve those goals and the means to relieve our associate professors from major administrative roles in order to write those books and articles is the difficult part.

3. Five-year Goals

In addition to successfully concluding the current search for a new BU Art Gallery Director, we must also have appointed an assistant professor of Greek art and architecture to succeed Hilda Westervelt, whose term ends in August 2011. The search for a new Hellenist must be conducted during the 2010-2011 academic year. Two other assistant professors are being reviewed for tenure and promotion this year: Alice Tseng in Japanese art and Jessica Sewell in American material culture and architecture. Dean Sapiro recently recommended tenure for Tseng and not for Sewell. If the Provost concurs, a joint AMNESP/AH search for Sewell’s successor must also be launched next year. There is also the possibility of one or more full professor retirements by 2015; those lines must be preserved by the authorization of new searches in those fields.

These searches would simply maintain the status quo, however. To make progress toward closing the

gap with the top art history departments, we will need to have achieved the following five years from now: 1) an accelerated rate of publication on the part of the current faculty; 2) the addition of at least one, and preferably two, new faculty lines in the two major remaining areas of non-Western art (Latin American and South Asian); 3) expansion into Film Studies in collaboration with EN and COM; 4) the renovation of the Visual Resources Center in order to create at least two new faculty offices, a prerequisite for hiring two new AH professors; and 5) the addition of at least two new teaching fellowships to our annual financial aid budget.

Department of Astronomy
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Executive Summary

Boston University's Astronomy Department has established its excellence in astrophysics and space physics research and education. Among all science departments at Boston University, and also among Astronomy Departments at our peer institutions, our Astronomy Department is the most successful in both total grant funding and the grant funding per faculty member.

Despite our successes, the department faces some daunting competitive disadvantages with respect to peer institutions. This plan addresses ways to bridge the gap and to enter the nation's elite (top ten) astronomy departments. Specific improvements include:

- Gaining direct access to a state-of-the-art research observatory, such as the Discovery Channel Telescope;
- Reinvigorating our 100-level curriculum and increasing our undergraduate non-science major enrollments;
- Improving infrastructure and administrative procedures to put us on par and remain competitive with our peer institutions, especially for building space-based experiments and instrumentation;
- Developing three exciting new research areas: exoplanets and planetary astronomy, computational numerical simulations of complex systems in space physics and astrophysics, and observational studies of the formation of galaxies and planetary systems.

Public fascination with astronomy could provide an important tool for fundraising efforts by attracting donors and gaining stature for Boston University. The Astronomy Department is poised to become the University's crown jewel in academic excellence.

B. The Present

Astronomy Department Mission

The Astronomy Department's mission is to advance our knowledge of the Universe from the near-earth environment to distant galaxies, to train the next generation of space physicists and astrophysicists, and to inspire our students with a fascination for the Universe and an appreciation for the role of science in modern society.

1. Overview of the Astronomy Department

1.1. Unique Aspects of Our Department. The Astronomy Department's organization is unique within the University's science departments. The department's research mission is governed not by the department, but by four research centers: the Center for Space Physics (CSP), the Institute for Astrophysical Research (IAR), the Center for Integrated Space Weather Modeling (CISM), and the Science & Mathematics Education Center (SMEC). This research-center model is common at other universities.

About half of our Astronomy faculty specialize in space physics research. In other universities, space physicists are affiliated with physics, engineering, or earth science departments. Such a large concentration of space physicists in an Astronomy Department makes Boston University unique.

1.1. Faculty. The Astronomy Department currently employs 17 full-time teaching faculty and 7 research faculty. The faculty's age distribution, as measured by the years since PhD, is fairly uniform, but their academic rank is heavily skewed toward senior faculty. *In the next few years, several new faculty hires will be necessary, both to replace retiring faculty and also to invigorate our programs with fresh ideas.*

1.2. Staff. The department has four staff members: a department administrator, an observatory curator, and two IT/computing support staff. The research staff serving the department's faculty are appointed and

funded through the research centers. The CSP staff consists of three administrative staff and eleven research associates and scientific support staff. CISM has two administrative staff, two staff scientists, and two postdoctoral researchers. The IAR staff consists of one fiscal administrator, two research scientists, and two postdoctoral researchers.

1.3. Research Activity. The Astronomy Department, through CSP, CISM, and IAR, enjoys an impressive research record. In space physics, Boston University is a recognized leader in our core areas of space-based instrumentation, space weather, energetic particles in the near-earth environment, magnetospheric physics, and ionospheric physics. The space physicists have been awarded several important multi-million dollar projects, including the Cosmic RAY Telescope for the Effects of Radiation (CRaTER), the Center for Integrated Space Weather Modeling (CISM), and the Loss Cone Imager (LCI).

In astrophysics, Boston University's key research areas are star formation, galactic astronomy, active galaxies, stellar astronomy, galaxy clusters, and cosmology. One of our particular strengths is in astronomical surveys, particularly of the Milky Way, such as the Galactic Ring Survey and the Galactic Plane Infrared Polarization Survey. Another important strength is the study of variability of active galactic nuclei and of the light output of stars.

The Astronomy Department is very successful in raising research funds. *In FY2009, the Astronomy Department had the largest annual grant income (\$24.0 M) and the largest grant income per faculty member (\$1.5 M) of any CAS science department (see Fig. 2).*

1.4. Teaching. Approximately 500 undergraduate students and 40 graduate students per year enroll in astronomy courses. The Astronomy Department has three distinct suites of courses to serve three distinct groups of Boston University students: (1) undergraduate non-science majors; (2) undergraduate astronomy and space physics majors; and (3) graduate astrophysics and space physics students. The Astronomy Department also plays a major role in the Core Curriculum by contributing three to four faculty per year and the course coordinator to CC105.

2. Comparison with Peer Institutions

In the United States, 37 universities have “stand-alone” Astronomy Departments like ours. Of these, 29 grant PhDs in Astronomy. In addition to Boston University, eight other private universities grant PhDs in astronomy: Caltech, Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Rice, Chicago, and Yale. The remaining 20 are large state universities, most with total undergraduate enrollments much larger than Boston University.

Because the combination of space physics and astrophysics within a single Astronomy Department is unique, it is difficult to identify peer departments. We have selected six peer institutions which, like us, have strengths in both astrophysics and space physics. Space physics research in the “peer” institutions, however, is typically conducted in other departments, such as Physics, Earth Sciences, or Engineering. The six “peer institutions” selected are Colorado, Cornell, Minnesota, Rice, UCLA, and Wisconsin. Most of these universities have a stand-alone Astronomy Department; the exceptions are Rice and UCLA, which have Departments of Physics and Astronomy.

2.1. Education. A large majority of US undergraduate students enrolled in Astronomy courses are non-science majors meeting general education requirements. Among our peer institutions, Boston University has significantly lower than average enrollments in the introductory 100-level courses; from 2004-2008 only Rice taught fewer 100-level students. About 2.5% of Boston University undergraduates are enrolled in 100-level astronomy courses, compared with an average of 3.3% for our peer institutions. Moreover, our 100-level course enrollments have declined by 28% over the last five years, from 655 in 2004-05 to 472 in 2008-09. Undergraduate astronomy major programs tend to be small. Our astronomy majors program, as measured by the number of junior and senior astronomy students (about 30), is about the same size as our peer institutions. Our graduate program of about 40 students is larger than average, second only to Colorado.

2.2. Research Facilities. Boston University shares with Lowell Observatory 50% of the time on one small research telescope, the 1.8 meter diameter Perkins Telescope. Guaranteed access to this research facility allowed us to build two major Boston University instruments, PRISM and Mimir, with funding from the NSF, NASA, and the Keck Foundation and to secure funding for several research projects. While we are grateful

for the University's support for the Perkins Telescope, *all of our peer astronomy departments (and many lower-tiered departments) have access to telescopes far superior to the Perkins. Indeed, thirty US astronomy departments enjoy guaranteed access to optical telescopes with over twice the collecting area.*

3.4. Publications and Citations. Astronomers and space physicists publish their research primarily in the form of papers in refereed scientific journals. Citations to these papers by other scientists indicate the impact of the research on the field. Compared with our peers, our publication rate of refereed papers over the last five years, although comparable, is a bit lower (we rank 5th out of the seven institutions), and the rate of citations to these same papers is about average.

3.5. Grant Activity. The Astronomy Department's grant activity is excellent. A comparison of our total grant funds (astrophysics and space physics in all relevant departments) shows that among our peers *Boston University's grant income in astrophysics and space physics is over twice that of our closest peer institution, both in terms of total grant income and grant income per faculty member.* This large grant income primarily reflects our strategic decision to build space-based experiments and instrumentation and to engage in NASA missions. Although one of our strongest faculty members in this field has recently left the department, an important component of our strategic plan aims to ensure continued success in these space hardware and mission support activities.

C. A Long Term Plan: Reaching the Top Ten

The Boston University Astronomy Department has achieved a high level of excellence despite competitive disadvantages with our peer institutions. Still, our department is not yet among the nation's elite. The top ten astronomy departments attract the very best students and command a disproportionate share of funding and resources. *Elite astronomy institutions such as Caltech, Berkeley, Arizona, Hawaii, and Texas often showcase their astronomical research as the crown jewels of their research enterprise.* Because of the public fascination with astronomy, these institutions have garnered significant positive publicity. Donors have noticed too, and provide large gifts to enhance the astronomical research at the elite institutions.

Our long-term plan seeks to launch the Boston University Astronomy Department into the top ten by improving our competitive position. Only then can we attract the very best students and faculty, and conduct the cutting edge research that leads to important, visible discoveries. Such discoveries will serve as magnets that attract public attention, research funding, and potential donors.

At our recent Astronomy Department faculty retreat, we established a vision for the future and a plan to realize this vision. In ten years, we aim to be:

- Leading, and attracting funding for, important scientific investigations and discoveries;
- Teaching an exciting, intellectually rigorous curriculum;
- Mentoring the next generation and integrating students at all levels into our research enterprise;
- Showcasing a diverse, talented, enthusiastic team of faculty, researchers, staff, and students;
- Conducting research in state-of-the-art facilities and labs, with the full support of key stakeholders in our University for our program;
- Self-governing with streamlined, effective proposal development and decision-making processes.

To achieve this vision, we need to meet four key goals: (1) to secure access to a research telescope, (2) to revamp our 100-level curriculum, (3) to improve our research support and infrastructure, and (4) to develop exciting new research areas.



4.1. A Research-Grade Telescope. In light of the competitive disadvantages with respect to our peer institutions, our current success is nearly miraculous. We especially lack access to a large, modern telescope. Indeed, *since all of our peers have better telescopes, they already enjoy a tremendous competitive advantage. The centerpiece of our long-term plan is*

for Boston University to acquire a share of a large, research telescope. Although several new telescopes are highly desirable, we have identified the Discovery Channel Telescope as the most attractive project.

The Discovery Channel Telescope is a new 4.3 meter diameter telescope being built by Lowell Observatory near Flagstaff, Arizona. It is designed to have a powerful capability for surveying and monitoring large sections of the sky in the optical and infrared, *a perfect match to our department's research strengths.* The Discovery Channel has provided \$20,000,000 for the DCT and plans to showcase the telescope and its discoveries through its 900 million worldwide television channel subscribers, as well as its K-12 educational programming. Thus, participating in the Discovery Channel Telescope would pay enormous benefits to the University and provide exciting synergies with the Schools of Education and Communication. A partnership with Discovery would lead not just to a telescope, but also to a strong media presence and unprecedented opportunities for training our student scientists, educators, and journalists. Lowell Observatory is seeking partners to join in the DCT's construction and operations. The buy-in costs are negotiable, but can be expected to reach \$5M to \$20M. We would be delighted to work with the College and University to educate potential donors about the enormous impact DCT would have throughout the University.

4.2. Reinvigorate 100-level curriculum. Our undergraduate course enrollments have fallen in recent years, and lag behind our peer institutions. Because we are committed to excellence in undergraduate education, we must reinvigorate our 100-level curriculum. We are committed to increasing our enrollments by 50% within five years, and by 100% within ten. To do this, we will hold a comprehensive review of our curriculum in Spring 2010. We intend to introduce attractive new courses and eliminate weaker courses. We will work with the SMEC to implement the best practices in science education and provide a curriculum that reflects current demographics. A key component of this plan is to observe teachers and provide feedback in a systematic way for our entire faculty, not just our junior colleagues. We plan to hold annual internal teaching workshops.

4.3. Improve infrastructure and support for research. Research in experimental astrophysics and space physics is complex. This is especially true in one of our core strengths: building cutting-edge instrumentation for space physics and astrophysics. Since many of our instruments are launched into outer space, an additional layer of federal regulatory complexity arises. We plan to continue building both ground- and space-based instruments, but to do so effectively, we need both infrastructure (laboratory space, computing, machining facilities) and administrative support (proposal development, seed funding, and research-friendly policies). Recently, we have been hampered in our hardware development efforts by administrative problems, such as the lack of timely decisions by University administrators and the issues surrounding "ITAR" high-tech federal regulations. We wish to remove the roadblocks and improve our capability to propose for, and ultimately to win, high-visibility instrumentation projects. We will redouble our efforts to inform our administration of the benefits of these high-visibility projects. We will improve our working relationships with administrators. We will seek out solutions and best practices at other universities, and propose options to facilitate effective research here. Obviously, the design and fabrication of instruments provides important synergies with engineering departments. Indeed, the Center for Space Physics has a significant membership from students and faculty in Engineering. Faculty growth in space physics and astrophysics instrumentation could find a natural home in either Astronomy or Engineering.

4.4. New Research Areas. To take the Astronomy Department to the next level, we must not only maintain our standing in our core fields, but we must also exploit exciting new developments in space physics and astrophysics. In future years, the Astronomy Department must have sufficient depth in its faculty to take advantage of the emergence of new fields. Important new cutting-edge large telescopes which will be built in the next few years (e.g., the Atacama Large Millimeter Array and the James Webb Space Telescope) and new NASA missions to study Mars, the Moon, and the heliospheres provide key opportunities for the next generation of astrophysicists and space physicists. These telescopes and missions will no doubt capitalize on discoveries in astrophysics and space physics that have led to the emergence of entirely new fields. Based on these opportunities, and several faculty discussions, we have identified three key emergent areas in space physics and astrophysics that would flourish in our department. We plan to develop these fields here through a combination of new faculty positions and replacement hires after retirements.

1. *Extrasolar planets and planetary astronomy.* The study of extrasolar planets (planets orbiting other stars), both observationally and theoretically, has been a field of explosive growth in the past decade. Moreover, NASA has established planetary exploration as a key objective, particularly new probes to the Moon and Mars.
2. *Computational space physics and astrophysics.* A growing need in our fields is to exploit the amazing advances in computers to perform realistic, complex numerical simulations and to mine vast amounts of survey data. Research in computational space physics and astrophysics would provide a natural synergy with the Department of Computer Science.
3. *Formation of galaxies and solar systems.* In a few years, the Atacama Large Millimeter Array and the James Webb Space Telescope will provide an unprecedented ability to detect distant galaxies and relatively nearby solar system analogs in their infancy.

D. Summary

The Astronomy Department is a flagship department at Boston University. The jump to the next level requires that we play on a level field with our competitors. There are several disparities to overcome before we have opportunities comparable to the best departments. The most important of these are the acquisition of guaranteed time on a modern large research telescope. One attractive possibility is the Discovery Channel Telescope, which also provides an important partnership with a major media outlet that will pay enormous dividends across the University in the Schools of Communications and Education. To reach the top ten in undergraduate education, we will reinvigorate our 100-level curriculum and provide a fresh, attractive suite of courses for non-science majors while continue to serve the needs of our majors and graduate students. To maintain our core strength in instrumentation, we will improve our research infrastructure and work with the administration to undertake complex projects more effectively. Finally, we will seize the opportunities of new telescopes and space missions along with important new topics in research to hire vigorous scientists who will lead the science of the next decade. This plan naturally leads to important synergies with Engineering (in space hardware development), Communications and Education (in the Discovery Channel Telescope), and Computer Sciences (in computational astrophysics and space physics).

The move to the next level will pay visible and important benefits to Boston University. Like many other universities, Boston University can showcase research in astrophysics and space physics to enhance its stature and to draw the attention of donors, funding agencies, and the public at large.

Department of Biology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Biology Department's mission is to advance and disseminate understanding of biological systems and processes through research and undergraduate and graduate education. Our organization as a single, broad-based biology department facilitates an integrated approach to both our instructional and research activities. At the undergraduate level, we teach 900-1000 students majoring in Biology and in the Program in Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, and students majoring in other departments and Colleges, including pre-medical and other pre-professional students. Our graduate programs are focused at the PhD level and geared towards training students for academic and research careers. Graduate training and research in the department take an integrative approach to the different disciplines of the life sciences, ranging from ecology to molecular biology, and connect to related programs in conservation biology, neuroscience and biomedical research.

B. The Present

The department is organized around three major faculty groups: Cell & Molecular Biology; Neurobiology; and Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology. Faculty with interests in Physiology, Endocrinology & Reproduction are included in one of the other three groups for the assessments below.

1. Academic Peer Group (in rank order, our department in middle of cluster)

USC, Department of Biology: Larger (>60 faculty members) but generally comparable to us in organization and stature

University of Pennsylvania, Department of Biology: Somewhat smaller (~35 faculty), generally comparable to us in organization and stature

NYU, Department of Biology: Smaller (~30 faculty) with strength in genomics and systems biology but weak in ecology and evolutionary biology. Has large Center for Neural Science.

Emory University, Biology Department: Overall comparable to us although weaker in organismal and evolutionary biology

University of Miami, Department of Biology: Approx 33 faculty, with additional faculty in Marine and Atmospheric Science and large neuroscience program. Overall not as strong as we are.

2. Faculty

a. Research Quality (aggregate, primary tenure and tenure-track faculty)

1) Refereed publications (2007-2009) 303 total, 7.1/faculty member

2) High quality pubs interdisciplinary (*Science, Nature, PNAS, PLoS Biol*) and top specialty (*Cell, Neuron, J Neurosci, Genes & Development, Development, Mol Cell Biol, J Biol Chem, Mol Endocrinol, Circulation Res, Ecology, Evolution, Systematic Biol, Molec Ecol, Animal Behavior*)

43 total, 1.0/faculty member

3) Research grants:	FY 2007 Total: \$7,553,953	Per faculty member: \$171,681
	FY 2008 Total: \$8,181,148	Per faculty member: \$190,259
	FY 2009 Total: \$8,166,524	Per faculty member: \$185,603

4) Citations (2006-2008): average 412 per faculty member

b. Research Quality (subfields, research active faculty)

Cell & Molecular Biology

1) Refereed publications (2007-2009) 81 total, 6.2/faculty member

2) High quality pubs 16 total, 1.2/faculty member

- 3) Research grants: FY 2007: \$3.2 M total, \$246,000 per faculty member
 FY 2008: \$3.4 M total, \$262,000 per faculty member
 FY 2009: \$3.2 M total, \$246,000 per faculty member
 4) Citations (2006-2008): average 549/faculty member

Neurobiology

- 1) Refereed publications (2007-2009) 42 total, 4.2/faculty member
 2) High quality pubs 11 total, 1.1/faculty member
 3) Research grants: FY 2007: \$2.0M total, \$222,000 per faculty member
 FY 2008: \$2.1M total, \$233,000 per faculty member
 FY 2009: \$2.2M total, \$220,000 per faculty member
 4) Citations (2006-2008): average 228/faculty member

Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology

- 1) Refereed publications (2007-2009) 180 total, 13/faculty member
 2) High quality pubs 16 total, 1.1/faculty member
 3) Research grants: FY 2007: \$2.4M total, \$160,000 per faculty member
 FY 2008: \$2.7M total, \$193,000 per faculty member
 FY 2009: \$2.8M total, \$215,000 per faculty member
 4) Citations (2006-2008): average 458/faculty member

c. Educational contributions (aggregate).

- 1) Course evaluations: Faculty numbers are based on evaluations of at least two different courses in a category during the last 3 years. Excellent >4.25, 21 faculty; Needing improvement <3.0, 1 faculty
 2) Teaching awards: Metcalf Cup & Prize, 2007 and 2009
 College Prize for Excellence in Advising, 2007
 3) Academic enhancement: Approximately 100-150 Biology and BMB undergraduates are engaged in research with Biology faculty annually, both during summers and the academic year. In 2008-2009, 11 Biology students did research for distinction, 26 did research for credit as juniors, and 47 as seniors.

d. Educational contributions (subfields).

- 1) Course evaluations: Faculty numbers in categories calculated as above
 Cell & Molecular Biology: excellent, 8 faculty; needing improvement, 0
 Neurobiology: excellent, 6 faculty; needing improvement, 0
 EBE/Marine Biology: excellent, 7 faculty; needing improvement, 1
 2) Undergraduate majors: Biology 765 total (2009/2010)
 Specialization in Cell Biology, Molecular Biology & Genetics, 89
 Specialization in Neurobiology, 80
 Specialization in Ecology & Conservation Biology, 37
 Specialization in Marine Biology, 1
 Specialization in Quantitative Biology, 3
 Specialization in Behavioral Biology, 4

Undergraduate Majors in Related Programs

Biochemistry & Molecular Biology	224
Marine Science	74
Neuroscience	160

Course enrollments (2008/2009):	<u>Total Students Taught</u>
Cell & Molecular	1731
Neurobiology	1342
Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine	1228

- 3) Graduate enrollments, Fall 2009 (76 PhD, 6 MA students):
 Cell & Molecular Biology: 30 PhD, 2 MA
 Neurobiology: 11 PhD
 Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology: 35 PhD, 4 MA

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education

1) *Goals:* We offer a general undergraduate major in Biology as well as Specializations in Neurobiology; Ecology & Conservation Biology; Cell Biology, Molecular Biology & Genetics; Marine Biology; Quantitative Biology; and Behavioral Biology. The Biology major includes two semesters of Introductory Biology; a breadth requirement consisting of one course in cell & molecular biology, one course in neurobiology or physiology, and one course in ecology & evolution; plus four additional Biology courses. The curriculum of each of the Specializations is consistent with the requirements of the Biology major, but emphasizes courses appropriate for the particular area of the Specialization. The Minor in Biology consists of five courses in Biology, including the two introductory courses. There were 114 students pursuing a Minor in Biology in 2008-2009. Our courses are also important offerings for pre-professional (e.g., pre-med) students in other departments (about 300 total). We also provide courses for Sargent College, the College of Engineering, and BU Academy.

We also offer a semester-long study abroad opportunity through the Tropical Ecology Program in Ecuador, in which 20-25 of our undergraduate concentrators participate each year.

2) *Vitality and quality:* The last full department retreat to review the curriculum was Spring 2007. Recommendations included replacing the Specialization in Marine Biology with the interdisciplinary Marine Science program, development of a 300-level course in evolution, and development of two-track courses in Cell Biology and Genetics to accommodate students with different backgrounds. All of these recommendations have been implemented. Further discussions have led to the creation of three new specializations (Quantitative Biology; Cell Biology, Molecular Biology & Genetics; and Behavioral Biology) during the last three years.

3) <i>Numbers of majors:</i>	2006/07, 826
	2007/08, 862
	2008/09, 789
	2009/10, 765

Note: the decrease from 2007/2008 reflects the establishment of independent majors in Marine Science and Neuroscience.

4) *Student outcomes:* based on exit surveys of graduating seniors (% of those responding)

<i>Post-graduation plans</i>	2007	2008	2009
Medical School	11%	14%	13%
Graduate School or other advanced	18%	20%	23%
training			
Employment in Biological Field	51%	47%	29%
Employment in Non-biological field	20%	19%	11%
Other			24%

b. Doctoral Programs

1) *Mission:* The focus of our doctoral programs is to provide training for research careers, primarily in academia or industry. PhD students are affiliated with one of five program areas: Cell & Molecular Biology; Neurobiology; Physiology, Endocrinology & Reproduction; Ecology, Behavior & Evolution;

and Marine Biology. Faculty in Physiology are included in one of the three major groups of the department, and this area is being discontinued as a separate program. The programs in Ecology, Behavior & Evolution and Marine Biology are coordinately organized.

2. *Vitality*: The faculty groups responsible for the Cell & Molecular Biology; Neurobiology; and Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology programs meet on a regular basis (at least monthly) for discussion of program issues, including admissions, curriculum and qualifying exams.

3. *Recruitment, Enrollments and Student Quality*: We generally make offers to 15-20% of PhD applicants, and about 40% of these enroll in our programs. For 2009, we had 158 domestic PhD applicants; 34 were accepted and 15 enrolled. For the newly enrolled PhD students, the average undergraduate GPA was 3.39 and the average GRE scores were 70th percentile Verbal, 80th percentile Quantitative, and 54th percentile for Analytical Writing.

Enrollments of Biology PhD students have decreased from 110-120 in the period 2000-2005 to approximately 80 currently. During the same period, enrollments in the related interdisciplinary program in Molecular Biology, Cell Biology & Biochemistry (MCBB) have decreased from approximately 40 in 2004-2005 to 32 in 2009. These reductions have been deliberate to compensate for the reduced levels of federal grant funding during this period.

4. *Student Outcomes*

Time to degree: The average time to degree is approximately 6 years (5.6 years for 07/08 graduates and 6.5 years for 08/09), which is about the norm for PhD's in biological sciences.

The placements of PhD graduates from 2006/07, 2007/08 and 2008/09 are as follows:

Postdoctoral Fellows:	30
Research Scientists:	5
Assistant Professors:	2
Scientific Writers:	3
<u>Other:</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	48

e. *Interdisciplinary Initiatives*

1. *Undergraduate Programs*

a. *Biochemistry & Molecular Biology*: Established in 1995, this program is currently directed by Prof. Celenza (Biology) and includes faculty from Biology (principally the Cell & Molecular Biology group) and Chemistry. It has a present enrollment of 224 majors and is an important part of our undergraduate program.

b. *Marine Sciences*: This program has been newly established as an independent major, growing out of the Biology Specialization in Marine Sciences. It is currently directed by Prof. Finnerty (Biology) and has an enrollment of 74 majors. Previously located in Woods Hole, the marine program has a long history (over 30 years) as a successful undergraduate program and remains an important program in Biology.

c. *Neuroscience*: Biology faculty (in the Neurobiology group) are key contributors to the new undergraduate Neuroscience program, which currently has 160 majors.

d. *Environmental Sciences*: Biology faculty (in the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology group) also participate in the undergraduate Environmental Sciences program, with an enrollment of 30-40 majors.

2. *Graduate Programs*

a. *Molecular Biology, Cell Biology & Biochemistry (MCBB)*: This program includes faculty from Biology (principally the Cell & Molecular Biology group), Biomedical Engineering, Chemistry, Physics and Health Sciences. The program was established in 1995 and is currently directed by Prof.

Hansen (Biology). There are 30-35 PhD students in the program, approximately 2/3rd pursuing their thesis work in Biology laboratories.

b. Bioinformatics: This program was initiated in 1999, with Prof. Cooper (Biology) as Associate Director, and involves several Biology faculty in both the Cell & Molecular Biology and the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution groups. The program has been very important to a number of Biology faculty, although it has lost momentum in recent years. It is hoped that this program will be revitalized as an important component of a University-wide systems biology effort, in which Biology needs to play a central role.

c. Neuroscience: The graduate Program in Neuroscience was initiated in 2000 and is currently directed by Prof. Eldred (Biology). Biology faculty in this program include members of the Neurobiology group as well as members of the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine groups who are interested in behavior. It is an important part of graduate training in the department, with 2 of the present 20 students permanently working in Biology laboratories and 3 others currently rotating in the department.

d. Terrestrial Biogeosciences: This is a newly established graduate certificate program, directed by Prof. Adrien Finzi (Biology) that brings together several Biology faculty in the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology group with faculty sharing related interests in environmental sciences from the departments of Earth Sciences and Geography. It is an important step in formalizing interdisciplinary collaborations in this area. Of the 11 students currently in the program, 6 are in Biology.

4. Facilities

Our research laboratories are located in the LSEB (20 laboratories), the BRB (5 Cummington; 17 laboratories) and the BSC (2 Cummington, 4 active laboratories). Laboratories in the LSEB require only minimal renovation to accommodate any changes in faculty occupancy. Laboratories in the BRB range from fair to excellent condition, and some will require significant updating when they become available for new recruiting. Most of the space in 2 Cummington (approx 12,000 sf) is in extremely poor condition and in need of major renovation before it can be used to productively support research. Given major renovation, this space could support another 4-5 laboratories and core facilities.

Our principal teaching laboratories are located in the Metcalf Science Center. These laboratories are adequate for our current needs, although many are old and in need of updating. The major facility issues are environmental rooms and the need for a large capacity dishwasher. The marine teaching laboratory is located in the basement of the BRB and is an excellent facility. However, it is at this point over-extended by student enrollment and needs expansion space, which could be provided by renovation of adjacent rooms.

Research in the department is dependent upon common facilities for microscopy, mass spectrometry, DNA sequencing, genomic analysis, and other general instrumentation. Support for these facilities has been derived largely from indirect cost return to the department, and in part by additional funding from the College. The maintenance of these common equipment facilities is essential for our research operation.

5. Other infrastructure

Staff support is currently adequate. However, as our instrumentation needs become more complex, we will correspondingly need technical support for more sophisticated core facilities (e.g., high-throughput sequencing). This may best be organized at the University level.

6. Collaborations

Because of the highly interactive nature of research in the life sciences, essentially all of our active research faculty have multiple collaborations both within and outside of Boston University. As noted above, we have collaborations with a number of departments involved in interdisciplinary programs of undergraduate

and graduate education. There are also major educational collaborative programs between our faculty in the Tropical Ecology Program and the Universidad San Francisco de Quito in Ecuador, and we have collaborations for field research with the Harvard Forest in western Massachusetts and the Hubbard Brook Experimental Forest in New Hampshire.

C. Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year Plan

a. Summary: We plan to remain a collaborative integrated biology department, with strength in both research and teaching that spans the breadth of the life sciences. Our strategy going forward is to continue strengthening each of the three major groups in the department by adding new faculty members with research programs in the areas of systems biology, neurobiology, evolutionary genomics, and environmental ecology. Over a ten-year period, we anticipate the recruitment of approximately 15 new faculty with active research programs, replacing 10-12 faculty with inactive or minimal research profiles and adding one or two new positions to the department. Proceeding in this manner will enable us to move into new research directions, building upon our existing strengths, while maintaining our current ability to serve the educational needs of a large and diverse student population.

b. Ten-year Goals

1. Faculty: We currently have five open faculty lines (two of which we hope to fill this year through ongoing searches) and over the next ten years anticipate the retirements of eight or nine additional faculty members. These retirements are expected to take place gradually over the next decade, consistent with the recruitment of 13-14 replacement positions over this period (including current searches). We would also propose the addition of 1-2 new faculty lines. This would represent a modest growth in the size of the department which, combined with replacement positions, would significantly increase the profile of research-active faculty members.

We anticipate that these appointments will be distributed with approximately five new faculty added to each of the three principal faculty groups in the department, with a major emphasis on building our strengths in integrative/systems biology. In the Cell & Molecular group, this focus will continue our participation in the major advances that are coming from quantitative and large-scale experimental approaches to understanding cell signaling, gene regulation, and development. In the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology group, this emphasis will take the form of recruiting organismal biologists conducting integrative research that incorporates genomics and modern quantitative and computational approaches. Faculty in these areas will be part of the University-wide effort in systems/integrative biology. Within the Ecology, Behavior & Evolution/Marine Biology group, we also plan to build additional strength in environmental sciences and global change biology. In Neurobiology, we plan to focus on the recruitment of faculty whose research links cellular and molecular phenomena to nervous system function. Such faculty, who can use cellular/molecular approaches to address whole-animal level questions, will benefit from and contribute to both the neurobiology group in the department and the larger neuroscience community at BU.

2. Undergraduate Education: Our overall program of undergraduate education will remain the same, with continual curricular adjustments to reflect student interest as well as scientific progress. The specialization in Marine Biology is being discontinued, to be replaced by the interdisciplinary Marine Science major. The specialization in Quantitative Biology is currently weak in terms of student enrollment, but we will continue to encourage students to take this approach, in order to foster interest in this critical area of the life sciences. We also plan to expand this by including computer science. The specialization in Behavioral Biology is new this year, and enrollments are expected to rise.

3. *Graduate Education:* We anticipate an increase in numbers of PhD students in all areas of the department, commensurate with planned increases in research-active faculty and expanded federal funding for scientific research.

4. *Interdisciplinary Initiatives:* At the undergraduate level, we anticipate continuing our activities in the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology, Marine Sciences, Neuroscience, and Environmental Sciences programs. At the graduate level, the MCBB program is focusing on increasing its interdisciplinary activities, distinct from being just a part of Biology, with the goal of becoming a significant component of interdisciplinary life science research. In particular, MCBB could be envisioned as the experimental arm of systems/integrative biology, with Bioinformatics being the computational arm of that program. The Bioinformatics program had a strong start in 1999, but has since fallen behind its many competitors. Under new leadership, it is hoped that the program becomes a more meaningful component of a University-wide integrative/systems biology effort. Both MCBB and Bioinformatics are key interdisciplinary areas that are critical to Biology. The multiple neuroscience programs across the University are currently fractured, and it is hoped that development of a more unified program will improve student recruitment in this critical area. Finally, the new certificate program in Terrestrial Biogeosciences is an important first step to interdisciplinary activities in the environmental sciences: it is anticipated that this program will continue to develop.

5. *Facilities:* The most important facilities issue is laboratory space. Since the majority of faculty who will be retiring over the next decade are not research-active, their departures will not make space available for planned replacements. We currently have two laboratories available in the LSEB and one laboratory available in 5 Cummington, all three of which need only minimal renovations. Anticipated retirements will likely open another two laboratories in 5 Cummington and one laboratory in 2 Cummington that can be made suitable for new faculty with moderate renovation costs (on the order of \$250-500,000). It is also likely that another 3-4 functional laboratories will be made available by faculty who are downsizing their research programs prior to retirement. However, recruitment of the 15 new research-active faculty anticipated will require an additional 5-6 functional laboratories. Space for these laboratories is available in 2 Cummington, but will require major renovation (estimated on the order of \$10-15 million for a total of 14-15,000 sq ft that will be available over the 10 year time frame).

Additional major research facilities include core equipment for systems biology and genomics, including high throughput sequencing and mass spectrometry (\$500K to \$1M). These facilities might be either departmental or university-wide, as long as sufficient access is available. Faculty recruitments in neurobiology will require two-photon microscopes suitable for in vivo imaging as part of their startup packages (~ \$500K). Additional animal space will also be needed, but this should be provided by the currently planned expansion of the LACF. The expansion of global change biology will require the development of a core instrument facility (~\$300K plus instrument contributions by individual faculty). Finally, expansion in both evolutionary genomics and environmental sciences will require an expanded greenhouse facility, which will also be of use to faculty in Geography and Environment (~\$200K).

Resources needed. Most faculty positions will be covered by replacement lines, with approximately 2 new lines requested. Additional staff positions will be needed to provide technical and IT support for systems biology facilities. Additional staff support may also be required in the LACF to meet increased animal usage. Facilities needs are discussed above. Maintenance of departmental core facilities is currently dependent on IDC return to the department: if there are reductions in this funding, it will need to be replaced by alternative means of support.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

The principal metrics of research productivity are grant funding, publications (particularly in high quality journals), and citations. Metrics for undergraduate education are enrollments, course evaluations, involvement of undergraduates in research, and placements. For graduate programs, important indicators are enrollments, acceptance rates, test scores of enrolled students, externally-funded fellowships, and placements of our graduates. Another metric for interdisciplinary programs is successful competition for training grants, which provide an important potential source of student funding for these programs.

3. *Five-year goals*

a. Expectations: In faculty development, we should have proceeded with the recruitment of 7-8 new faculty distributed among the areas discussed above. Enrollments in the Quantitative Biology and new Behavioral Biology specializations should increase, and clear directions determined for the interdisciplinary graduate programs in MCBB and Bioinformatics.

b. Steps needed: The department will monitor undergraduate enrollments in order to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum and areas of specialization. Cooperative efforts between the department and the leadership of interdisciplinary graduate programs will optimize the directions and funding possibilities for these efforts. Resources for new faculty startup packages and space renovation will be needed from the College and University.

c. Indicators: Successful recruitment of research faculty should be indicated by proportionate increases in publication and funding. Adjustments of specific areas of emphasis for recruitments will be made to reflect progress in the department, as well as changes in the relevant scientific fields. Curricular adjustments will be made as indicated by student enrollments, and adjustments in graduate programs will be based on both student data and funding potentials from both research and training grants.

Department of Chemistry
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

mission statement

Our dual-component mission is to (1) pursue with distinction the discovery and transmission of knowledge and understanding related to the chemical sciences and (2) teach Chemistry in a way that promotes a culture of creativity in classrooms and laboratories and which prepares students for positions of leadership and lives of service.

summary of overall assessment and planning aims

The Boston University Department of Chemistry (BUCH) long-term goals are to: (1) grow and improve the educational experience of our graduate and undergraduate students, (2) rise significantly in national rankings by accepted measures of research accomplishment, and (3) evolve our leadership in synthetic and biological chemistry to advance University interdisciplinary initiatives. To accomplish these goals, we will:

Grow the number of tenure-track (TT) faculty to 34 from our current complement of 24. We believe this ambitious number, which is based above all on our teaching needs, is compellingly justified by student enrollments and our programmatic aspirations. This target will bring Chemistry faculty-to-student ratios in line with those of other CAS science Departments, give us the faculty number and breadth to provide a first-rate educational experience in our core programs and our large service courses, and enable us to participate in and contribute to important cross-disciplinary undergraduate teaching initiatives and interdisciplinary graduate programs. This faculty development is also inspired by the University's need for Chemistry's contributions to its interdisciplinary research initiatives, our desire to develop new graduate programs, and our aim to participate even more broadly in collaborations across departments and campuses.

Rise in national rankings and evolve two areas of excellence through strategic investments in faculty and research resources. Chemistry's national rankings are important to BU's overall reputation as a research institution. To impact key performance indicators on which these national rankings are based, we need to expand our graduate program, increase publications, and expand external funding. With University support, we plan to couple our faculty expansion with the development of research laboratory space, core instrumentation resources, and levels of support staffing to facilitate greater faculty productivity and recognition. At the same time, building on strategic senior faculty hires and ongoing junior faculty recruitment, we plan to expand our contributions to University interdisciplinary initiatives by evolving two areas of Departmental research excellence: Synthetic Organic Chemistry and Biological Chemistry.

Implement innovative curricula and academic programs in molecular science to enhance undergraduate recruitment, learning, and retention. Our Department's innovation and excellence in chemical education and mentorship is demonstrated by College and University awards, as well as by our national leadership in the development of novel approaches to teaching and learning in the sciences. We aspire to continue and expand these attainments by restructuring our first- and second-year chemistry sequences to improve fundamental training, reflect modern methods of molecular science research, and enhance academic support for all students. These initiatives will improve student recruitment, retention, and academic success, which are the shared goals of the University.

the present: description and assessment

BUCH Peer Group. We have identified eight higher-ranked university chemistry departments that we believe we can match in the next decade in terms of faculty size, research grant income, and publications given a focused SP and adequate resources. In addition to NRC rank, derived from the 1995 National Research Council (NRC) report, and 2009 Council for Chemical

Research (CCR) survey quartile, the table shows the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking in its annual “America’s Best Graduate Schools” (2007).

Institution	NRC Rank (’95)	CCR Quartile (’09)	US News (’07)	Faculty Size (FS)	FS/1000 UG
Columbia University	7	1	11	17	2.2
University of Chicago	10	1*	12	30	6.0
Rice University	29	1	28	20	6.1
University of Pittsburgh	34	1*	43	27	1.6
University of Southern California	40	2*	43	23	1.4
University of Virginia	43	2*	50	34	2.5
Boston College	79	3*	50	16	1.8
New York University	87	3*	74	33	1.5
Boston University	89	3	62	24	1.3

Faculty: Assessment of faculty quality related to mission. Our roster of 24 tenured and TT professors, compared with data in the 2009 CCR survey, places BUCH between the 2nd (average 26) and 3rd (average 20) quartiles. Of the schools chosen for comparison, we have the smallest faculty size when measured per 1000 undergraduate students.

<p>Full Professors (12): Allen, Coker, Dill, Grinstaff (CH/BE), Keyes, Mohr, Panek, Porco, Snyder, Straub, Tullius, Ziegler</p> <p>Associate Professors (5): Caradonna, Elliott, Georgiadis, Schaus, Whitty</p> <p>Assistant Professors (7): Doerrer, Jasti, Liu, Reinhard, Stephenson, Wang, Xia (BF)</p> <p>Research Professors (1): Beeler</p>

The number of our teaching faculty (11 non-TT professorial and lecturer appointments: Abrams, Bassina, DeSensi, Golger, Kyte, Rubio, and Weinstein) and Postdoctoral Faculty Fellows (four: Hammond, Karr, Moser, and White) is anomalously large compared to any department reporting in the CCR survey. In addition, we have a growing number of emeritus faculty (nine: Giering, Hartman, Hoffman, Jones, Laursen, Lichtin, Milburn, Prock, Steliou) and faculty with secondary appointments (four: Costello, BUMC, Smith and Stanley, PY, and Vajda, BE).

Faculty: Assessment relative to disciplinary and institutional research initiatives. In terms of traditional disciplines and University interdisciplinary research initiatives BUCH faculty can be grouped as follows:

Traditional Disciplines	<p>Synthetic (9): Grinstaff, Panek, Porco, Snyder, Caradonna, Schaus, Doerrer, Jasti, Stephenson</p> <p>Biological (6): Allen, Mohr, Tullius, Elliott, Liu, Whitty</p> <p>Physical (3): Reinhard, Ziegler, Georgiadis</p> <p>Theory/Computation (6): Coker, Dill, Keyes, Straub, Wang, Xia</p>
University Initiatives	<p>MSE Materials Science and Engineering (4): Grinstaff, Doerrer, Jasti, Reinhard</p> <p>SBB Systems Biology and Bioinformatics (7): Allen, Mohr, Schaus, Straub, Tullius, Whitty, Xia</p> <p>PHO Photonics Research (4): Georgiadis, Jasti, Reinhard, Ziegler</p> <p>ESE Energy Science and Engineering (4): Caradonna, Doerrer, Elliott, Stephenson</p> <p>MMD Molecular and Medicinal Discovery (6): Allen, Porco, Panek, Schaus, Snyder, Whitty</p>

With consistent averages of two active grants per BUCH faculty member and per capita per annum funding of \$200,000, external grant support for research remains strong relative to other natural science departments at Boston University. Overall publications in peer-reviewed journals average three per faculty member per annum with H-index values for the most widely cited faculty members falling in the upper thirties.

A clear center of excellence in our department is Synthetic Organic Chemistry (demonstrated by the NIH-funded Center for Chemical Methodology and Library Development at Boston University). It is our goal to strengthen this area to world-class leadership and to evolve a second area of excellence in Biological Chemistry.

Faculty who have received major recognition for teaching and research contributions include NSF

CAREER Awards for junior faculty (*Doerr*, Liu, Reinhard, Wang), Cope Scholars (Panek, Porco), Kennedy Award for Healthcare Innovation (Grinstaff), as well as Metcalf (Snyder, Straub), Gitner (Caradonna, Elliott, Straub), and Templeton (Elliott, Snyder) awards. However, there have been too few Sloan (*Caradonna*, Dill, *Grinstaff*, Straub, *Tullius*) and Dreyfus (*Caradonna*, *Doerr*, *Grinstaff*, Snyder, *Tullius*) scholars, and we currently have only one chaired professorship (Panek). A significant number of these signal awards (italicized) were earned by faculty before moving to Boston University.

Increasing the number of major awards to BUCH junior and senior faculty will be critical in helping us attain our goal of improving our profile and standing.

Faculty: Achieving diversity and excellence in teaching and research. BUCH TT faculty and lecturer positions analyzed in terms of women and minorities and compared to peer institutions in the 2009 CCR report is as follows:

Category	1st Quartile	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	Boston University
Tenure-Track	35	26	20	24
Women	5	4	3	3
Minorities	2	2	1	1
Lecturers	5	5	3	10
Non-TT Teaching	3	5	6	1
TOTAL Faculty	43	36	29	35

These data inform the BUCH SP's faculty development aims, which are to: (1) convert a number of Lecturer positions to TT faculty positions so that our key courses are taught by research-active faculty-scholars, consistent with the philosophy of the College and University; (2) appoint more senior teaching faculty as non-TT faculty rather than Lectures, consistent with national standards; (3) improve the representation of women and minorities on our faculty, consistent with the University focus on "diversity and excellence."

The distribution between TT and teaching faculty, more than the overall number, must be addressed in strategic BUCH faculty development if we are to raise significantly the profile of our Department.

Faculty: Collaboration with other academic units and institutions. Other key faculty development aims relate to our desire to contribute to established and nascent University interdisciplinary initiatives, which are drivers in achieving research advances and attracting outside funding to both BU and CH. We propose to: (1) rebuild experimental Physical Chemistry, particularly in relation to the MSE, PHO, and ESE interdisciplinary initiatives, (2) expand Theory and Computation to strengthen our affiliation with the SSB, and (3) pursue recruitments that strengthen connections to the Center for Molecular Discovery initiative between the CRC and the MED school.

Academic Programs: Undergraduate enrollments and curricular development. Faculty and curricular development that require significant capital resources such as those being proposed in the BUCH SP must be justified by current and projected enrollments. We believe that we can clearly provide this justification. Enrollments in our undergraduate chemistry majors and service courses (2,150 students in the 2009 Fall Semester and 1,560 in the 2010 Spring Semester) continue the trend of increasing enrollments over the last several years. The anticipated enrollment in our undergraduate courses for the coming academic year is expected to remain at this historically high level and speaks to the importance of the "molecular sciences" in the medical, materials, biological, and energy fields.

In Fall 2009, nearly 1,380 students enrolled in 100-level CH courses, a number equal to three-quarters of the entering CAS freshman population. Since 2002, the annual declared CH majors have increased by more than 20%, reaching 135 for 2009. In addition, there are 224 Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) majors this term. While these large enrollments provide wonderful opportunities for our teaching mission, they also present significant challenges. In the absence of substantial faculty development, the 2009 ratio of students to CH TT faculty had risen

to 107:1 (from 70:1 in AY 2002). For comparison, the Physics student-to-TT faculty teaching ratio was 18:1 and the Biology ratio was 45:1.

Significant improvements in student-teacher ratios and the realization of curricular aspirations can only be achieved through faculty development, including replacement and the addition of new faculty lines.

Academic Programs: Interdisciplinary research, education and outreach. We aspire to continue our long tradition of encouraging international research collaborations and educating our undergraduate and graduate students as to the “global nature” (and necessity) of scientific research. We will expand fruitful research collaborations, build on shared research resources, facilitate faculty and student exchanges to include exciting initiatives in the computational, materials, and energy sciences with research universities in the UK, Europe, and Japan. Locally, we will continue to serve as advocates for “giving back” to our community through participation of BUCH faculty and students in outreach to our “neighbor” public schools in Brookline and Boston, mentoring high school and community college students and faculty, and participating in national organizations that promote science education and literacy.

Facilities. CH laboratories will serve over 3,700 registrations in 2010 (a 12% increase over 2009), the majority of which are associated with 100- or 200-level courses. Fall 2009 enrollments in the 100-level instructional lab courses exceeded enrollment limits, jumping from 650 students to 850. We need to fully renovate these laboratories (which are more than 20 years old) if we are to meet this demand and offer a safe and engaging educational experience. A strategic planning study is now underway to assess the cost of renovations in the Metcalf Science Center (SCI), which will include critical renovations required to support undergraduate instructional programs and academic advising, including: (1) major renovations of organic, analytical, physical, and biochemistry instructional laboratories; (2) reconfiguration of our main office to meet administration and academic advising needs; and (3) critical HVAC upgrade for the “East Wing” of the Metcalf Science Center. There is consensus about the need for space development to support our teaching and research missions. Consider the following analysis of existing space available to BUCH. (Of the research laboratory space shown, 12.5 % needs to be renovated for faculty development.)

Space	1st Quartile	2nd Quartile	3rd Quartile	Boston University
Teaching laboratories	26,400	18,700	11,600	23,500
Research laboratories	88,000	52,100	34,100	63,000
Faculty offices	9,900	10,900	5,500	6,300
Support services	17,700	8,500	6,200	6,500
Administrative offices	6,200	4,000	1,800	2,500

These data show that space for administrative and research support services is undersized and that research space must grow substantially if we are to support our ambitions for faculty growth.

Other Infrastructure: Staff for research and administration. The 2009 CCR report showing general funded (GF) and other funded (OF) staff positions demonstrates the inadequacy of current BUCH staffing levels.

Area	1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		Boston University	
	GF	OF	GF	OF	GF	OF	GF	OF
Administrative	9	3	4	1	2	0	5	1
Clerical	11	3	6	1	0.5	0.5	4.5	1.5
Technical	10	4	6	1	4	1	4.5	1.5
Research	3	7	4	5	2	3	0	4
Faculty	35		26		20		24	

Other Infrastructure: Continuing funding of instructional laboratories. We have worked closely with the College administration to develop an understanding of the distinction between “continuing” expenses (the predictable costs of offering instructional laboratory courses to

thousands of students each year) and "supplemental" expenses (representing "one-time" costs). We have a need to: (1) correct our "continuing" budget to recognize predictable expenses related to core courses, and (2) restrict "supplemental" funding requests to curricular innovation and true one-time expenses. If the College and Provost believe that the tuition revenue generated by these courses cannot adequately provide a source of income for the proper budgeting of our academic programs, we suggest the implementation of a "lab fee" for the substantial additional cost to the University of these courses.

Adequate support of CH instructional programs is necessary to realize our curricular aspirations.

strategic plan for the future

Our Strategic Plan is informed by our mission, the need to meet historically high and growing enrollments in CH courses, the aim to evolve clear centers of research excellence, and the desire to realize opportunities for participation in College and University interdisciplinary research and teaching initiatives.

Faculty: Overall goals for 10-year plan and 5-year goals. Our vision is for a BUCH faculty size growth to 34, which is an increase of four over the 2006 BUCH Strategic Plan. That prior number was informed by past conversations with the administration and student enrollments. In the years since, important changes in the educational and research landscape compel us to revise our goal for strategic growth:

- Dramatic enhancements in student enrollments in majors and service courses
- Call to serve growing number of interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate programs
- Desire for interdisciplinary growth that provide only partial teaching and service to CH
- Enhanced faculty "buy out" particularly in Synthetic and Biological chemistry

Our development target is the minimum CH faculty that we need to serve our Teaching Mission by: (1) offering majors, service courses and a complement of "core" graduate courses; (2) allowing for modest levels of faculty "buyout," sabbaticals, and teaching release for administrative roles; and (3) advancing interdisciplinary initiatives.

	2009	2010	2015	2020
Biological Chemistry	6	7	7	8
Chemical Synthesis	9	10	12	13
Physical Chemistry	3	4	5	6
Theory/Computation	6	6	7	7

Academic programs: Undergraduate enrollments and curricular development. We now face historically high enrollments in both our service and majors courses, reflecting the growing importance of chemistry and "molecular science" in the education of students interested in medicine and health sciences, biology and neuroscience, materials science and nanotechnology, and medicinal and biological chemistry. To meet the challenges and opportunities presented by these enrollments, we have a clear need for enhancements in tenure-track faculty numbers in order to:

- Establish more equitable student-to-faculty ratios relative to other CAS science departments
- Enable undergraduate course development and broader participation in teaching initiatives
- Expand "discussion" time and academic support for "at risk" students in the largest First-Year courses
- Enhance academic support through fruitful collaboration with the Educational Resource Center

The proposed target of 34 faculty was informed by the high undergraduate enrollments in CH courses, as well as compelling opportunities for curricular development that will serve Chemistry and Biochemistry majors and minors, including (1) *Quantitative Chemistry and Instrumental Analysis* (lab), (2) *Methods of Mathematics for Chemistry Majors*, and (3) *Biophysical and Biomacromolecular Chemistry* (and lab). These courses will also serve students in the interdisciplinary programs, BMB and MSE, including (1) *Physical Chemistry for Biochemical*

Majors (and lab) and (2) Synthetic Materials Science (and lab).

Finally and importantly, students interested in satisfying breadth requirements in various colleges through majors or non-majors “molecular science” courses will be served by (1) *Introductory Molecular Sciences for Non-Science majors* (with lab) and (2) participation in University Honors College first-year seminars. Faculty will also continue to participate in key interdisciplinary programs (CAS Core Curriculum and Bioinformatics).

Our strategic plans for academic programs and planning also include enhancements to advising, mentoring, and academic support that should play an important role in the "first-year experience" and student retention.

Academic programs: Masters education (research and professional). Two proposed graduate programs innovations have been proposed in recognition of opportunities for training students at the Masters level: Masters Program in Organic Chemistry and joint programs in Business or Law and Chemistry. These programs aspire to broaden the educational mission of our Department and further develop the connections between our faculty, pharmaceutical and biotechnology companies, and firms involved in intellectual property and patent law associated with research and development in the molecular sciences. The greatest challenge in realizing this bold vision is the pressing need for faculty development.

Academic programs: Doctoral education and graduate program and resource development. The proposed increase in research-active faculty in the next 5 years will require graduate program growth from 100 students to 150 students:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase fellowship support for graduate students (including NSF, Ford, AAUW) • Secure graduate support through federal Training Grants (including NIH, NSF IGERTs, GAANN) • Enhance recruitment of underrepresented minorities • Support the Boston University Women in Chemistry (BUWIC) Group • Expand graduate course offerings in core and interdisciplinary areas |
|---|

Facilities: Strategic plan for space development for research and “core” services. Substantial laboratory space must be renovated for the proposed faculty expansion. These renovations present significant investments due to the high space construction costs for synthetic chemistry and the poor state of HVAC infrastructure in SCI. The preliminary conclusions of the BUCH Space Planning Study (to be completed in Spring 2010) suggest that the proposed faculty expansion can be accommodated through thoughtful redesign of existing laboratories in SCI and modest expansion in the shared science research buildings in CRC. The planning study has also considered the need to grow the Chemical Instrumentation Center (CIC), a University “core facility” serving a teaching and research programs that require molecular analysis, located in the Basement of SCI.

We are strongly committed to proposal development to attract external funding for research laboratory renovations to support research initiatives and collaboration with University development efforts.

Facilities: Strategic plan for space development for teaching and administration. Our strategic plan for the renovation of our largest instructional laboratories consists of four phases. **Phase I** (completed in 2005) addressed the critical need for the renovation of laboratories serving our large First-Year Chemistry courses CH101/102 and CH131 (ENG). **Phase II** will address the need to renovate our Organic Chemistry instructional laboratories serving CH172 (SAR), CH203/204, and CH211/212. **Phase III** will address our urgent need to renovate our the laboratories serving our Analytical, Inorganic, Physical and Biochemical courses CH109/110, CH111/112, CH181/182, CH171 (SAR), CH201, CH354, and CH421. This phase is the largest of the instructional laboratory renovations in terms of size and engineering challenges given the placement on the 1st Floor of SCI. **Phase IV** will address renovation of our administrative offices to facilitate improved financial and academic administration and student advising.

We anticipate continued engagement with the University in an effort to raise 50% of the funding necessary for the renovation of the organic chemistry laboratories planned for

Summer 2010.

Facilities: Strategic plan for other space development supporting the CH mission. Planned renovations of major lecture halls in SCI are essential to enhance lecturing in our large first- and second-year courses. These courses are crucial to our Department's mission, as well as to a number of University priorities including the *First-Year Experience*, student retention, and success of our large cohort of premedical students in CAS, SAR, and ENG. Unfortunately, many sections are taught in buildings other than SCI.

It is a goal of our Department to see that these core CH courses are taught in SCI where they can benefit from chemical demonstration support and the proximity to our teaching laboratories, faculty, and academic support services offered in collaboration with the Educational Resource Center.

Establish BUCH Advisory Board to enhance planning and development. Over the course of the past year and in close consultation with the CAS Dean, we have identified key leaders in academia and industry, with representation of alumni, administrators, and prominent research scientists, who will be invited to serve on the BUCH Advisory Board. Our Board will meet annually to discuss key challenges and opportunities facing our Department. Board members will serve as an important resource throughout each year to provide advice on and support for departmental initiatives, including faculty recruitment, academic planning, and fund-raising for research and teaching goals.

evaluation of progress toward the goals of the ten-year plan

Graduate programs in Chemistry continue to rely on quartile rankings defined by the NRC's 1995 *Rankings of Graduate Programs*, at which time our graduate program fell in the 3rd Quartile. In anticipation of an updated ranking, in July 2009 the NRC released "A Guide to the Methodology of the NRC Assessment of Doctorate Programs":

Assessment Area	Specific Criteria and Relative Weights of Importance
Research Activity:	Publications per faculty (0.28), citations per publication (0.26) Percent faculty with grants (0.29), and awards per faculty (0.17)
Student Support and Outcomes:	Percent students with full support (0.29) Cohort completing in 6 years (0.23), mean time to degree (0.12), placement of students (0.18), and collection of outcome data (0.18)
Diversity of Academic Environment:	Percentages of underrepresented minority faculty (0.10), female faculty (0.20), underrepresented minority students (0.20), female students (0.29), and international students (0.21)

These metrics are published, consensus-based evaluations that inform, more than any others, the national ranking of the BUCH program. Specific goals for future development and assessment relative to comparison institutions will be refined following the release of the long-anticipated updated NRC rankings.

A number of clear performance indicators exist for assessing research productivity and graduate program standing. Performance indicators for undergraduate program success include numbers of students taught and student outcomes in admission to postgraduate or professional study or securing employment upon graduation.

BUCH goals to improve aspects of faculty and program productivity and ranking include:

- Increase annual publication numbers and impact (raising total citations) per faculty member
- Improve the time-to-graduation for students in our doctoral program to 5 years
- Guarantee full support to all students in our doctoral program
- Enhance the percentage of women on our faculty and in our doctoral program
- Increase the number of underrepresented minorities on our faculty and in our graduate program

We can expect to see the secondary impacts of those primary measures on undergraduate education, academic programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, participation in

interdisciplinary research initiatives, and expanded research collaborations. Enhancing the level of external funding will improve student support and years-to-graduation. Increases in funding and in total faculty numbers will also lead to concomitant improvements in staffing levels in our department. These changes will provide faculty with more time for research and lead to more publications and citations, key measures of research productivity that inform departmental standing. Our faculty will evaluate our progress toward our strategic goals using these clearly defined measures of faculty and program productivity in consultation with our Chemistry Advisory Board. We will assess our progress relative to our five-year goals, just as we have recently assessed progress three years out relative to the goals of our 2006 Ten-Year SP, which remains a very relevant and detailed roadmap for present and future BUCH development.

Department of Classical Studies
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Department of Classical Studies seeks to establish and to teach what was done, written, said, and thought in the ancient Mediterranean world, to establish and teach how those things have been understood or utilized since antiquity (the classical tradition), and to demonstrate how those things are relevant to our lives today (the humanistic mission).

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Groups

General criteria for ranking include number and eminence of faculty, size and strength of graduate programs, coverage of crucial disciplines, and connections with related departments.

- a) Peer-plus Group: Cornell University, Brown University, Columbia University
- b) Peer Group: USC, Northwestern Univ., Univ. of Buffalo
- c) Peer-minus Group: Johns Hopkins, NYU, Univ. of Virginia

2. Faculty

Analysis of tenure/tenure-track faculty (no FT lecturers in CL). Data drawn from calendar year 2006 through 2008 (last three FAR periods).

a. Scholarly research quality

1. Scholarly publication: 10 books (1 monograph, 1 edited vol., 1 text/translation, 1 translation, 6 journal volumes) [plus 4 trade books]. 8 articles, including 3 in highest-quality journals. 14 book chapters. Norms per faculty/year = .256 books, .564 articles/book chapters. *NB: During this period several faculty were completing major monographs (to appear in the next two years): Scully, Nelson, Várhelyi, Vasaly, Esposito. Henderson was also Dean of CAS for most of this period.
2. 3 journal articles in top-tier publications.
3. Grant activity: \$141,240. Norm per faculty/year = \$3,621.
4. Rankings: No independent classics faculty rankings exist.
5. Awards: Esposito: Frank and Lynne Wisneski Award for Excellence in Teaching, 2009; Johnson: Visiting Scholar, American Academy in Rome, June 2006; Larash: Andrew Heiskell Post-Doctoral Rome Prize, American Academy in Rome, 2008-2009; Samons: Onassis Senior Visiting Scholar, 2007-08; Scully: Senior Society of Fellows, Boston University, 2006-07; Vasaly: Professor in Charge, School of Classical Studies, American Academy in Rome, 2006; Johnson: Senior Hum. Found. Fellow, 2006-07.
6. Citations: Classics citations are not systematically catalogued.

b. Subfields: The strongest subfields in the department are 1) fifth-century Athenian literature, history, and culture, 2) Roman literature of the late Republic and early empire, and 3) Greek poetry and drama.

c. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions (aggregate)

1. Course Evaluations: The department faculty have a history of excellent course evaluations (when gauged by written comments or, where relevant, quantitative evaluation (treating a rating of 4 out of 5 for course or instructor as “excellent”). With limited exceptions (consisting primarily of less experienced, untenured faculty), course evaluations are extremely strong across the department.
2. Teaching awards: Department faculty have won numerous teaching awards including the

Metcalf Cup and Prize (Johnson), Metcalf Award (Samons), College Prizes for excellence (Samons, Johnson, and Esposito), and Honors Program awards. Esposito won a College Prize in 2009 and Nelson in 2009-10 is (for the second time) a finalist for a Metcalf Award.

3. Academic enhancement participation: Undergraduate research and publication is virtually unheard of in classics. Despite this, in 2008-09 Johnson undertook and produced a commentary on passages of Virgil's *Aeneid* (with GUTS grant) composed by undergraduates and this project is now in preparation for publication.

4. Curricular and Pedagogical Innovation: Department faculty have developed new courses (or new offerings under umbrella course rubrics) in the last three years, including courses in the areas of the classical tradition/comparative literature (Scully and Nelson), Greek tragedy and film (Golder), ancient society and culture (Várhelyi), and senior, capstone courses (Esposito, Nelson, Henderson) as well as new graduate courses and pro-seminars (Alonge, Henderson). The umbrella structure of such courses as CL406 Advanced Seminar in Classical Civilization encourages faculty to develop new offerings on a regular basis. On average approximately two entirely new courses/topics are offered each year in CL, a fact which continually rejuvenates the department's curriculum.

d. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions (per field): The department is too small and too interdisciplinary to break down contributions by "field." For example, civilization and literature courses necessarily treat history (and vice versa). Please see notes above for the department as a whole.

f. Major Professional and Public Service Contributions (2006-2008): major positions with APA, American Acad. in Rome, Loeb Classical Library; referees for major univ. presses, top-tier journals, academies, trade press, Guggenheim foundation; major conferences organization; major committees and task forces for BU hiring, Metcalf, ATP, WR program.

3. Academic Programs

a. Assessment of undergraduate education.

1) Goals and purposes: see Mission Statement.

2) Vitality and quality: The department undertook a comprehensive undergraduate curriculum review in 2008-2009, a review that resulted in the renumbering of several courses and the institution of a set of recommended and required prerequisites. About 6 years earlier the department conducted another curriculum review, which resulted in an increase in the requirements for graduation for several concentrations as well as the institution of a 400-level, capstone course requirement for all concentrations.

3) Enrollment history and projections: Department enrollment increased markedly from 1995 to 2005 (from ca. 40 concentrators to 97) and have since leveled off. Department research from 2007-2008 suggests that this department often has the largest number of undergraduate classics concentrators (typically ca. 80-100) in the country. At this point, it would be unrealistic to expect enrollments or the number of concentrators to increase significantly in the future.

4) Student outcomes: Success is measured at BU through the acquisition of the skills necessary to read and understand classical texts (in the original language or in translation) and in the ability to employ such skills in the analysis of ancient literature, history, and culture in the service of the humanities. In practice, this means students must learn to think and write critically about the ancient world.

5) Student diversity: The department maintains no records on student diversity. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the department's student profile reflects that of the College of Arts & Sciences as a whole.

b. Assessment of doctoral program

1) Goals and purposes: see Mission Statement.

2) Vitality and quality: The graduate program has improved in vitality and quality over the last fifteen years, a fact that may be attributed to the arrival of Henderson as chair in 1991 and the terms of several excellent DGSs (Scully, Vasaly, Johnson, and now Henderson). Entering students' preparation for undertaking graduate work has improved markedly over that time. At present, most graduate students arriving at BU are more than prepared to undertake serious work in the ancient languages. Placement of graduates has been excellent over the past decade.

3) The graduate program's competitiveness has been hampered by the inability to offer students (relatively) guaranteed support for five years, which is the discipline standard for first- and second-tier programs. The department's ability to attract excellent students despite this is a testament to the hard work of the various DGSs and the reputation of the faculty. Average number of GRS student enrolled in program over last ten years is 18.

4) Student outcomes including time to degree, placement: Time to degree (PhD) averages 6-7 years, which is typical in the field. Placement for B.U. PhDs has been excellent, including recent appointments for B.U. PhDs at Hoffstra and Bard College (Columbia Univ.).

5) Available rankings: There are currently no conventionally respected, relevant rankings of classics PhD programs. When the next National Research Council report is issued it will already be out of date, as it is based on data gathered in the 2005-2006 academic year. It is also unclear whether schools that produce as few doctorate degrees as Boston University and many other small to mid-sized classics graduate programs will even be included in the report.

6) Student diversity: The department maintains no records of student diversity. Observation indicates that the population is largely Caucasian, with the following male/female division: 2006/07 = 13/9, 2007/08 = 13/8, 2008/2009 = 14/8.

c. Assessment of masters programs

The department's Master of Arts program is, strictly speaking, an adjunct to the Ph.D. program. The department does not advertise itself as a school offering the "terminal master's" degree (with the exception of the M.A.T.: see below). The department does not offer financial support for students seeking only the M.A. Some students do depart the program after taking an M.A. degree, but such students entered the program planning to pursue the Ph.D. Thus, for information on the M.A. program, please refer to the Ph.D. section above.

The M.A.T. program suffers from structural and curricular problems due to insufficient faculty and the inability of students to complete the program in the advertised one-year time frame. The department will recast its M.A.T. program as an "advanced" program, which requires an undergraduate degree (or equivalent) in Latin or classical languages for admission. At the same time, the department plans to develop a B.A./M.A.T. program, which will allow our own undergraduate concentrators to pursue the M.A.T. (and thus certification) at Boston University. Both these proposals are dependent on the approval of the College and Graduate School and SED.

d. Other (non-degree) programs [N/A]

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives

Classics as a field is inherently interdisciplinary, embracing the study of literature, history, religion, philosophy, and art. Special initiatives beyond the field of classics itself in the last three years include 1) assisting in the development of the Comparative Literature program, 2) offering courses in XL/CL, 3) a conference on sacrifice in the ancient Mediterranean (Várhelyi with Knust of RN/STH), 4) faculty lectures in the Core Curriculum program, 5) 2 courses offered in Women's Studies.

The department is poised to support further interdisciplinary initiatives as individual faculty members' research programs and pedagogical and curricular needs of the college and university demand.

f. International/global initiatives

The department now participates in the Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies (ICCS) in Rome, a program allowing one or two undergraduates per year to study in Italy. A similar arrangement with a program in Greece is desirable and initial talks with the Classics-Advanced Semester Program

(CASP) offered by the Hellenic Education and Research Center (HERC) have begun.

g. Outreach Initiatives

- 1) Academic scholarships (awarded annually to HS students after a national examination contest),
- 2) Hosting the Mass. Junior Classical League's Classics Day,
- 3) Hosting the Boston Area Roman Studies Conference, (BUHF funding),
- 4) Hosting the Study Group on Myth and Religion (BUHF funding), and
- 5) Graduate student conferences (BUHF funding). Beyond such formal initiatives, individual faculty members often participate in programs to enrich the curricula of local high schools.

4. *Facilities*

a. Adequacy: The department possesses the bare minimum space necessary to fulfill its missions. Needs include

- 1) additional office space for graduate students in teaching roles,
- 2) a dedicated seminar room (to free the department library/seminar room up to serve as a full-time library).

b. Plans for addressing issues: As additional space opens in STH the department will continue conversations with CAS to secure needed facilities.

5. *Other infrastructure*

a. Adequacy

The department non-academic infrastructure ranges from poor to adequate. Offices have little to no control over heat and thus range from too cold to (sometimes much) too warm. Water from poor windows leaks into offices and destroys paint, books, etc. Recent renovations of several offices have improved conditions, moving them into the range of "adequate" spaces for meetings with students, but few department facilities could be considered particularly "comfortable."

b. Plans for addressing issues

The department continues to request renovations on a revolving basis. In approximately 2-3 years, on the current schedule, a full cycle of renovations will have been completed, but the offices first renovated (in the mid 1990s) are already in need of further attention. A major overhaul of the HVAC systems in STH is needed to address the heating/cooling issues.

6. *Collaboration with other academic units and institutions*

a. Key collaborations inside BU

Joint undergraduate degree programs with departments of Philosophy and Religion. Joint Masters/PhD program with Philosophy and plans for such a program with Archaeology. Collaboration with Core and WR in providing section leaders and plenary lecturers (Core), as well as senior faculty leadership in designing/oversight for both programs. HP courses offered by department faculty on a regular basis. Support (especially acting as referees) for the journals *Arion* and *IJCT*. Support for one graduate student provided through work in the ISCT.

b. Outside BU

Visiting lecturers often coordinated with other New England schools, especially Brown University. Collaboration with ICCS allowing BU students to attend the Centro's program in Rome (and formerly Sicily).

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. *Ten-Year Plan*

a. Ten-year Goals

- 1) Faculty: Increase in faculty by 3-4 FTE. a) Tenure/track specialist in Modern Greek and Comparative Literature (to anchor Modern Greek and expand cooperation with MLCL), b) Senior Latinist (to provide balance with the senior Hellenists and provide additional senior leadership and dissertation oversight in Latin), c) Specialist in Latin pedagogy (assuming the M.A.T. program is continued), d) specialist in Hellenistic world/Roman Republic, fourth-century Greek prose, or late antiquity (bridging and expanding current strengths)
 - 2) Undergraduate education: Maintain current levels of enrollment and concentrators; development of undergraduate prose composition courses; development of additional comparative literature courses; development of junior-level course aimed at research methods and writing.
 - 3) Doctoral education: Maintenance of current quality and numbers. Increase in numbers of TFs to 10 and add at least one PUGF/year. Increase in stipend amounts and ability to guarantee at least five years of support.
 - 4) Masters education: Recast of M.A.T. program as indicated.
 - 5) Other academic programs: Increase (especially graduate) students involvement with *Arion* and the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*. Although not strictly speaking “academic programs,” the journals edited by department faculty and published at Boston University (*Arion* and *IJCT*) play a major role in the department’s academic life and international profile and status.
 - 6) Interdisciplinary initiatives: Additional cooperation with MLCL to develop the curriculum in comparative literature; development of graduate degree program in cooperation with department of AR.
 - 7) Facilities: see above.
 - 8) Other infrastructure: see above.
 - 9) Collaborations: Continue to foster collaborations within and outside department, allowing the natural research vectors of individual faculty to dictate such work.
- c. Resources (needed to accomplish goals): Faculty lines to support staff growth; 1 to 4 new offices and designated seminar room space; 3 additional TF lines and ability to offer 5-year graduate support; increase in TF stipends; increase in annual department travel budget to at least \$5,000; research accounts of \$2,000 for all faculty who do not already have such accounts; increase in salaries to alleviate structural/compression issues and encourage retention.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

- a. Indicators that will be appropriate for measure progress to goals: Maintenance of current undergraduate and graduate enrollment numbers and quality; hiring, tenure, and promotion of quality teacher-scholars; high-quality publications (scholarly articles/books of original research, literary translations, works that reach out to non-scholarly community, pedagogical works); continuation of journals *Arion* and *IJCT*.
- b. Resources needed for collection and analysis of data: None.

3. Five-year Goals

- a. Expectations of progress after five years: Maintain current enrollment levels/quality; tenure/hiring of Roman historian; tenure/hiring of specialist in Modern Greek/Comparative Literature; promotion of Scully, Vasaly to Professor; development of further courses in comparative literature (staff pressures allowing); retention of current senior faculty.
- b. Steps to be taken to achieve goals: Implementation of undergraduate curriculum restructuring; support of current faculty’s research programs allowing for successful tenure/promotion including

assignment of graduate courses in areas of specialization and research and encouragement to seek assistance from senior colleagues; in the case of new hiring, creation of effective subgroups to screen and interview prospects; restructuring of M.A.T. program.

c. Metrics used to indicate progress and realign goals: Beyond maintaining enrollment numbers, the department's goals are primarily qualitative rather than quantitative.

Department of Cognitive and Neural Systems
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

Special questions directed to the CNS department:

1. All of our small departments, and departments with relatively small enrollments, face special challenges in sustainability in all their missions. Is it possible for CNS to remain sustainable as a separate department through the future and if so, how?

CNS was chartered as a graduate program in the fall of 1988 and then as a graduate department in the 1990-1991 academic year. At that time there were virtually no undergraduate neuroscience departments, and computational neuroscience was almost unheard of as a component of the undergraduate curriculum. CNS's interdisciplinary approach to modeling of brain and behavior, expressed as mathematical systems that could be adapted for technological applications, was revolutionary. The field of neuroscience has expanded greatly since then; many universities now offer undergraduate majors. The demand for the CNS mission and its "products," both in research and teaching, has grown by multiplicative factors since our inception, vindicating BU's vision from the late 80s to the present. The fields that we have led promise to expand explosively in the future as technologies such as sensory and motor neural prostheses are developed or as artificial active vision systems and robotics lead to new applications, such as autonomous vehicles or collision avoidance systems. However, trying to sustain our mission with only eight tenured faculty members and none on the tenure track (with our most recently hired member now a full professor) is proving increasingly disheartening. Accordingly, CNS faculty members wish to join forces with other Charles River Campus (CRC) neuroscientists in the context of a new, larger department, provided that its charter provides a structural basis for building upon BU's decades of leadership in expanding the horizons of computational neuroscience and its applications to cognitive systems.

2. With the growth of interdisciplinary neuroscience programs in research, graduate education, and undergraduate education, we face important questions of how to support and organize neuroscience within CAS. Within CAS, there is a large and growing subfield program in Psychology, a small department of Cognitive and Neural Systems as well as some faculty in Biology and elsewhere. Some people have suggested we develop a Department of Neuroscience; probably more faculty would see this as a very problematic move, especially for the Department of Psychology. Are there alternative solutions that would benefit both psychology as a discipline and neuroscience? Consider, for example, that at least a couple of universities now have a single Department of Psychology and Neuroscience. Is this a desirable goal to consider in CAS?

All members of the CNS faculty have expressed a preference for some solution that does not involve our becoming members of an expanded Psychology Department. Consider that MIT long ago assimilated many of its experimental psychology faculty and neuroscientists into a new department called Brain and Cognitive Sciences (BCS). Notable is the absence of "psychology" in this department's name or the name of any other department at MIT. The key issue is that all CNS faculty members conduct research, and teach, in the STEM tradition (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics). Our research and teaching mission demands that we work in a department that is so constituted, in name and substance, that it can attract excellent STEM students, as CNS has long done. CNS at BU was carefully named, as was BCS at MIT, to make it unmistakable to applicants and funding agencies that the disciplines pursued were STEM disciplines. If the new department's name does not make this clear—and to many technically proficient STEM undergrads "psychology" connotes the opposite—then it will not succeed.

One name for a new department that has been discussed by CNS faculty and by other neuroscientists at BU, including some in the Psychology Department is "Cognitive & Computational Neuroscience," or CCN. Note that this could be construed to exclude molecular and cellular neuroscience.

Another possibility would be "Neuroscience & Cognitive Systems," or NCS. This is more inclusive, and the "Cognitive Systems" part would be seen as encompassing brain simulations, neuromorphic

technologies, and aspects of psychology that are in the STEM tradition.

Another possibility would be to keep the name Cognitive and Neural Systems in an expanded department, where the number of faculty presently outside of CNS would outnumber the faculty presently in CNS, and where the teaching and research mission of the new CNS would be significantly expanded to include experimental approaches, as explained in what follows. Nothing in the name Cognitive and Neural Systems precludes the research and teaching of many cognitive or computational neuroscientists presently on the Charles River Campus who are not presently in CNS.

Another possibility would be Cognitive and Neural Science and Technology. “Science” both generalizes in principle and is more restrictive in practice than “systems,” because “neuroscience” is applied to biological intelligence, where as “systems” can refer to living or machine systems. Inclusion of “technology” in this construction would connote the possibility of research programs that span the biological and technological ranges of intelligent behavior.

Because it is premature to name the new entity before its constituents have been identified, in what follows we will refer to “the new department” or “the ND.” Whatever the name of the ND, it should be able to assume the major burden for teaching for degree programs already on the books, notably the Graduate Neuroscience Program, the present CNS (MA and PhD) degrees, and the new undergraduate neuroscience major, which will suffer if the faculty associated with it continue to be spread across several departments.

In summary, CNS faculty welcome the idea of assimilating cognitive neuroscientists on the Charles River Campus, including CNS faculty, into a new larger department that can better meet the daunting challenge of understanding how the brain works well enough to construct brain-like cognitive systems.

A. Mission Statement

CNS provides MA and PhD training in *systems computational neuroscience*, which constructs mathematical and computer models of how brains enable learning and intelligence. This focus makes CNS a unique haven for outstanding STEM-trained students who seek a rigorous understanding of how physiological mechanisms within brain circuits, or related neuromorphic technologies, enable complex functions like vision, recognition, attention, memory, decision-making, cognitive information processing, navigation, sensory-motor control, skill learning, and speech communication. Although CNS offers no undergraduate degrees, its 200- and 300-level lab courses in computational neuroscience (five proposed; two fielded to date) combine with its nine multi-disciplinary 500-level courses to help make BU unique for the range and depth of its computational neuroscience and biologically-inspired technology offerings.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

The purpose of this section is to describe and assess the quality of your programs in a clear-eyed way. This whole section is preparation for the development of a strategic plan in Part C. This section requires that you provide indicators and benchmarks of quality. ... imperfect evidence systematically collected and intelligently interpreted is better than purpose-built anecdotes or no evidence at all. You are welcome to develop indicators more appropriate to your area that are not listed here.

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group: identify up to 8 other departments ... as your main peer group ... some you would define as stronger, some as weaker. Provide a website for each, cluster rank them, and provide a very brief explanation of their relative merits in relation to your unit.

We know of no truly comparable *department* anywhere in the world, due both to our small size and the uniqueness of our near-exclusive focus on computational neuroscience joined with biologically-inspired technologies. Most departments with more than a few computational neuroscientists are notably larger and have a predominant focus on experimental neuroscience. Whenever prospective students choose another department rather than accept CNS’s offer of admission, they usually indicate that they prefer a department that will allow them choice of either an experimental or a computational specialization, however they

eventually decide. Among the US departments that offer both options, and we occasionally lose students to, are:

Brain and Cognitive Sciences, at MIT (a much larger department: 47 faculty) at <http://bcs.mit.edu/>.

Graduate Neurosciences Program at UCSD (a huge program, with 18 computational faculty listed as associated with a comp-neuro specialization within the much larger department) at <http://neurograd.ucsd.edu/doctoral/cnspec.html>.

These comparisons make it clear that the small faculty size and near-exclusive computational focus of CNS place it at a comparative disadvantage from the perspective of some students. Conversely, however, our focus has led certain other students to elect CNS even with funding offers in hand from MIT, UCSD, or other excellent institutions. Thus, the specific research programs and high productivity of CNS faculty, together with CNS's reputation as a haven for students strongly inclined toward computational studies and research, have allowed CNS to attract excellent students who have been in very high demand upon graduation.

Department of Computer Science
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

We study and teach computing, its possibilities, limitations and applications. We advance the field of computer science through academic research. We ensure the future of the field by training PhD students to contribute to knowledge and share it with others. We prepare undergraduate and master's students for long-term professional success, in courses taught by world-class researchers with a passion for teaching. We give many more students their first exposure to computer science, imparting a deeper appreciation of our discipline. As a focal point for computing expertise on campus, we collaborate with the University community in scholarship and education.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peers

Academic Peer	TTF	#citations '06-08		USNEWS '06		USNEWS '08		#endowed chairs
		median	mean	score	rank	score	rank	
Duke	19	170	182	3.6	25	3.7	20	4
Brown	27	145	155	3.7	22	3.7	20	5
USC	28	121	158	3.6	25	3.7	20	4
NYU	33	116	160	3.4	29	3.4	31	3
BU	18	100	140	2.8	56	3	48	0
Johns Hopkins	15	97	130	3.5	28	3.6	28	1
Rochester	23	68	136	3.1	40	3	48	1
U Chicago	19	48	150	3.2	34	3.2	39	2
Northeastern	30	37	63	NS	NR	2.7	61	2

Table 1: TTF = tenure-track faculty. 2006-08 citation data is taken from the Microsoft Academic Research engine. US News CS doctoral program rankings are updated in even-numbered years.

Our peers are CS departments at private, urban universities. Selection criteria include the quality of the faculty and research program, competition for undergraduate and graduate students, and scholarly productivity.

Northeastern (NEU) has emerged as the top competitor for applicants admitted to BU CAS with a declared CS undergraduate major, i.e., decreasing our yield. NEU CS is housed in a prominent new building, and NEU is making considerable investments in increasing the number and quality of its CS faculty.

2. Assessment in Relation to the Most Important Elements of our Mission

Scholarly Research Quality: The scholarly work of BU CS faculty members is of high caliber and impact. In the past five years, three of our faculty members were recognized with awards for their long-term contributions to the field, and six received best paper prizes at prominent international conferences. Ten of our current 18 faculty members are among the top 1% most-cited authors in CS according to the CiteSeer scientific literature digital library. The three-year citation rate for BU CS places us well with respect to peers who ranked among the top-40 in the US News 2008 rankings of CS doctoral programs.

Last year, our faculty was involved in more than \$14M in active grants, covering a broad range of interdisciplinary research projects within the University. Roughly 50% of this funding supported cross-departmental collaborations. Average external funding expended annually per BU CS tenure-track faculty member to support research puts us on solid footing with departments in the peer group of NRC (1995) rank top-36 departments. BU CS ranked seventh in the Chronicle of Higher Education Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index in 2006 – ahead of U. Maryland at College Park, Cal Tech, and UNC at Chapel Hill.

Scholarly Research Quality – Subfields: Many of our faculty are active in multiple subfields and across disciplinary boundaries. BU CS has a presence in the following subfields: (1) theory/algorithms, (2) cryptography/security, (3) networks, (4) programming languages/compilers, (5) systems, (6) databases/data mining, and (7) computer vision. BU CS has long had internationally recognized faculty in theory and

algorithms; two were recently recognized with major awards, including Leonid Levin receiving the Kolmogorov Medal. In the past three years, faculty in networks, systems, databases, and vision won best paper prizes at leading conferences, and John Byers was awarded the 2009 ACM SIGCOMM “Test of Time” award for a seminal paper in networks. Despite an adverse funding climate, faculty in all subfields secured research grants.

Nonetheless, our small faculty size vis-à-vis our peers (median = 25, BU CS = 18) limits the department’s research quality in a number of ways. First of all, two key subfields are underrepresented in BU CS: systems and cryptography/security. The breadth and importance of these subfields requires greater coverage than we can currently provide, and may undermine the competitive positioning of our degree programs. More strikingly, the department lacks entire subfields that are thriving in most peer departments. The most notable omissions are computer graphics, machine learning, robotics, artificial intelligence, and computer-human interfaces. Finally our small size limits our ability to work in interdisciplinary areas such as computational biology.

Education/Pedagogy: Our lecturers and tenure-track faculty are dedicated and passionate teachers, and student evaluations data bear this out. CS has a number of excellent faculty role models for teaching. Among them, Azer Bestavros was recently recognized with the BU United Methodist Scholar/Teacher of the Year Award for 2010.

Our faculty has a deep commitment to the mentorship of graduate students. One indicator of the intensity and quality of this mentoring is the rate of publication with graduate students: on average, each faculty member publishes three papers per year with a student. Moreover, during the past five years, five of these papers garnered best paper awards at leading conferences. Our faculty also engages undergrads in research activities that enhance students’ education outside the classroom. On average, ten undergrads per year were engaged in research projects with faculty during the past three years.

Computer Science is a fast-changing field; this drives BU CS faculty to continually rethink computer science education, for majors and non-majors alike. One example is the newly introduced quantitative literacy course MA/CS 109, which is team-taught in the style of the Core Curriculum by faculty members from CS and Math.

3. Assessment of Academic Programs

Undergraduate Education: The Computer Science program provides an education to last a lifetime in a fast-changing field. While making sure that our students are competitive on the job market the moment they graduate, our principal goal is to teach problem solving techniques that apply regardless of short-term technology trends.

The enrollments in our undergraduate degree programs have followed the well-recognized national cyclical trend. Industry demand for CS graduates is strengthening, and the US Bureau of Labor Statistics forecasts that there will be rapid growth in CS jobs over the next decade. In agreement with this prediction, CS course enrollments have increased by an impressive 10% per year, over past three years.

We are committed to providing a quantitative literacy education to all undergrads. Over 60% of undergrad enrollments in CS courses are from non-majors. We offer eight divisional studies courses, six of which are targeted specifically to non-majors.

Nationwide, CS has a notable shortage of women and ethnic minorities, when compared with proportions in the general population of the US. This is widely cited as an important challenge to our nation’s future ability to lead in scientific innovation, and compete in the international marketplace. The profile of our undergraduate population roughly matches the national averages in terms of representation of women and ethnic minorities, but we aim to do better, as summarized later in this section.

Doctoral Programs: The goal of our PhD program is to produce researchers capable of forging future directions, teaching effectively, and creating new scientific knowledge broadly across the discipline of computer science.

The US News ranking of our doctoral program improved from 60 in 2002, to 48 in 2008. Despite our limited size and resources, we are competitive in attracting students from top institutions. One indicator of the

strength of our students is the number of best paper prizes they have won over the past five years (6). During the past three years, CS awarded 18 doctoral degrees. Nine (50%) of these graduates took jobs in academia (seven on the tenure track), one started a company, and the rest took jobs in industry.

Nearly all of our PhD students are supported by fellowships or TF/RA scholarships. As a result, our PhD student population often follows the state of the economy and investments in science, and thus, declined by about 25% over the last four years. Given the recent indication of economic recovery and a return to investment in CS, we anticipate an imminent increase in our capacity to recruit and retain a larger graduate population.

We have been making progress toward a more diverse student population, though we hope to further increase our enrollment of US citizens and permanent residents, and especially of women and minorities. To that end, we have applied for US Dept. of Education's GAANN grant to increase available fellowships for these students.

Masters Programs: The goal of the MA program is to produce computer professionals with a deep knowledge of CS principles and with hands-on experience in at least one CS subfield, enabling them to participate in and lead the development of new technology.

Our MA program (including BA/MA students) is relatively small (30% of our graduate program). Most of our MA students have a weaker CS background than their supported PhD counterparts. On the other hand, students in the BA/MA program are among the best of our undergrads, and some go on to doctoral programs at top schools.

We are planning an overhaul of our MA program in the next 1-2 years to increase the quality and diversity of the admitted students, as outlined later in this document.

Outreach Initiatives: The department engages in activities that are aimed towards "broadening the pipeline" of diverse students in CS and encouraging them to pursue careers in computational fields. For instance, we give open houses for local high schools, BU Summer Pathways, and Girl Scout troops. We are active in the National Empowering Leadership Alliance, and joined with Tufts, U Mass Boston, Brandeis, and Boston College to propose to the NSF a new Computing Undergraduate Scholars Program that is aimed at preparing students from underrepresented populations for graduate education.

3. *Assessment of Facilities*

BU CS is spread out over three antiquated buildings. The inadequate physical condition of these buildings creates distinctly uncomfortable environmental conditions for faculty, staff, and students, and has resulted in the loss of expensive equipment due to flooding, leaking roofs, and failing air conditioning. At the same time, there has been a space squeeze; BU CS space grew by 30% while the number of applied and systems faculty (whose research groups require significant lab and office space) quadrupled. The lack of space limits our ability to attract new research funding, and has serious implications on our ability to retain faculty and students. Moreover, the disconnected nature and dilapidated state of our space negatively impacts the experience of our undergrad students, and sends a negative message to visitors, prospective students, parents, and sponsors.

4. *Assessment of Collaboration with Other Academic Units*

Over the past three years, BU CS faculty have collaborated in research projects with faculty in Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Linguistics, Math and Statistics, Physics, Biomedical Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Metropolitan College, the School of Management, and various centers, including Bioinformatics, Information Systems Engineering (CISE), Ecology and Conservation Biology (CECB), Reliable Information Systems and Cyber Security (RISCS), and Computational Science (CCS).

BU CS faculty members have also collaborated in numerous educational initiatives and new courses. Three CS faculty members are appointed in Systems Engineering, and others have participated in the certificate and education programs of CCS, Bioinformatics, and RISCS. CS faculty jointly developed graduate courses, e.g., Quantum Computing (CS/Physics), and Methods of Scientific Computing (CS/Math), and an NSF IGERT proposal for a new doctoral program that includes CS, Economics, and the School of Management.

C. **Strategic Plan for the Future**

1. Ten-Year Plan

Faculty: Computer science is a rapidly changing discipline with fluid boundaries among its subfields. Consider just a few recent paradigm shifts: the explosion of the Web in the 1990s, the rise of collaborative and social networking in the 2000s, and most recently the emergence of computation as a service – also known as cloud computing – a paradigm that has in fact reemerged after being largely abandoned in the 1970s. In the future, computer scientists will have to address problems of analyzing massive amounts of data, utilizing distributed and connected computing resources on an unprecedented scale, ensuring individual privacy and collective security, collaborating with humans effectively, and understanding the limits of what is possible. While some answers may come from well-established subfields—such as machine learning, algorithms, computing systems, cryptography, computer graphics, human-computer interaction, and theory of computation—it is difficult to discern today what the subfields will be ten years from now.

Our goal for the next decade is to grow our tenure-track faculty towards the median size of our peers, so that we can build sufficient breadth and strength in core strategic areas and sufficient capacity for our planned research and education initiatives. To improve our agility in targeting emerging areas, we also envision the addition of limited-term faculty positions, for instance teaching post docs and sabbatical visitors. *Multiple Entry Points for CS Majors:* Upon entering college, students have varying prior computing experience. For instance, recent studies have shown that freshman women on average have less computing experience than men. To address the experience gap, we intend to design multiple entry points into the CS curriculum, with all students eventually reaching the same place in the curriculum. We expect that our attention to the experience gap will help increase levels of satisfaction among both more and less experienced students, and help increase our undergrad population. It will be difficult, however, to staff such a curriculum given our current faculty size.

Joint Degree Programs: As the need for understanding and using computing concepts extends to more disciplines, we will explore building joint programs that go beyond cross-listed courses or single-course divisional studies offerings. For example, we are working with Biology on a specialization in computational biology. The main obstacle in that effort is the number of background courses required by each discipline and the lack of resources to develop specialized courses that avoid the need for this background. If that obstacle is overcome, the resulting curriculum may serve as a model for joint programs with other sciences and social sciences.

Quantitative Literacy: To be competitive, college graduates must possess the means for understanding and using the quantitative decision-making, computational thinking, and mathematical modeling that define the information society and knowledge economy of the 21st century. Recognizing that these skills – much like writing – are essential to most intellectual endeavors, the departments of Computer Science and Mathematics and Statistics envision leading a concerted effort within CAS over the next decade to equip all BU undergraduates with a requisite level of quantitative literacy, in the traditions of a liberal arts education. Achieving this ambitious goal requires the pursuit of a spectrum of initiatives to match the varied quantitative skills of incoming students and the diversity of disciplines. Implementation of our vision for quantitative literacy at BU will require freeing up a core set of faculty from both departments. Given the needs of our own academic programs, this can only be done if additional faculty and TF lines are committed to MCS.

Doctoral Education: Historical assessments of our doctoral program indicate a progressive advancement in quality and ranking with respect to our peer departments. Maintaining this upward momentum is our primary goal. Our faculty members also participate in a range of interdisciplinary doctoral programs, and we hope to continue innovation, for instance with the proposed NSF IGERT in Economics and CS. However, focused faculty growth and appropriate facilities are needed to sustain our momentum.

Masters Education: We plan an initiative to reposition our Masters program. A small but significant change is that we will seek to convert the “MA” designation to “MS”. The purpose is to address a perception issue, particularly among international students, that the program is not technically focused. We will explore offering MS areas of specialization, perhaps associated with research/training centers that have CS faculty involvement, e.g., the RISCS program in cyber security.

Facilities: Our plan for the next decade is critically dependent on a long-term solution to our facilities crisis. There has been some progress made in the past year towards longer-term planning for CS to move to a new building. It is hard for us to envision delivering on our ambitious ten-year plan without a move-in by mid-decade.

Research Collaborations: Computer science has opened the door to paradigm shifts in almost every discipline. BU CS faculty are active in a broad range of teams across the University that are collaborating to identify, formalize, and solve “computing grand challenges” in interdisciplinary research efforts. With proper support and continued growth of our faculty, we plan to increase the scope and scale of such collaborations.

Institute for Computing: There is a wide spectrum of computing research and education taking place at BU, e.g., in the College of Engineering, School of Management, Metropolitan College, and Medical School. There are also many departments and programs in the College of Arts of Sciences where computational research is taking place. Further computing research takes place in BU centers, including RISCs, CCS, and CISE. The time has come to develop a coherent framework for computing research and education at BU, and the CS Department stands ready to lead such an undertaking. We envision an *Institute for Computing*, which has a lateral structure that represents the various computing interests on campus. Such a structure would leave academic units and centers where they fit best, but would coordinate and project an integrated picture of computing at BU, while also coordinating growth, minimizing waste, and upholding quality.

Resources Needed to Accomplish Goals: New building: We are eager to collaborate with the Dean and the university administration in fundraising. New faculty lines, including tenure-track faculty and limited-term faculty are needed. To help support this growth, we believe endowed professorships would have significant impact and may have particular appeal to prospective donors. We also believe there is capacity in our alumni-base to establish endowed graduate student fellowships. Finally, additional teaching fellowships will be needed to support new initiatives described throughout this document.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

Success in hiring top faculty candidates is one measure of evaluating progress. For our undergraduate programs, measures include statistics on the gender of our students, course enrollments, and numbers of CS majors and joint-majors. For our graduate programs, measures include numbers of applicants, quality of applicants (GPA, GREs, incoming institution), number of matriculated students, and job placements.

3. Five-Year Goals

- a. Continue growth of the CS tenure-track faculty. Help with the proposed effort to establish new endowed professorships in computer science.
- b. Devise stopgap measures for our current building. Collaborate with the College and University Administration in fundraising for the new building.
- c. Work towards facilitating multiple entry points for CS majors, investigate models for CS joint undergrad degree programs, and plan expanded numeracy initiative.
- d. Re-position our Masters program.
- e. Lead the proposed effort to establish an Institute for Computing at BU.

Department of Earth Sciences
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

We integrate geological, physical, chemical and biological approaches to understanding the past, present and future of the Earth's complex natural systems. We approach our mission as a community of faculty, postdoctoral and student-scholars interweaving research throughout all levels of our classroom-, field-, and laboratory-based curriculum. We foster discovery and seek distinction by clustering faculty with complementary research methodologies into thematic areas critical to understanding our evolving planet, its climate, and its natural resources. With our unique course offerings and research expertise, we contribute to, and share leadership of, a growing set of cross-departmental programs and initiatives in the geosciences.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

Peer institutions are hard to identify because it is highly unusual to have a small department (13 tenure line faculty, 3 research faculty) be as research active as we are. The average geoscience department has 8 faculty (source: *Status of the Geoscience Workforce*, Report Summary, American Geological Institute, 2009). However, geosciences departments will typically be either tiny (3 or 4 faculty, focused entirely on undergraduate teaching), or significantly larger (20+) with research focus. We consider the following five relatively small research-active departments (with highly regarded reputations) as our peers: the Johns Hopkins Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences (14 tenure line faculty); the Dartmouth College Department of Earth Sciences (11 tenure line faculty); the Northwestern University Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences (12 tenure line faculty); the Rice University Department of Earth Science (16 tenure line faculty); and the Washington University of St. Louis Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences (18 tenure line faculty). As an impression, we consider ourselves better than Dartmouth and Northwestern, on par with Hopkins, and just behind Washington and Rice. This is largely based on our personal knowledge of how these departments, and specific individuals in them, are perceived. Note, however, that in 2006 *we were ranked in the top ten schools in geosciences by the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education*. The other schools in the top included significantly larger powerhouses like Princeton (18 faculty), Yale (26 faculty), Berkeley (25 faculty) and Harvard (30 faculty). Perception-based *US News and World Report* ranks our graduate program below all 5 of our identified peers, but the data-based ranking in the *Chronicle* had us above all of them in that year. One goal is to return to the top ten in the *Chronicle* ranking.

2. Faculty Assessment

a. Scholarly/research quality: Note, 7 of our 13 tenure line faculty are untenured, 4 with their Ph.D's earned in between 2007 and 2009. The statistics below do not include work by or citations to Full Professors Abers and Plank who were recruited to Columbia University in 2007. Many of these statistics are thus less than they would be in a department with a typical demographic distribution.

1) Publication Rates of Tenure-Line and Research Faculty: Between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009, we published 100 peer-reviewed journal articles (not counting proceedings, abstracts etc). This is approximately 2.1 papers per year per faculty.

*2) High-quality Publication Rates of Tenure-Line and Research Faculty: Of these, specifically high profile publications include: 3 in *Nature*, 4 in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 3 in *Geology*, and 4 in *Geophysical Research Letters*, and 8 in *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*. This is approximately 0.5 "high quality" papers per year per faculty.*

3) Research Activity: A different faculty base used here than in answer 2. Here we exclude

two tenure line faculty who started at the end of 2009 and submitted their first grants in December 2009. Thus we count 11 tenure line and 3 research faculty in this analysis. Again, grants awarded to Full Professors Abers and Plank were excluded from these totals. These grant numbers represent distinct source-code grants with start dates between January 1 2007 and Dec 31 2009. As above, Total awards are divided by grant duration. Between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009, 39 new grants (new “-5” source codes) were awarded to our 14 faculty for a total of 2.55 million dollars per year. This yields an average, grant dollar generation of 180K per year per faculty member. These grants are mostly from the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Department of Energy (DOE), and Office of Naval Research (ONR).

4) Rankings: The source is U.S. News and World Report Graduate School Rankings. Our 2006 ranking is 55 with an aggregate 5 point scale score of 2.9. The peers we list above are, in order, Hopkins (21; 3.7), Rice (25; 3.6), Washington University in St. Louis (25; 3.6), Northwestern (31; 3.4), and Dartmouth (49; 3.0). According to U.S. News and World Report, these rankings are the result of a 2005 survey of department heads ranking the quality of graduate programs on a scale of 1-5. The response rate was 40%. No statistical analysis of data are made in these rankings (as are done in the Faculty Productivity Index, which ranked us in the top ten geoscience departments). We believe that in these lagging peer-based rankings will, over ten years, place us with our identified peers.

5) Awards: In 2008, Research Professor Maureen Raymo was elected Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In 2007, Associate Professor Ethan Baxter received the F.W. Clarke Award of the Geochemical Society. The award is made “to an early-career scientist for a single outstanding contribution to geochemistry or cosmochemistry, published either as a single paper or a series of papers on a single topic.” Also in 2007, Full Professor Duncan FitzGerald was made a Fellow of the Geological Society of America. Other faculty awards, prior to 2007, include: NSF CAREER award (Baxter, 2005); Guggenheim Fellowship (Raymo, 2003), the Macelwane Medal of the American Geophysical Union (Salvucci, 2003); Fellow of American Geophysical Union (Salvucci, 2003); Geological Society of London Best Young Author (Baxter, 2003); Cody Award in Ocean Sciences from Scripps (Raymo, 2002), the 50 Most Important Women in Science Award of Discover Magazine (Raymo, 2002), W.S. Bruce Medal of the Royal Society of Scotland (Marchant, 2001); Fellow of the Geological Society of America (Murray, 1999); three citations in last decade for excellence in reviewing by American Geophysical Union and American Meteorological Society.

6) Citations: According to the Web of Science, articles (not including proceedings, etc) published by the 16 tenure line and research faculty of Earth Sciences were cited a total of 3700 times between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2009. This normalizes to an average of 77 citations per faculty member per year. As mentioned above, of these 16 faculty, 4 received their Ph.D. between 2007 and 2009, and thus had little published work to potentially receive citations.

b. Scholarly/Research Quality (subfields): With recent hiring, our department has clustered faculty in three topical areas: Mantle and Crustal Processes (including the complementary fields and associated research approaches of geochemistry, seismology, geodynamics, and experimental rock physics); Terrestrial and Coastal Biogeosciences (including the complementary fields and associated research approaches of geomorphology, biogeochemistry, hydrology, soil physics, and remote sensing); and Earth History (including the complementary fields and associated research approaches of paleoclimatology, paleoceanography, and geochronology). While our department has defined thematic cluster areas, each is too small for a separation of the data requested in a.1-6 to be meaningful. Also, many faculty associate themselves with more than one subfield.

c. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions

1) *Course reviews:* Our faculty are exceptional at teaching. Average faculty evaluations in Fall 06 through Spring 09 were as follows: 4.3, 4.3, 4.2, 4.3, 4.3, and 4.4. These *excellent* evaluations are consistent across all levels of the curriculum, including divisional studies courses.

2) *Teaching Awards:* In 2004, Professor Marchant won the university Metcalf Award for Teaching. In 2007, Professor Baxter was nominated for a UROP Mentor of the Year Award. In 2006, Professor FitzGerald won the UROP Mentor of the Year Award, and in 2004 Professor Murray won the Distinguished Teaching award in the Honors Program.

3) *Academic Enhancement:* We strongly encourage undergraduate involvement in research, including publication of results in the scientific literature and presentation at national meetings. Over the last three years, with graduating classes of 15, 16 and 14 students, 6 students have taken advantage of UROP with faculty sponsorship, 5 have completed Work for Distinction, and 7 have worked in our labs and in the field through directed studies, 2 of these experiences lead to journal articles and 10 too conference presentations. In recent years, *undergraduate students* have conducted field research with BU faculty all over the world, including Alaska, Antarctica, Central America, Greece, and Maine. These are extraordinary opportunities for undergraduates, and it is one reason why our undergraduate program is so strong. On average, 40% of our majors actively participate in research at some point.

4) *Curricular and Pedagogical Innovation:* Specific examples of innovative teaching include our block-format courses, Estuaries (ES543), and Tropical Oceanography of the Caribbean Sea (ES545 and 546). Each of these courses fulfill the BU Marine Program block requirement. They combine intensive field and laboratory work with classroom teaching in a concentrated 3.5 week immersion into a research topic. Early indications are that the students, and involved faculty, love this format. We are considering adopting a similar format for the major concentration in Earth Sciences. We also recently developed two new quantitative methods graduate courses (701 and 702), required of all incoming graduate students regardless of their specific research topic. ES701 covers geomechanics (continuum fluid and solid mechanics of earth materials) and ES702 covers analysis and modeling of geological processes (modeling and geostatistics). These courses give our graduate students a common baseline understanding of modern geosciences methods, and help to develop a cohort of scholars.

d. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions by Subfield: Our department supports the curriculum of two Earth Sciences major concentrations (Earth Sciences and Environmental Earth Sciences), four interdepartmental concentrations (Geophysics and Planetary Sciences, Environmental Science, Environmental Analysis and Policy, and Marine Sciences), science breadth requirements of the college and university, the Core Curriculum, our own MA and Ph.D. degree programs, the graduate programs of Geography and Environment and Biology, and the certificate Ph.D. program in Terrestrial Biogeosciences. We do this through a set of courses, most of which apply to many more than just one of the above. We thus cannot break down questions 1-4 of section C by subfield or program. In general, our courses that fulfill the requirements of multiple programs are better enrolled, but there are so many exceptions that definitive statements cannot be made.

e. Clinical Practice: Not Applicable.

f. Major Professional and Public Service Contributions: All of our tenured faculty, and some of our junior faculty, play prominent roles in our scientific community as: Editors (*J. Hydrometeorology*) and Associate Editors (e.g., *J. Geophysical Research*, *J. Coastal Research*, *Antarctic Science*, *Am. J. Science*, *G.S.A. Bulletin*) of major journals; participants in federal funding review panels (e.g. NSF, NASA, NOAA); and committee members on advisory boards (e.g. National Research Council, International Ocean Drilling Program, American Geophysical Union).

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education (goals, quality, enrollments, and outcomes): We have sole responsibility for two concentrations (Earth Sciences, Environmental Earth Sciences), and we provide coursework, advising, and leadership in three interdepartmental concentrations (Geophysics and Planetary Science, Marine Science, Environmental Science). Our students receive a rigorous, quantitative education in earth sciences (as opposed to the more descriptive approach offered in some colleges) in generally small classes (~10 to 40). We integrate field and laboratory based methods throughout the curriculum. We have an active undergraduate/graduate student organization (BUGS), which has served as a great source of feedback on the undergraduate experience. Our students are happy with the program, in particular the teaching (B.2.c.1), small classes, and research opportunities.

Examples of undergraduate student outcomes over the past few years include the following in a three year period: 25 (of ~45) went on to graduate school in geosciences (nearly all went on to their school of choice, including, for example, Brown, U. Penn, MIT, Washington University in St. Louis, UT Austin, UC Davis, BC, UNH, University of Maryland, University of Rhode Island, Colorado School of Mines, SUNY Stonybrook). Two subsequently won NSF graduate fellowships (at MIT and UNH). Almost all were awarded either teaching fellowships or research assistantships. *Over 80% of the students who went on to graduate school) completed research with BU faculty in the labs or in the field, demonstrating the impact of hands-on research experience for future success.*

Over the past 3 years, the numbers of majors enrolled in the three programs we administer solely have increased from the low to upper 30s. However, we also directly support through required coursework the Marine Science major, which has seen enrollments increase from the low 50s to mid 70s over this period, and the Environmental Sciences major, which has held steady at about 35 students. The other key component of our teaching mission is provide introductory courses (on the solid earth, atmosphere, oceans, climate history and change) to students in the college and professional schools to satisfy their curiosity of how the earth works and to broaden their understanding of the scientific method. Enrollments over the past three years were 975, 1055, and 1028, yielding student/faculty ratio of 10.

b. and c. Graduate Education (goals, quality, enrollments, and outcomes): Our graduate program (20 to 25 students), which mostly (80%) consists of Ph.D. students but also includes a research active, thesis-based MA program, is the core expression of our scholarly research. We focus most of our grant writing activities on developing funds to sponsor and oversee the research of our graduate students. We average 2 to 3 students per faculty, and a 3:1 ratio of external sponsored support to TF support. We have high standards for graduate admission (GRE's typically in the 700s and GPA's well above 3), and individual faculty have had success in recruiting the best students to work on specific funded projects. As discussed in section two above, we dramatically improved our graduate curriculum as part of our 2007 strategic plan through new core courses and through recent faculty growth that allowed us to offer graduate courses on a more regular basis. The quality of our students and programs can be seen in many ways, including that we have had 4 NSF graduate fellows and 1 NDSEF fellow over the past 5 years. The quality is apparent in outcomes as well: Four students received Outstanding Student Paper awards at the American Geophysical Union, and, over the past five years, *seven* of our BU advisees have gone on to *tenure-track faculty positions* (at Wellesley College, the University of Rhode Island, and North Dakota State, Temple, James Madison, University of Wisconsin, and East Carolina University). Others have gone to highly competitive named post-docs (e.g. through NSF, and at Carnegie, Woods Hole, Oregon State University, Stanford, the Byrd Polar research institute, and Colgate), and to careers at Exxon, Shell and environmental consulting firms.

d. Non degree programs: NA

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives: As discussed above, we are directly integrated into the Geophysics and Planetary Sciences major with AS, the Environmental Science major with GE, and the Marine Science major with BI and GE. New initiatives include: 1) A Ph.D. certificate program in Terrestrial

Biogeosciences with BI and GE. This is under review in the University. This program is already attracting high quality graduate students and providing a critical mass and an energizing forum for research in a new field.; 2) Discussions are ongoing with CH to design a new undergraduate major in Geochemistry; 3) Discussions are ongoing with AR about revamping the Geoarcheology program.

f. and g. International/Global and Outreach: As part of the International Polar Year (IPY), Professor Marchant's plays a leading role in PolarTrek which fosters collaborations with K-12 education initiatives. In RoBOT ("Rocks Beneath Our Toes"), Professor Baxter has engaged 40 Boston area high school students and our 30 BU undergraduates in a field and lab based mineralogy program. Several of our faculty are funded through and participate in oversight of internationally-coordinated research initiatives, including the International Ocean Drilling Program and Geotraces.

4. and 5. Facilities and Infrastructure

We recently renovated and equipped many of our research labs through direct BU support (renovations, startup accounts) and federal funding. These include our chemical labs (the Geochemistry Clean lab, the Coastal Biogeochemistry Lab, TIMS), physical labs (the Soil Physics Lab, the Rock Physics Lab), and computation and visualization labs (the Geophysics Computing Lab and the Digital Image Analysis Lab). We have renovated about 25% of our office and conference room spaces. These lab and faculty spaces serve our current needs well, though faculty growth will put increasing pressure on them. We are currently outgrowing our research, teaching and lab spaces, and this threatens our productivity in all parts of our mission. Current specific needs include: 1) expanded graduate student and postdoctoral scholar space (at least ~600 square feet); and 2) renovation and expansion of our undergraduate teaching labs (CAS B8A and B), especially as our field and lab based teaching has increased (e.g. through our offerings in the Marine Block Semester) and will, with our proposed adoption of a Block Semester for Earth Sciences, increase even more. On the whole, we have less than half the lab space, for the size of our program, than all of our competitors.

6. Collaboration with other academic units

We currently work closely with geosciences-oriented faculty in BI and GE in teaching and research initiatives, and with AS in undergraduate teaching in our joint undergraduate major. We serve an important teaching role in the Fall semester of the Natural Sciences Core Curriculum. We are exploring enhanced and new collaborations with BI, CHI, GE, CS, the Center for Remote Sensing, and the College of Engineering, under the rubric of a Geosciences initiative at BU, with possible foci related to Earth Observations (including Remote Sensing, Data Processing/Data Mining, Instrumentation), Earth Materials (e.g. materials science research), and High End Computation (including geophysical fluid mechanics and climate modeling).

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Plans

Three years ago, we described the Department of Earth Sciences as being at a crossroads (*Strategic Planning Document*, Department of Earth Sciences, 2007). Over the previous decade, with a new generation of faculty we developed a modern and rigorous undergraduate curriculum and increased our research program to the extent that in 2006 we were ranked in the top ten schools in geosciences by the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. We identified our anemic graduate curriculum (which was not supporting our sponsored graduate research) and our small size as our impediments to sustained excellence. With the support of the college and university, we have made significant progress in these areas. We have hired two new faculty, both supporting core internal interests as well as cross disciplinary programs with the departments of Biology and Geography & Environment (the BU Marine Program and the Terrestrial Biogeosciences certificate Ph.D. program). With these additional teaching resources, we have addressed the weakness in our graduate curriculum by teaching a

new set of required core courses for all our Ph.D. students. We have also already undergone (or secured resources for) massive renovation of most of our labs (see B.4).

While progress has been significant, there is remaining work to be done from our 2007 plan, as well as new goals. Over the *next five years*, we want to proceed with our strategic hiring. We have hired 2 of 4 proposed positions from the 2007 Plan. What remains from that plan is a tectonicist who will bring a field-based perspective and geochemical/geochronological approaches to studying the crust, and a paleo-climate modeler (i.e. someone using computational global circulation models to simulate past climates). The former will strengthen our solid earth group (Baxter, Dalton, Faul, Hall, and Jackson) and will contribute to Earth History research. The latter will build on our current strength in *observational* Climate History (Marchant, Murray, Kurtz, FitzGerald and Raymo), and will complement climate science strengths in Geography and Environment (Anderson, Friedl, Woodcock, Myneni, Kaufmann). *Later in the decade*, we seek to hire two additional faculty in fields to be determined based on: 1) complementing our current strengths with emerging areas of geoscience; 2) strategic hiring opportunities; and 3) responses to anticipated growth in enrollment, discussed below.

Second, we plan to undergo (*within five years*) a fundamental restructuring of our undergraduate curriculum. We plan to offer four to six of our key upper level courses in a unified field-lab-lecture format based on the highly successful Marine Program block sequence. This format (four sequential 3.5 week intensive courses) is a natural fit to the study of Earth Sciences. We know from the experiences of two of our professors in the Marine Semester that the undergraduates and the professors love the experience. This also will solve the long-standing dilemma of our Field Camp requirement, which, due to previous faculty loss, is currently met through students taking summer courses (without financial aid, and without significant curricular control by our faculty) at other institutions. The faculty position in tectonics, and renovations to and expansions of our undergraduate teaching labs (B8A and B), are required to make this goal a reality.

2. Measures

As the rest of the University has already committed to, we simply choose to be great. We believe we can. We have not yet landed back in the top ten of the Chronicle's Faculty Productivity rankings, and, having recently lost two outstanding full professors, we expect it will take some time. Seven of our faculty are junior, having been hired in the last 4 years. But as these junior faculty further develop their graduate student groups, funding bases, and labs, we anticipate returning to the level of scholarly productivity that earned us a top ten rank. We are prepared to be evaluated based on: 1) the indices appearing in Chronicle ranking (e.g. normalized publications, citations, grants, awards); 2) an administrative review our revised, experience-based block-format undergraduate major; 3) maintaining and improving our excellent student outcomes as measured by the quality of the graduate schools our majors gain admission to, and the faculty and research positions our graduate students obtain. This plan looks ten years into the future, and these are the standards to which we hold ourselves.

Department of Economics
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Our mission is to produce and transmit economics knowledge. The faculty strives to create, publish and disseminate economics research of the highest quality, and to participate in the public debate. Through a broad curriculum we teach undergraduates to apply economic tools to a wide range of social and economic issues. We rigorously train MA and PhD students to prepare them for accomplished economics careers in the academic, government, non-profit and private sectors. We desire to be an integral part of the university community and engage with other disciplines in teaching and research pertaining to economics.

B. The Present

1. Summary and Identification of Peer Group

Boston University's Department of Economics is one of the premier academic departments in the United States. In the late 1990s, BU Economics was widely viewed as among or just below the "top-10." Unfortunately, a period of turnover followed, with a subsequent decline in ranking. Since 2005, the department has largely stabilized, but it faces serious challenges in the form of inadequate faculty resources in the face of pressing student demand, an aging senior faculty, and fierce competition for top students and faculty from traditional peers and new upstarts.

The peer departments are Brown, Duke, New York University, Northwestern and Penn. Northwestern and Penn are higher ranked than BU and have been for a long time. NYU has succeeded in catapulting itself to a position among the very best departments in no small part by hiring stellar faculty away from BU. Although Brown was ranked below BU a decade ago, today the two departments frequently compete for faculty. Duke is a rapidly improving department with substantial resources and a stated goal to move up in the rankings.

2. Faculty Productivity in Economics

Faculty research productivity in economics at BU compares favorably with the peer group over the AY06 to AY08 period. The median BU faculty member was as well-published in top refereed journals as the median peer group faculty member. Median and mean citations per BU faculty member exceeded the peer group. A majority of the BU department received external funding, a figure that, as best as can be determined, was as high as the peer group. Major professional distinctions are as frequently or more frequently found at BU than at the peer group. Differences in productivity between BU and the peer group within fields (e.g. macroeconomics) are broadly similar to the overall differences.

BU Economics is highly ranked. The most up-to-date ranking is that computed by RePEC (*Research Papers in Economics*) which is based on faculty productivity. In October 2009, the BU department was ranked ninth by RePEC among all US academic economics departments compared with an average ranking of twelve for the peer departments. Half of associate and full professors at BU rank among the top 5 percent overall among economists registered with RePEC while 75 percent rank in the top 5 percent in at least one category measured by RePEC. Reputation-based rankings such as *US News and World Report's* place BU lower (see the discussion of the PhD program). A comprehensive measure that weighted productivity as well as reputation likely would rank BU Economics in the 15-25 range, with 20 being a conservative point estimate.

Three factors limit BU faculty productivity relative to the peer group. Senior faculty members, especially those in mid-career, are more productive; BU has proportionately fewer tenured professors than its peers. Rankings depend on total as well as per faculty productivity so that larger departments tend to be higher ranked; this particularly affects the BU vs. NYU comparison. Third, BU economists are less likely to publish in the most prestigious "top-five" journals (e.g. *American Economic Review*, *Econometrica*) than the top peers.

3. Academic Programs

Educational/Pedagogical Contributions: Historically, BU Economics has always taught large numbers of students; in recent years, that role has grown substantially. Between AY05 and AY08, economics credit hours increased at an average annual rate of about 7 percent per year, higher than the CAS average. As of FY09, BU Economics accounted for 8.9 percent of all CAS credit hours, the largest such program overall in CAS.

BU Economics values high quality instruction. Instructors and tenure-track faculty are audited every semester. Teaching fellows meet regularly with the faculty member in charge during the term and after to discuss their performance. Senior faculty mentors review the evaluations of their mentees to suggest improvements. Course evaluations play an important role in salary determination. Awards are given annually in recognition of outstanding teaching.

Numerical course evaluations provide a systematic basis for assessing instructional quality. For the AY06 to AY08 period, the average instructor rating was 4.06 (5 point scale), and the average course rating was 3.94/5; both are good in light of the very large average class sizes in the department (see below). In general, average differences in teaching evaluations by rank are small; however, instructors (PhD students and adjuncts) do less well on average than regular faculty. This is important because BU Economics relies more heavily on instructors than several of the peer departments in meeting its instructional demands.

Course evaluations tend to decline on average with class size in all fields, and economics is no exception. Economics class sizes are much larger than in other BU departments for courses at the same level. By reducing average class size and by substituting tenured and tenure track faculty for instructors, the hiring envisioned in this plan will substantially improve instructional quality.

Undergraduate Education: BU Economics faces unprecedented demand for undergraduate instruction. Many economics courses are routinely filled to room capacity, usually within hours or days of the opening of registration. To meet the increased demand a large and growing share of undergraduate classes are taught by instructors (adjuncts and advanced PhD students). Many instructors perform well in the classroom but as noted their performance on average is less satisfactory than regular faculty. Due to insufficient resources the department has been unable to require econometrics in its undergraduate major. As a result, economics majors at BU have fewer opportunities to conduct empirical research than students in the peer departments. Undergraduates with strong research skills fare better in the job market and in graduate school admissions.

Doctoral Program: The department operates a prestigious PhD program that attracts students from around the globe. Currently, our target is 35-40 new PhD students each year, a size that is consistent with the department's ranking and aspirations, and similar to its peers. The lively intellectual atmosphere is enhanced by weekly workshops, the annual Rosenthal public lecture, and a recently established short-term visitor series bringing to campus distinguished researchers.

Reflecting its success, the BU program was the only CAS program to be included in the top-25 nationwide by *US News and World Report* in its most recent compilation. Although gratifying, it is important to note that the USNWR ranking (24) is well below the RePEC ranking (9), and that the difference between the two – 15 places – is larger than the peer group average. Top peer departments are able to place more new PhDs in faculty jobs at highly ranked research universities, particularly those in the US. Such placements depend on the inherent quality of students as well as the number and quality of senior faculty (who do the bulk of PhD advising). Our reputation will improve when the department has greater resources to attract able graduate students (PhD funding) as well as more senior faculty.

MA Program: The department runs a stand-alone MA program that, like the PhD program, draws on students from around the globe. The program has grown in recent years because of increased demand (“the MA is the new BA”), a trend that BU is favorably positioned to benefit from by location and tradition, and because of the rising reputation of the program. The program is academically rigorous and students graduate

with substantial econometrics skills, which significantly enhances employment prospects. Aside from its inherent intellectual merits the current MA program provides a crucial source of financing for the PhD program. The current tuition revenue sharing arrangement between the College and the Department has enabled a healthy synergy between the MA and PhD programs. Any alteration of this arrangement will cause complex changes in admission policy, academic standards, administrative effectiveness and resource allocation in the immediate and longer terms. These consequences must be carefully addressed so that we will be strengthening rather than diluting the hard-won achievements and unique advantages of our graduate programs.

4. Outreach and Interdisciplinary Initiatives

BU economics faculty regularly engage in outreach through media interviews, Op-Ed articles, and policy advising at the local, national, and international levels. The department sponsors a well-attended public lecture series, “Conversations with Economists” that brings to campus important figures from the academic, business, and public sectors. We are in the early stages of establishing a visitor series that will bring to campus scholars whose work cuts across disciplines. Economics faculty members have been involved in interdisciplinary linkages with African-American Studies, Women’s Studies, geography, international relations, mathematics, law, finance, public health, and the medical campus.

5. Facilities

The department occupies a portion of 264-270 Bay State Road. Departmental spaces received much needed renovation during the summer and fall of 2009 as part of a general refurbishment of the building. Additional space was obtained from the relocation of African Studies. For current faculty the space allocation is adequate at present but additional space will be required if all hiring is accomplished as set forth in the strategic plan. The current space allocation is not adequate to meet the needs of the PhD program. A significant number of graduate TA’s do not have regular offices. Students who desire office space in the Department to work on their research cannot be accommodated.

C. Strategic Plan

To improve the quality of teaching in the face of increasing student demand, BU Economics needs to add regular (tenure and tenure-track) faculty. To move up in ranking, BU Economics needs to increase publications in “top-5” journals. To meet both objectives, this plan calls for additional faculty, some of whom should be external senior hires.

Compared to the late 1990s, BU Economics is down by about four faculty members. This shortfall is entirely accounted for by net losses of tenured faculty to peer group departments (Brown, NYU and Northwestern, in particular). Even if it recovered from the shortfall, the department would still be too small because instructional demands have increased substantially in the past ten years. Moreover, the current senior faculty, while still very productive, is aging. A decade from now, a majority of productive full professors in the department will be on the cusp of retirement, and some already will have retired.

The department seeks to add 1.5 net FTE hires per year for the next ten years. A net addition of this magnitude will increase the number of tenure and tenure track faculty to 47, a figure that while still too low will allow significant improvements to the department’s research and teaching programs. The plan also envisions raising the tenure ratio from its current level among the full-time tenure and tenure-track faculty from 63 percent to 70 percent, a figure in line with the peer group average. For a faculty of size 47, this requires 12-13 additional senior faculty members, some of whom must be external hires.

During the past 15 years, annual turnover in BU Economics has averaged about 1.5 faculty members per year. To achieve 1.5 net hires per year, we propose to hire three new faculty members annually, split (approximately) equally between new (or recent) PhD’s at the assistant professor level and tenured faculty primarily at the mid-career level. The historical tenure rate in BU Economics (the probability that a newly

hired assistant professor will remain at BU long enough to be considered for tenure and achieve it) is about 45 percent. To achieve the same expected “success” hiring new assistant professors solely would require an approximate doubling in the gross hire rate. To improve the department’s ranking, it is necessary to increase the rate of publication in “top-5” journals as well as improve PhD placements. This is best accomplished by hiring mid-career senior faculty with a track record and strong incentives to continue such publication. Senior faculty members do the bulk of PhD advising in economics as well as perform the most important service jobs. The split is equal because, given historical patterns about half of expected faculty turnover will be senior faculty.

The gross hire rate of 3 per year could be lowered by reducing normal turnover. The most reliable way to reduce turnover is to hire mid-career senior faculty. Such individuals are attracted to BU not only by the vibrant intellectual life of the department but also by the presence of MIT, Harvard, and the NBER in nearby Cambridge and by the high quality of life in metropolitan Boston. Turnover analysis indicates that externally hired senior faculty members are more likely to stay than new PhD’s or internally promoted senior faculty.

Virtually all top economics departments, including BU Economics, cover the core areas of microeconomic theory, macroeconomics, and econometrics; and in some subset of the large and small special fields (e.g. labor economics, development, and health). By and large, the BU department is well-balanced across fields with one exception – BU Economics has fewer econometricians than the peer group. At present, this shortfall is pressing at the senior faculty level in cross-section econometrics, an area of considerable and ongoing importance in the department as well as offering potential for cross-disciplinary applications. Therefore, the plan calls for focusing on cross-section econometrics. Beyond this, hiring should be driven primarily by the desire to maintain educational and research activities consistent with those undertaken by leading departments. While always keeping in mind existing strengths and synergies, this desire can be met best by hiring the strongest faculty, regardless of specialty — a policy followed by virtually all leading departments, including the peer group. That said, our hiring should be flexible enough to take advantage of serendipity as well as opportunities that may arise for collaboration with other CAS departments and other units (e.g. SMG, Law, or Medicine).

Implementation of the plan will significantly improve the department’s teaching program. The net increase in size will permit more regular faculty time to be allocated to undergraduate teaching. Class sizes will fall, improving instruction. We will be able to significantly increase the research component of the undergraduate major. It will become easier for undergraduates to form mentoring relationships with regular faculty; such faculty members are natural choices to write letters of recommendation. PhD students can expect more and better advising, with the attendant effects on placement. A larger department along with improved placements will naturally attract more capable graduate students. Increased numbers will also improve the quality of MA instruction although, in fact, most MA courses are already taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty.

The long run cost of the plan should be approximately 50 percent of the current annual faculty payroll in economics. The actual cost is likely to be less than this because, as noted, external senior hires have lower turnover than new PhD’s and as such, on a per year basis, start up costs can actually be lower for senior hires. To offset the cost of hiring new senior faculty as well as retaining existing ones, endowed chairs in economics should be a central priority for the capital campaign. Compared with the peer departments BU Economics is woefully short of chaired professorships. “Career development” or rotating chairs could be especially useful in attracting mid-career senior faculty. Another way to facilitate senior hiring is through increased slots for full-time visiting faculty.

To summarize, our strategic plan is:

- 1.5 net FTE hires per year over a ten year period, or 15 additional faculty members.
- Approximately half of new net hires should be senior faculty.
- Special focus on cross-section econometrics at the senior level.

2. *Five-year Goal*

At the end of five years, the goal is to increase the size of the economics faculty by 7.5 FTEs on net; 3-4 hires should be at the senior level, at least one of which should be in cross-section econometrics. At the end of five years, progress towards the goal can be assessed and “course corrections” made if necessary. Data gathered for this strategic plan will be updated every two years to assess progress. Existing information systems are adequate for this purpose.

Department of English
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The central mission of the Department of English is the study of literatures in English in all their complexity, from the still evolving canon of past works to newly emerging literary and cultural forms. Our field has a constantly-expanding base of knowledge and methods. We help undergraduates develop the critical, linguistic, and imaginative skills required to understand literary and cultural texts in their historical and social settings; we train students in close reading, archival research, and theoretical critique, among other scholarly methods, and constantly work to develop their ability to write clear, effective, expository prose. Our graduate program prepares students for careers in university research and secondary teaching. Unlike many programs, ours is notable for the pluralism of methods and approaches employed in our courses and our research.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Group

Weaker: Tufts; Boston College; Brandeis; Stronger: Stanford; Princeton; Michigan; Rutgers; Brown; NYU. The “stronger” departments are all vastly better funded than BU EN, in terms of faculty research support, undergraduate programs, and graduate support; all have larger faculties, except Brown and Princeton (same size as BU EN). Even the “weaker” group of Boston-area competitors have more graduate fellowship aid (e.g. Tufts).

2. Faculty

Our 35 faculty includes 30 FT faculty and 5 with partial appointments (except Creative Writing Faculty, and Redford and Burnett, whose main appointments are elsewhere).

a. Scholarly/research quality (aggregate 2006-2009). (1) Refereed Scholarly Publications. The 2007 “Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index” rated BU EN as #2 in the country (behind Harvard). EN faculty published 28 books (critical, edited collections, editions) in 2006-9, with many more in press for 2010-11 and beyond. Also: 61 articles in refereed journals, 30 book chapters in edited collections (most of which are refereed at the same standard), 43 poems, and 14 translations of poems. Books appeared from the most distinguished university presses in the world (Cambridge, Columbia, Cornell, Johns Hopkins, etc.) and the most distinguished trade presses (AC Black, Arden Shakespeare, Norton, Routledge, Wiley-Blackwell etc.).

‘High quality’ journal publications: An equally strong list of 61 journal publications. Generalist: *New Literary History, PMLA, Representations, Raritan, Yale Review*; Medieval to 1900: *Early Modern Women, English/Germanic Philology, Medieval/Early Modern Studies, Restoration, Review of English Studies, Studies in Romanticism, Victorian Review, Victorian Studies, Wordsworth Circle*; American Literature: *American Literature, Early American Studies, Nineteenth-Century Literature, William&Mary Quarterly*; Modernism: *African American Review, Boundary 2, Modern Fiction Studies, Modern Intellectual History, Modern Language Quarterly, Modernism/Modernity, Novel, Theatre Journal, Twentieth-Century Literature*; Composition: *College Composition & Communication, Rhetoric Review*; Interdisciplinary: *International Studies in Philosophy, J. of Architecture, Music&Letters*. Also: 30 book chapters (an important venue, also peer-reviewed, in the humanities). *Research grant activity/Awards.* “Grants” in the humanities come in the form of release-salary fellowships. In 2006-9, EN faculty earned these: ACLS(3)@\$60K; NEH@\$40K; Humboldt@\$42K; Harvard Society of Fellows@\$60K; Fulbright@\$20K; Mellon(2)@\$50,000; Cullman Center@\$60K=\$502K released salary. EN faculty therefore averaged about \$167K per year in outside

fellowship support/salary release. Also short-term fellowships (funded but non-salary release) from NEH, Folger Library, Clark Library. Internal fellowships/awards 2006-9: NEH Distinguished Teaching Chair; 9 Senior Fellowships, 1 Junior Fellowship (Humanities Foundation); William Fairfield Warren Distinguished Prof.; Peter Paul Prof.

Rankings. Informed observers would now rank BU EN as the 4th best department in New England, after Harvard, Yale, and Brown. BU EN was ranked 2nd in the country in the “Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index.” *US News* rankings show EN steadily gaining stature: from #54 (2001) to #46 (2009), now well ahead of BC, Tufts, and tied with Brandeis and UMass, but we will surely be ranked ahead of the latter two in 2010; moreover, Brandeis, UMass, and Tufts all declined in ratings since 2001, while BU rose. These rankings seem too low (we should be ranked in the 30s, rather than 46). What is clear is that BU EN has been on an upward track, and could go even higher with minimal additions to its resources (see **C.1.c** below).

Citations. In literary studies, citation indices are too unreliable to be useful.

b. Scholarly/research quality (subfields). EN does not have specialized subfields (except Composition – see WR report – and linguistics), and much work now is trans-Atlantic and interdisciplinary. American and modern generally are perhaps strongest.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate). (1) Course evaluations and (2) Teaching awards. EN has on its faculty 1 Metcalf Cup and Prize Winner, 3 Metcalf Award winners (1 in 2006), 2 Methodist Teacher of the Year winners, 1 Neu (2009) and 1 Gitner Teaching Award winners, 3 CAS Honors Outstanding Teacher Award winners, and 1 NEH Distinguished Teaching Professor (2005-8). EN supports an extremely strong culture of teaching; all faculty teach undergraduates, every semester, as part of their course load. We do not tolerate weak or lazy teaching. Consider the overall numerical rankings for EN (an average of 1336 evaluations per semester, which includes 100-level courses taught by Teaching Fellows) for the previous 5 semesters: *Course rating:* 4.266; 4.264; 4.292; 4.306; 4.330. *Instructor rating:* 4.424; 4.428; 4.447; 4.500; 4.482. Overall course and instructor ratings are therefore *very high:* 4.2-4.5.

Enhancement activities. EN faculty have co-published work with graduate students, supervised UROP projects, served as advisors to undergraduate literary magazines and student theatrical groups, directed reading groups, and arranged an entire panel of speakers at a major conference composed entirely of former BU undergraduate EN majors now faculty or graduate students elsewhere. The Eve Sedgwick Symposium enhanced student education and was an important outreach to the larger community, as was “Genderfest” (organized by EN faculty).

Curricular/pedagogical innovation. We are now in the third year of a 3-year analysis and revision of our overall curriculum. We established a new standing Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) in 2007-8, which surveyed peer institutions as well as all faculty and students, and formulated recommendations. In 2008-9, EN faculty voted in favor of revisions to both the graduate program and the undergraduate major. In 2009-10, we are focusing on revisions in the non-major general education courses.

d. Educational/pedagogical contributions (field) (1) Course evaluations. See **c. (1)**.

Share of enrollments. While it is impossible to break enrollments down by field in EN (many courses cover multiple periods and genres), a plurality of undergraduate enrollments are in courses broadly considered “modern.”

Academic enhancement activities. See **c. (3)** above.

Curricular and pedagogical innovation. EN faculty propose and teach new courses every semester; a full list would run several pages. The teaching culture of EN encourages innovation, as does our process for making teaching assignments. Our curriculum constantly grows to reflect new work in the contemporary area, newly discovered texts and authors in earlier periods, and new approaches in every area; interdisciplinary courses linking literature, music, and the visual arts are now common.

Clinical practice contributions: N.A.

Major professional/public service contributions: EN faculty served as presidents of major scholarly organizations; leaders of programs for MLA and the Folger Library Institute; members of editorial

boards of many journals; manuscript readers for many journals and presses; outside tenure consultants to many colleges and universities; application reviewers for Ford Foundation, Mellon, ACLS, NEH, Guggenheim, American Academy in Berlin; editors of journals; and organizers of sessions at professional conferences.

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate education. (1) Goals/purposes: to educate students in the ever-expanding literary canon; to teach them multiple techniques of reading and interpreting; and to teach them how to write lucid and correct expository prose. (2) Vitality and quality: We are continuing a review of our curriculum (see 2.c.4 above). Compared to our peers, we are strong in the canon of historical literary forms, but lag behind (even compared to “weaker” peers) in teaching minority and ethnic literatures, and literary theory. We have instituted new courses and requirements in these areas. (3) Enrollment history and projections: The creation of WR as a separate program led to a large drop in credit hours taught (from 28,502 in 2000-1 to 15,142 in 2001-2); as students worked through the system, EN credit hours taught settled in the 11,000-12,000 range. The past 3-4 years show a further slight decline in the number of 100-299 enrollments (though part of this reflects our re-numbering of EN 222/223 to 322/323). Nevertheless, data show a decline in both CAS and non-CAS students taking 100-299 non-major general education courses, and it is this area of the curriculum we are now reviewing. The number of EN undergraduate degrees awarded has averaged 124.7 per year since 2000 (high: 138 in 2000; low: 105 in 2005; most recent: 122 in 2009). CAS statistics show total majors to fluctuate between 380-420 at any given time.

b. Assessment of doctoral programs. (1) Mission: to provide professional training in literary studies, with the expectation that M.A. and Ph.D. awardees will seek teaching positions at university or secondary level. (2) Vitality and quality: We revised the graduate curriculum in 2008-9, voting for revisions to the foreign language requirement and “philology” requirement. We offer 5-7 true graduate seminars each semester, a rich curriculum for a relatively small program (clearly distinguishing us from Brandeis, BC, and Tufts). (3) Competitiveness/enrollment history: We are competitive with all but the top 15 programs *when we have fellowship aid to offer*. Student quality can be measured, in part, by the high GRE Verbal scores (the only meaningful predictor among the GRE categories) of our entering students. Entering MA students *averaged* 93% (raw score 669) and 80% on Analytical Writing; the national mean score for English was 561, the GRS average was 65% (raw score 534). No other Humanities program at BU (with more than one admitted student) came close. Recruitment selectivity: GRS data are misleading: we make 10-12 offers with financial aid to bring in 6 M.A. students from the top of our pool; to bring in an additional 6 students *without aid*, we may have to admit 40. Admission to the 6-7 Ph.D. slots each year comes almost entirely from our own M.A. class, hence the importance we stress on additional aid for the entering class. (4) Student outcomes: The placement record of PhD’s is excellent: 2006-9 tenure-track positions at Dartmouth, Northwestern, Southern Mississippi, Howard, Ryerson (Canada), Arkansas, Tulsa, and others; visiting positions at Oxford, Ohio Northern, DePaul and others. EN has a relatively long length of time to the Ph.D. at 8.2 years average (though it is lower than the national average), resulting from two causes: (1) the extremely high standards required for the dissertation (which lead to the jobs our Ph.D.’s receive); (2) lack of funding beyond the 4th year, particularly the lack of dissertation fellowships. (5) Rankings. See 2.a.4 above. (6) Student diversity. The program has had a slight majority of female students, as English does nationally. We have, regrettably, had relatively few students of color, though international students are a vital part of the program.

c. Assessment of Master’s programs. Same as b. above.

d. Other academic programs. EN support of AMNES, Creative Writing, and WR in particular – through curriculum offerings and faculty project supervision – is substantial. EN faculty have regularly served as Directors of AMNES. We initiated a joint appointment in Women’s Studies (and have proposed others), and 2 EN faculty have joint appointments in African American Studies (one

now serves as Acting Director). Support of Religious Studies, the Editorial Institute, and BU Academy is also ongoing, though less intense. One faculty member is co-leading the development of a Film Studies major with COM. We are close to finalizing a joint M.A.-J.D. program with the Law School.

e. Interdisciplinary initiatives. EN provides a strong faculty presence in CORE, AMNES, and WR, ranging from directorships and regular faculty staffing to (for WR) providing 6-7 EN-funded TF-taught sections per semester. EN faculty also participate in activities of the Comparative Literature program, Romance Studies, the Literary Translation Seminar, and the long-running Lectures in Criticism program. We have historically close connections to COM (English minors on both sides) and CFA – particularly the School of Theatre and our drama courses. Preliminary discussions on a joint Theatre Studies program with CFA have begun.

f. International/global initiatives. We play host to Visiting Scholars from all over the world every year; had we more appropriate space, we would host more of them. One faculty member taught in the Fulbright program in 2008; another has applied for 2010.

g. Outreach initiatives. One faculty member works closely with English High School in Jamaica Plain. Another is the ESL expert in the Step-Up initiative of BU (with English High School). The Sedgwick Symposium drew a substantial public audience, as did “Genderfest”; “Lectures in Criticism” has been open to the public for 25 years.

4. Facilities

The EN building at 236 BSR should be an embarrassment to Boston University: at best, it is run-down; at worst, it looks like a slum (peeling paint, falling plaster, holes in the wall, worn floors/rugs, leaking radiators, windows falling out of their frame). Meeting with students, and sometimes their parents, in such an environment demeans everyone. Much of the furniture, moreover, dates from the 1950s.

5. Other infrastructure

Aside from the building and furniture, our main needs are a good xerox machine and reasonably up to date computers; we need more of the latter.

6. Collaboration with other units

Major collaborations involve teaching (see 3.e above) with or in other programs, and (outside BU) participation in the Boston Graduate Consortium, and the Boston Graduate Consortium in Women’s Studies.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten year plan

a. Summary. EN will continue its climb up national rankings with modest additional support for faculty research and graduate aid. We will further enhance our reputation as both a teaching-centered faculty *and* as highly productive, internationally-known scholars. We also seek to strengthen our role in general education within BU, and find new ways to enhance the experience of our undergraduate majors.

b. 10-year goals. (1) Faculty. Given present enrollment patterns, the faculty needs to grow slightly by 2-3 positions, so that more can be released to participate in the University Honors College, CORE, AMNES, Women’s Studies, and WR without damaging our basic curriculum, and so that we can develop new curricular areas such as Film Studies (see below) and add strength in Contemporary Literature in English. Retirements and replacement lines will present opportunities to shift resources to different curricular/scholarly areas. We will redeploy existing lines to include broader historical and

interdisciplinary areas of study and teaching. In the next few years, we expect to reduce our current 3 medieval positions to 2, moving the third line into another area, more broadly British; the traditional 'third' Romanticism line (vacated through Wagenknecht's retirement) will be redefined as well. Of the 35 faculty included in this report, 13 are 59 years of age or older. Hence, a large percentage of EN's most productive and best-known scholars will retire in the next ten years. The impressive group of Associate and Assistant Profs. who will take over leadership of EN need additional research support in order to maintain and improve our international reputation in research. (In almost every case, our doctoral students have better research support in their first jobs than their senior EN advisors have at BU.)

Undergraduate education. Non-majors will be better served through revisions to our general education curriculum. Perhaps the greater challenge lies in finding ways to enhance the experience of our 400 majors. While EN majors find great satisfaction in their individual courses, and obviously appreciate the quality of their teachers, there is relatively little sense of belonging to a cohort; we have made a modest effort in this direction with the re-introduction of senior seminars this year. There is no place where majors can easily gather. The EN building (see 4 above) is inadequate in size to stage even modest events, and otherwise embarrassing as a site for public interaction.

Doctoral education. We do not wish to expand our graduate program in size, but to improve its already high quality; the better the placement of our graduates, the more BU EN will be known for its quality. The past 10 years have shown a clear step up in the placement record of our Ph.D. students, in terms of quality of institution. We are now poised, with very modest additional resources, to make a significant leap in the next 10 years. A package of 2 additional entry-level fellowships and 6 dissertation fellowships would allow us to compete at the highest levels in admitting a full class of 8 students, fully-funded for five years, to a unified, single-admission M.A./Ph.D. program each year – the standard resources at peer institutions.

Other academic programs, interdisciplinary initiatives, collaborations: Our already-substantial participation in AMNES, CORE, WS, and WR will continue, and we anticipate active participation in the University Honors College and further links to Comp Lit. Our links to COM and CFA will increase, particularly as the field of English generally evolves to include visual culture (we join AMNES, AH, MLCL, RS, and COM in wishing for an appointment in film). Our connections to the Editorial Institute are likely to be closer in the future as well. One area of cooperation being discussed is for an inter-departmental honors seminar for undergraduates doing Departmental Honors in their majors; such students in text-based fields – EN, MLCL, RS, CL, RN, HI – would participate in a fall seminar (with individual projects in the spring). The inter-departmental honors seminar would allow programs with relatively few DH students to combine into a critical mass of top students, and lead to more interdisciplinary work. For the major, we will investigate possible joint majors in areas into which literary studies have moved in recent years (e.g. Lit. and Cognitive Studies [BI, PS, Neuroscience]; Lit. and the Environment [ES, BI]; Lit. and Film Studies [COM, AMNES, RS, MCLC, CL, HI]; Lit. and Music [CFA, MU]; Lit. and the Visual Arts [CFA, AH]); some areas already have minors to build on.

Facilities. EN does not have the resources to renovate our building (see 4 above).

c. Resources. The greatest untapped resource for EN is alumni giving. With one exception, previous Chairs have been unable to access alumni support; in that one case, EN alumni gave the greatest amount in one year of any CAS department. It will be the goal of this and future Chairs to make much greater efforts. We are beginning with the creation of a department newsletter, which is being emailed to all alumni; an alumni page will be added to our new website this spring, with instructions on how to donate to EN. The recent Hildreth gift to Creative Writing proves that major gifts are possible, even from those who are not alumni. Frequent contact with alumni will become standard.

Foundations are another under-utilized resource for EN, with 3 possible areas of support that we will explore: (1) curriculum innovation (NEH, Mellon, Davis Foundation); (2) collaborative research (NEH, Delmas); and (3) graduate education (NEH, IHR). We will consider areas where we can compete at the highest level (e.g. collaborative research).

2. *Measures for evaluating progress*

Most national ranking systems, like *U.S. News*, are flawed in many ways, and lag behind institutional realities. Still, we would expect to see BU EN move up in the rankings – into the 30s, we would hope – and become even more clearly distinguished from our local peers such as BC, Brandeis, and Tufts. The EN Chair in 2020 will be able to count dozens of new books and articles, teaching awards, and national fellowships from his faculty. Doctoral students will continue the upward trend in placement. These upward-tracking patterns will occur very slowly without additional resources, as described above. The English Department is poised to make a significant quantum leap, if it is given modest additional resources. For our undergraduate majors, in 10 years there will be an enhanced set of major/minor options, with more interdisciplinary work becoming standard (see C.b.5,6,9).

3. *Five-year Goals*

The same as the Ten-year Goals, with two differences: (1) we expect to see a real increase in alumni giving in the next few years; (2) development of joint majors will move slowly and carefully; Film Studies (or “Visual Culture”) is the likely first program. The metrics of evaluation would be the same: high faculty productivity in publications and fellowships; continued excellence in teaching; even greater participation in intra-university programs; and even better doctoral placement.

Department of Geography & Environment
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Teaching and research missions center on the preeminent challenge facing humanity: a sustainable human existence on the planet. The goal is to explore climatic and ecological systems, how these systems combine with energy and natural resources to underpin human wellbeing, and how these insights translate into policy. This research supports one of the nation's premier environmental programs that prepare students for graduate school or employment in the private, public and nonprofit sectors. Our curriculum also prepares young people to become creative and contributing members of a society that faces a diverse array of personal and social challenges related to sustainability.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. *Academic Peer Group*

This ranking is based on general perceptions within the department—no formal rankings are available. Comparisons are difficult because GE does not ‘look like’ traditional Geography Departments. We have no political geographers and faculty that focus on economic/transportation geography have retired/left (see below). Furthermore, faculty generally do not publish in Geography journals but rather publish in journals associated with traditional disciplines, such as economics and biology, from which many GE faculty have advanced degrees. This is a strength--GE can pursue its mission in a way that would be daunting to a traditional Geography Department. Consequently, BU faculty perform at the highest level relative to Geography faculty at other institutions, based on objective measures such as citations.

2. *Faculty Assessment*

This assessment includes eleven full-time (and two research) faculty who were present continuously from fall 2006 through fall 2009. The GE faculty is highly productive, as measured by the quantity and quality of their research, extramural funding, and teaching evaluations. Similarly, GE faculty consistently earn high marks from students, as measured by the CAS teaching evaluations.

3. *Academic Programs - Assessment of Undergraduate & Graduate Education*

The environmental undergraduate concentrations and graduate MA degree programs are flourishing, as indicated by expanding class offerings, rising class enrollments, and concentrators, whereas the number of geography concentrators is stable at modest levels. The increasing number of students interested in the environment also generates a rapid increase in the number of BA/MA students. Overall interest in the environment, combined with the increasing number of concentrators, provides a balanced distribution of enrollments among 100, 200, 300, and 400 level courses. We anticipate these numbers to increase, given the current interest in energy and the environment, and the new undergraduate and graduate programs that we propose below.

GE also contributes to the larger mission of CAS and beyond. In addition to offering nine divisional studies courses, GE faculty teach courses for International Relations (IR 292), the Core Curriculum (CC 106), GE 201, which is required by the School of Education, and electives for the Energy Minor in the School of Engineering. We also offer classes on quantitative techniques (e.g. GIS, simulation modeling and time series econometrics) that enroll students from EC, BI, and SMG. Finally, GE faculty sponsor several student clubs including the Environmental Students Organization, BU Bikes, Organic gardening club, Compost-ability, etc.

4. *Interdisciplinary Initiatives within Boston University*

Eleven faculty have PhDs in seven disciplines; GE therefore embraces interaction across disciplines. Indeed, *every* faculty member in GE has a substantive collaboration with a colleague(s) in other departments at the University. Here are some notable examples.

Global Development Policy Program: The Global Development Policy Program is an interdisciplinary MA program coordinated among GE, EC, IR and SPH. This program is central to GE's strategic focus in "Sustainability Studies" with addition foci on climate change adaptation and policy. GE currently is searching for a junior faculty member with teaching and research interests in sustainable development in support of this program.

Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range Future. GE faculty (Research Fellows) and students (fellowships) play central roles in Pardee Center symposia and its interdisciplinary, policy-relevant, and future-oriented research.

BU's Clean Energy and Environmental Sustainability Initiative (CEESI). GE faculty played a founding role in CEESI, and they actively advance its mission to address critical issues of energy supply, efficient use of energy, and effective management regarding sustainable development. This activity is central to GE's strategic focus in energy and sustainability. GE is currently searching for a junior faculty member to help support this program.

Terrestrial Biogeosciences Program: This program provides an intellectual focus for natural science faculty in CAS, and complements GE strengths in remote sensing. Organized around a Ph.D certificate program, this initiative also enhances research and teaching linkages with faculty in Earth Sciences and Biology. The program was initiated in Fall 2009, with exceptionally high faculty and student enthusiasm.

Center for Energy and Environmental Studies (CEES). GE faculty founded and continue to direct CEES, a national leader in the education and training professional MA students in the energy and environmental policy fields. CEES was one the first US graduate programs related to sustainability, and continues to be one of the few with an explicit focus on energy.

Center for Remote Sensing (CRS). GE faculty founded the Center for Remote Sensing, an international research leader in the use of satellite images and other data from airborne and ground sensors to study the Earth and its resources, including the monitoring of environmental changes due to both natural processes and human activities. GE faculty currently provide the majority of funded research in CRS.

Boston University Marine Program (BUMP): GE faculty actively participate in the BUMP by teaching two courses, as well as joint research in the Massachusetts ocean partnership program that involves both undergraduate and graduate students.

Department of Cognitive and Neural Systems, CNS Tech Lab: The tech lab at CNS serves as the home base for neural technology research and development. GE faculty members are actively engaged in CNS research and educational initiatives relating to spatial data modeling and classification models.

Center for Ecology and Conservation Biology (CECB). Seven GE faculty are Faculty Associates in CECB. They help advance the Center's goal of understanding ecology and conservation biology through research (co-PIs on CECB grants), education, and outreach.

5. Global Initiatives

Beijing Normal Ph.D. Exchange: This joint PhD program with Beijing Normal University focuses on Remote Sensing. Senior BNU students are admitted to the BU program and complete a full course of study at BU before returning to BNU to complete their program there and obtain PhDs from both institutions. Several students have been graduated and several students are still enrolled.

European Union Erasmus Mundus Program. GE is a partner in a consortium that offers an MSc in Geo-information Science and Earth Observation for Environmental Modelling and Management. Lead institutions are University of Southampton, the University of Twente in the Netherlands, Lund University, and the University of Warsaw. This collaboration has supported the exchange of student scholars and faculty members. We plan to expand the program to the PhD level and more explicit recognition of research ties.

6. Outreach

GLACIER: GE faculty are lead PIs for the NSF project GLACIER: Global Change Initiative: Education & Research. Co-PIs include faculty from ES, BI MA, and ENG. This project will train graduate students in climate change, and prepare them to communicate this knowledge in the G5-8 classroom settings, create partnerships with Cambridge and Brookline schools to integrate climate change and geospatial concepts in G5-8 curriculum, and provide training for GK-12 teachers in Cambridge and Brookline.

Encyclopedia of Earth (EoE): GE faculty founded the award-winning EoE (www.eoearth.org). EoE disseminates authoritative information about the environment to a broad global audience. The EoE has supported dozens of BU students as interns (paid and unpaid), and contains numerous articles written by GE faculty. EoE is supported directly by the Provost and the Pardee Center, and in-kind support from GE.

Professional Networking: The department hosts Facebook and Link-In sites where alumnae and current students connect regarding job opportunities and professional events.

7. Facilities

All existing offices are currently committed, which will make it difficult to house new faculty required to satisfy growing student demand and resource expansion. The physical plant is in disrepair; water leaks are rampant during rain events and the HVAC system produces fluctuating (and sometimes unworkable) temperature conditions.

Computing facilities are insufficient (and dated) to support the department's teaching mission. Specifically, teaching labs used by the department are woefully inadequate to meet student needs, and technical support from CAS is insufficient. Computing facilities acquired and supported by extramural funding are frequently used to support courses, which compromises both teaching and research, and would not stand an external audit.

C. Strategic Plan For The Future

1. Ten-year Plan

a. Summary of aspiration

We are a small department that sees great opportunities over the next ten years. We envision a department that (1) remains at the forefront of research, education, and outreach related to environmental science and policy; (2) uses its resources to enhance the mission of cognate units and to respond to new opportunities for collaboration across the University that undoubtedly will arise given the magnitude of challenges posed by global change and sustainability; (3) plays a central role in the implementation of the University's decision to make clean energy and sustainability one focus of its major capital campaign, and (4) provides the human and intellectual resources for the University's drive to enhance the sustainability of campus development, education, research, and operations. This future concentrates on *global change science, sustainability, land-use change, urban ecology, energy, geospatial techniques, and environmental policy*. In addition to basic research, we envision contributions critical to environmental policy formation, business planning, and communication with the broader public.

b. 10-year goals

(i) *Faculty*. GE has 3.5 open FTE's. We propose to redeploy these lines away from human geography and request a net addition of three FTE faculty (for a total of 18 FTE) to (1) satisfy surging demand for courses and degrees in sustainability (and reduce the need for adjuncts), (2) to support collaboration that enhance the productivity of faculty beyond GE, (3) to compete for expanding opportunities for external funding, and (4) to enhance University's focus on sustainability for fundraising and campus operations. Success depends on this modest increase in faculty lines because existing faculty resources are fully committed to a substantial array of

obligations within the department and across the University, and demand for GE coursework is high and cannot be met by existing faculty. Specific priority areas for total additions of 6.5 FTE include:

- Remote sensing/geospatial techniques: We have an international reputation in remote sensing and GE faculty support multiple populations, courses, degree programs and research initiatives in this area. However, we have not hired in this rapidly changing domain for well over a decade, and remote sensing technology has evolved in areas not covered by existing faculty. New hire(s) in this area will help maintain the quality and standing of our program and support new collaborative endeavors with ES, AS, and BI.
- Ecosystem and global change science: To support the *terrestrial biogeosciences program*, we will add faculty in the area of ecosystem processes who will offer courses and develop research activities focusing on the ecological dimensions of global change science. This focus will foster research and teaching collaborations with BI and ES.
- Energy, society and environment. Expansion in the area of energy is required to keep pace with the increasing demand for courses and degrees in this field and to leverage ongoing investments in the cross-college energy initiative, CEESI, and the Pardee Center. Energy could be a vital area for fundraising.

These positions will be defined and filled in collaboration with Departments that share common research interests, curricula, and aspirations. For example, remote sensing is of interest to faculty in GE, AR, ES, AS, and BI, and will support interdisciplinary research initiatives such as the Terrestrial Biogeosciences Program, the proposed Earth Observatory, and the Boston ULTRA-Ex project (see below). The energy position will support the CEESI initiative, the cross-college (or University-wide) energy curriculum, and will contribute to the Global Development MA program and the Energy Transitions Project in the Pardee Center. The terrestrial biogeosciences position will have direct linkages with faculty in BI and ES, and will contribute more broadly to the wider environmental and geoscience enterprise within CAS.

(ii) *Undergraduate Education*. We propose to jointly develop and administer a concentration in Sustainability Studies (and associated BA/MA program) in collaboration with other departments in CAS. This concentration will replace the existing concentrations in Human Geography (The Physical Geography concentration will be merged with environmental science). We hope to use this concentration to expand interdisciplinary activities in social sciences beyond collaborations within GE. Specifically, we will design a concentration that actively involves faculty from other departments, especially the social sciences (the terrestrial geoscience initiative will provide natural science collaborations). To generate these collaborations, we will hold meetings where we challenge faculty beyond GE to envision what their discipline says about sustainability. This is the same approach used by the Core Curriculum to revise its social science offering, in which it invited faculty members to think about what their discipline has to say about inequality. This ground-up interdisciplinary emphasis will ensure that all departments are committed to the sustainability concentration and will provide an ideal way to develop innovative team-taught classes for the new Honors College. We will also develop a University-wide minor in Energy that requires students to take classes in the School of Management and the School of Engineering. To date, a CEESI subcommittee has sketched three complimentary required classes that would give students the background expected of students in each of the three schools.

(iii) *Masters Education*. We will expand the MA pre-professional degrees to include dual degree programs offered in conjunction with the School of Management and the College of Engineering. Specifically, we will develop two new programs, an MA/MBA and an MS/MBA that combines training in economics, public policy, management, and environmental science.

(iv) *Interdisciplinary Initiatives*. In the next 3-5 years, GE proposes to develop or enhance four interdisciplinary initiatives, as follows:

Urban Metabolism. GE faculty are lead investigators on an ULTRA (Urban LongTerm Research Area) exploratory award from NSF. This interdisciplinary, multi-institutional project measures and models energy and carbon flows associated with biological and anthropogenic activity to understand the urban metabolism of Boston. Because the project links economic, ecological, technical, and behavioral factors that control urban metabolism, we will use ULTRA to build collaborations with Earth Science, Biology, and other BU Departments and units thereby creating a larger, highly visible initiative that establishes Boston University as leader in understanding the sustainability of urban environments.

Energy Transitions. We will create a BU-led, international community of interdisciplinary scholars who think about the nature of historical energy transitions and who apply that understanding to build a post-oil, low-carbon world. We will use the Mellon grant to seed a larger initiative on energy transitions that will draw faculty from SMG and ENG.

Terrestrial Biogeosciences Initiative. Faculty in GE will participate in training grants, continued curriculum enhancement, annual retreats, and the newly created Terrestrial Biogeosciences seminar series. We envision an interdisciplinary program that (1) integrates teaching and research across GE, BI, ES; (2) provides a foundation for development of future strategic interdisciplinary initiatives in biogeosciences within CAS, and (3) provides a strategic focus for the Ultra-Ex project and the BU Earth Observatory (below).

Carbon Observatory. Many faculty in GE study aspects of the global carbon cycle—these efforts provide the basis for an interdisciplinary research focus on carbon flows that connect human and natural systems, and by extension, determines their sustainability. This focus also connects directly with the Terrestrial Biogeosciences program, with GE’s foci in remote sensing and energy systems, and with the Boston Ultra-Ex project. It will also serve as GE’s key focus and contribution within a larger Earth Observatory that engages the wider environmental and geoscience community in CAS.

c. Describe the resources that will be needed

- Three new faculty lines as described above.
- Conversion of Stone Science Library. Funds to convert the Stone Science Library to a mix of faculty offices, classrooms and lab space for the proposed initiatives.
- University cost-sharing to build the Carbon Observatory. Funds will be required to supplement equipment purchased with extramural funds in support of the ULTRA/Carbon Observatory. We will submit a proposal for the equipment/funds needed.
- Support for Energy Fellows. Funds to seed an Energy Fellows program, a key feature of the Dual degree MA programs described above.
- Computing facilities. Funds to upgrade the instructional computer facilities that serve our curriculum, and support instruction on other departments.
- Increased TF support. An 2-3 additional TFs over the next five years to support sharply rising enrollments in GE classes in general ‘computer lab’ classes in particular.

The highly visible these efforts lend themselves to fundraising efforts by the Development office. With the Dean’s help, together, we will develop an exciting program for potential donors.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

Undergraduate Concentration in Sustainability

- AY 2010/2011 Convene CAS wide committee to guide development and submit proposal for new undergraduate concentration.
- AY 2011/2012 Offer undergraduate concentration.

Dual degree MA programs:

- AY 2010/2011 Energy/sustainability specialization in School of Management.
- AY 2010/2011 Develop budget and fund-raising plan for Energy Fellows.
- AY 2011/2012 Submit proposal for Dual MA degree programs.
- AY 2014/2015 Matriculate first class of Dual MA degree programs.

Boston Ultra-Ex

- AY 2010/2011 Develop fund-raising plan with office of development.
- AY 2012/2013 Submit proposal for full NSF funding of ULTRA effort.

Terrestrial Biogeosciences

- AY 2010/2011 Matriculate first students; offer seminar series, organize retreat.

Carbon Observatory

- AY 2010/2011 Develop budget and fund-raising plan.

Computer Facilities

- AY 2010/2011 Develop budget and fund-raising plan.

Department of History
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

History embraces the sum of the human experience—politics, economy, religion, ideas, culture, social structures, and science. Imaginative encounters with the past, interpreting who we are and how we got to be here, should remain a foundation of undergraduate education at BU. It also provides students with the intellectual skills they require to make sense of an increasingly integrated globe, where an understanding of cultural difference is often crucial to professional success. The department also seeks to enhance its international reputation for original research, particularly in the study of political, intellectual and cultural exchanges across geographic boundaries, and to train the next generation of historians.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Peer Group

Given the wide range of specialties, with nearly every national history and time period constituting a separate sub-field, it is impossible to identify an academic peer group that applies well to all branches of the discipline. That said, in the aggregate, the department's main competitors comprise other national urban research universities that maintain top-flight research and graduate programs in some areas and general competence across a wide range of fields. Peer departments include Boston College, Emory University, George Washington University, Northwestern, NYU, Penn, Syracuse University, and USC. Of these, we would consider Northwestern, NYU, and Penn stronger, BC, Syracuse and George Washington weaker. In general, top-ranked institutions like Penn deploy much larger faculties (especially when measured against number of students and develop a reputation for clusters of expertise across a wide range of geographically and chronologically defined fields. Other top institutions leverage locational advantages (like NYU's emphasis on New York and urban history and USC's focus on Los Angeles and Latin America) or build strengths in non-traditional concentrations (such as UCLA in Chinese History, Northwestern in African, and Binghamton in Women's History). The History Department will pursue a similar strategy, at once exploiting our location in Boston and our strengths in innovative and under-served fields, especially trans-national intellectual and cultural exchanges.

2. Faculty

The BU History faculty forms an unusually productive cohort. For the period 2006-09, it ranks second to Northwestern in the core index of total books per faculty member; focusing on authored books alone, BU ranks second only to Penn. In both categories, the department not only outperforms its peers, but displays significantly greater productivity than the elite departments at Harvard and Yale. To be sure, books per faculty member is an imprecise indicator (it measures only output not quality), but in a book-driven discipline for which no accurate citation indices exist and in which few scholars publish in journals after getting tenure, it offers a fair proxy of scholarly research activity.

Over the covered period, History faculty won nineteen research awards from major national funders, including the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation (2), the ACLS (3), the NEH, the U.S. Department of Education (2), and the American Philosophical Society, and eight from international organizations, such as the DAAD, Camargo Foundation, and the American Academy of Berlin. Within the university, Brooke Blower served as Peter Paul Professor, James McCann was named among the Senior Faculty of the Pardee Center, five members of the faculty received Henderson Senior Fellowships from the Humanities Foundation, three won other internal research awards, and two won Junior Humanities Center Fellowships. That represents a rate of 0.95 total fellowships and 0.675 external fellowships per faculty member. Comparable data with other institutions or earlier periods was unavailable, but these figures can serve as a baseline for future assessment.

Department faculty also received two major book prizes: James McCann won the 2007-08 Marsh Prize of the American Society for Environmental History, and John Thornton and Linda Heywood shared the 2008 Herskovits Award of the African Studies Association. In addition, the Organization of American Historians named Nina Silber to its Distinguished Lecturers Program. In 2006, the History News Network also named Schulman among its “Top Young Historians.” Nonetheless, research productivity is not equal across the board. Just forty-five percent of the faculty accounted for all of the fellowships and research awards. The department includes a number of stalled Associate Professors—those who have not made substantial progress toward promotion to Professor since the publication of their first major work more than a decade ago—and a small number of full professors who do not pursue research programs.

Sub-Fields: With four faculty in African History, including two acknowledged world leaders, and the university’s historic relationship with Africa, African History remains the strongest sub-field in the department, widely rated by peers among the top three institutions (along with Northwestern and UCLA). The department also maintains a strong presence in United States History, particularly in 20th Century American political and cultural history, and is currently navigating a generational transition in European history, one of our historic strengths. In recent years, the department has also seized the opportunity to build a new sub-field in Asian History and create an innovative concentration of research effort in transnational cultural and intellectual changes across time periods and geographic areas. In so doing, the department is poised to develop alliances with colleagues in Religion, Area Studies, IR, Anthropology, Archaeology, and Literature.

Pedagogical Contributions: The department has long placed a major emphasis on undergraduate teaching, a priority documented not only by strong course evaluations and numerous teaching awards, but also by an active program of peer evaluation and mentoring. The department identifies course evaluations of 4.0 or higher as a level constituting excellence and scores below 3.5 as requiring attention. Since 2006, the department has maintained an average course rating of 4.1575 and an average instructor rating of 4.332. Two-thirds of the faculty has earned average evaluations in the excellent range, with the remaining third concentrated between 3.5 and 4.0 (only one faculty member scored below 3.5). Several internal and external teaching awards reflect the department’s commitment to undergraduate education. They include the 2008-11 NEH Distinguished Teaching Professorship (Wylie), the 2006 Outstanding Teaching Award of the CAS Honors Program (Nolan), the 2007 Methodist Scholar-Teacher of the Year Award (Schulman), and the 2008 H-German History Syllabus Prize (Zatlin). During the review period, History faculty created 24 new courses and participated in a variety of academic enhancement activities. Department faculty have made major contributions to developing new undergraduate programs in Muslim Studies, Asian Studies, the Writing Program, American Studies, International Relations, and the University Honors College.

Enrollments: Over the past two years, the department has experienced a significant drop in enrollments, one shared by History Departments at seven other institutions (and probably related to prevailing socioeconomic conditions; the University of Michigan, for example, reports declines of 70 percent). Annual enrollments in U.S History have fallen from a high of 900 in 2007 to 657 in Fall 2009, a drop-off of roughly thirty percent. World/Regional History also sustained a thirty percent drop from 361 to 249. In European History, enrollments fell less steeply from 613 to 551 (10%). Over the past three years, U.S. History has accounted for approximately for 45% of total enrollment, European History 38%, and World/Regional 17%.

Public/Professional Service: A broad cross-section of History Faculty has made significant contributions in professional/public service. This activity includes service on the editorial boards of journals, leadership positions and committee memberships in professional societies, testimony before Congressional committees, and outreach to the public schools. While prodigious, the department’s public service and professional service activity lacks coordination and might be more effectively gathered around core missions.

3. Academic Programs

Undergraduate Education: As the study of human experience in time, history allows us to understand the world in which we live by exploring political, social, economic, intellectual, and cultural transformations. In recent decades, the geographical scope of historical inquiry has widened considerably. No longer centered only on the “West” – and in particular on Europe and the United States – historians’ work has become

increasingly international and concerned with the interplay between different regions of the world. Though the scope of historical investigation has widened, the discipline retains its traditional place in liberal education. The study of history cultivates critical thinking by teaching students how to interpret a wide range of literary and visual texts, from government documents and personal memoirs to works of art and literature. It also fosters the ability to conceptualize problems, conduct research, and analyze large quantities of complex data. The department undertook a major review of the History concentration four years ago and introduced a new undergraduate program in 2006. The revision aimed to update the curriculum in light of the changing practices of the historical profession and the changing expertise and interests of the History Department faculty. The most ambitious elements of the new program included instituting a new field in cultural/intellectual history and providing opportunities for interdisciplinary inquiry through a series of new tracks (History and Religion, History and Art History, History and International Relations).

The department has just this month initiated another analysis of the undergraduate curriculum, led by DUS Jonathan Zatin. The current review was prompted by a routine evaluation of the new requirements for the History major. During the evaluation, it became clear that the way in which the History Department presents itself to the outside world does not always convey the History faculty's intellectual and teaching strengths to undergraduates. The overly complex requirements for the major, for example, are confusing to faculty and students alike. A cursory analysis of our undergraduate course inventory, moreover, revealed that course titles and descriptions do not always provide necessary insight into what faculty members do in the classroom or speak to current undergraduate interests. In addition to revising the major requirements by introducing more uniformity, the History Department will improve its presence on electronic media, including creating a Facebook site. It will also evaluate the breadth of the courses offered by History faculty to mediate more effectively between student interest and faculty expertise and explore possible partnerships with the Law School and the Journalism Department.

Doctoral Program: The doctoral program forms a central component of the Department's intellectual life and a crucial determinant of its profile within the profession. A vibrant graduate community helps attract top-quality young faculty as well as superior students. Moreover, successful Ph.D. candidates function as ambassadors of the department to other institutions. Despite limited resources, Ph.Ds trained by our faculty have landed fourteen tenure track positions over the past eight years. They also hold important positions in museums (Mystic Seaport), academic administration (Addis Ababa University), and foundations (Gates Foundation Global Health Initiative), as well as a large number of non-tenure track lectureships.

The data for 2006-09 reveal two significant patterns. First, placement of Ph.D.s proved far less impressive than during the previous four-year period, in which recipients of BU doctorates won tenure track appointments at Columbia, San Francisco, Michigan State, Purdue, St. Lawrence, Sonoma State, and Tougaloo College. Second, while average time-to-degree hovered around nine years, the doctoral students actually fell into two cohorts--those completing degrees in 6-7 years and those taking more than eleven. Not surprisingly, the two cohorts, fast and slow, map almost one-to-one to the separation between well-supported (those receiving Dean's or President's Fellowships) and poorly or non-supported students. Recent disadvantages in placement also reflect our paucity of resources for graduate aid. To some extent, placement data reflect market conditions (the large number of lecturers rather than assistant professorships probably speaks to the impact of the economic crisis). But until 2008, when the department received some additional fellowship money as part of retention packages, an uncompetitive aid budget (lagging significantly even behind institutions like Syracuse and GWU) hampered recruiting and retention. Even with the new fellowships, BU still remains a laggard among peer institutions, but the department has recruited two banner classes of new doctoral candidates, which we believe will return us to more normal placement results over the next several years.

The department completed its last systematic review of the doctoral program in 2003 and has gradually implemented the new requirements over the past four years. With the first offering of HI 900, the Dissertation studio, the new requirements became fully operative in fall 2009. During discussions of the strategic plan, the department also noted that the nature of the graduate program--we offer degrees in only three fields (African, Europe, U.S)—bifurcates the faculty into those that work extensively with History Department graduate students and those whose graduate teaching takes place entirely outside the department.

Other Academic Initiatives: Under the aegis of the American Political History Institute, the

department pursues several important initiatives, including a monthly seminar that attracts participants from across the region, a website, a graduate student exchange with Clare College, Cambridge University, and an annual conference, co-sponsored with Cambridge and Princeton. These programs greatly enhance the department's reputation and recruitment in U.S. History and raise its public profile. In collaboration with the Boston Public Schools, History also supervises a series of U.S. Department of Education funded outreach programs to the public schools.

4. Facilities and Infrastructure

The department suffers from a chronic shortage of space for both faculty offices and meetings. The building also requires maintenance, especially replacement of smelly, unsightly carpeting. Beyond space considerations, staffing remains the most important infrastructure need. Peer institutions average more than double the staff coverage of the BU History Department.

5. Collaboration

The department plays major roles in the university's Area Studies programs and in interdisciplinary initiatives, maintaining especially close, longstanding collaborations with AMNESP and African Studies. In recent years, History has moved aggressively to help develop new programs in Asian Studies and Muslim Studies. Department faculty offer many related courses and have been involved in the founding and expansion of the BU Center for the Study of Asia and the Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations. History professors have also been instrumental in establishing and monitoring BU's overseas programs in supporting minor concentrations in these areas of study.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

The department's main strength, broadly conceived, lies in the early modern and modern Atlantic world—the histories of specific nations and regions within that sphere as well as connections and interactions between them. Over the next ten years, the department seeks to maintain the momentum in this area. We also anticipate building a smaller but nevertheless important cluster of expertise in Asian history, focused especially on that region's contacts and exchanges with other parts of the world. Given our size and resources, ambitions to expand our research effort beyond the department's historic emphases on Africa, Europe, and the United States must inventively augment existing lines of inquiry and areas of strength rather than attempt to offer encyclopedic coverage of the globe for its own sake.

Central to these objectives, then, is the department's ability to create areas of expertise—arenas of scholarly exchange and productivity—that cut across traditional geographic and chronological boundaries. For example, the combination of African, Armenian, and Jewish historians allows us to make inventive contributions to "Diaspora Studies." Environmental and Food History is another area of potential strength. At the same time, the department has developed a critical mass of scholars focused on intellectual, religious, and cultural exchanges across national boundaries. That gives the department a distinctive, and distinctively innovative profile, at a time when the discipline is rethinking national histories along these very lines. Fortuitously, the department's historic strengths in international history, political history, and cultural/intellectual history, approaches that once seemed out-of-step with the profession, now represent its most vital fields and leave BU well positioned to move to the forefront in these areas. Our strategy is to build up "clusters" of faculty in fields where we can become top players within ten years. The History Department has excellent scholars in a variety of fields and we must ensure that traditionally strong areas such as European history are not deprived of the resources necessary to maintain their vitality. While the department faces considerable challenges in the next five to ten years, particularly the need to complete an ongoing generational transition in the faculty, we have the capacity in several fields to rise to the top rankings of departments of roughly our size.

2. Faculty and Research Profile

“*A World University.*” We believe that the department’s mission is crucial to the realization of BU’s objective to become a “global university” (as indicated in the university strategic plan). The study of history—understanding of the development of peoples and cultures, and the interactions between and among them—should be a central feature of higher education in the age of globalization. Accordingly, the department needs to retain its core assets in the field of African History (in which it houses an unusually potent concentration of leading scholars and possesses an international reputation for training scholars, NGO executives, and government officials) and European History—a historic strength of the department and the incubator of ideas and approaches that inform the entire discipline. Maintaining those strengths requires planning for retirements and faculty turnover in both fields. In European history, we also plan the redeployment of faculty resources and teaching effort toward the Modern and Early Modern periods, positions that will fortify trans-national strengths in the history of the early modern Atlantic world and the post-World War II era.

At the same time, becoming a “World University” also requires the department to develop new strengths. Drawing on recent hires in Chinese and Japanese History and the establishment of the Center for the Study of Asia (BUCSA) and the Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations, the department envisions enhancements in Asian History. This endeavor reflects the already large community of Asianists at BU, second only to Harvard and Yale in New England, the composition of our student body (which reflects growing populations of students from East and South Asia), and student interest in this part of the globe. It also reflects a strategic opportunity: although BU has not previously placed emphasis on this field, there are few major competitors in the eastern United States and the potential to develop a presence within ten years.

“*Boston’s University.*” The university’s strategic plan, *Choosing to Be Great*, simultaneously seeks to establish BU as an international campus and as “Boston’s University,” intellectually immersed in and offering service to its home region. Central to that enterprise is the maintenance of the university’s enduring academic strength in U.S. History, its public programs (such as the APhi seminar, the rotating international conferences in American Political History, the Bacon Lecture, and the annual Graduate Student Conference in U.S. History) and its collaboration with local organizations such as the Teaching American History (TAH) program with the Boston Public Schools and the Society of Colonial Wars Fellowship program.

Understanding the changing identity of Massachusetts in the 21st century—a region that plays home to large concentrations of immigrants Asia and Latin America as well as the one-time center of British North America, a capital of biotechnology as well as the birthplace of American industry—the department should also play an important role in interpreting and explaining the changing contours of the city and the region. In addition to retaining and developing the department’s current faculty and programs in U.S. history, the department seeks to deepen its identity as “Boston’s University” in the following ways:

Enhancing efforts in early American history, through the addition of faculty focused on colonial New England and the Atlantic to complement the scholarship of Professors Thornton, McConville, Capper, Chernock, Roberts, and Heywood; pursuing strategic alliances and joint funding opportunities with local institutions such as Historic New England, the Massachusetts Historical Society, the Boston Athenaeum, and the National Park Service. These might include funded research internships for undergraduate and graduate students, and joint exhibitions and publications; developing programs in urban history that would use the city an object of study. For example, in conjunction with the Boston Public Schools, the Department is launching a series of Summer Teacher Training Institutes, funded by the U.S. Department of Education; offering co-curricular Boston programs, such as walking tours for incoming Freshmen. The Department is also well placed to collaborate with colleagues in AMNESP, Archaeology, Sociology, Art History, English and even GES.

Graduate Program. Over the next decade, the department will shift toward a Ph.D. program that fully funds all doctoral students, at a nationally competitive level in number of years and size of stipends. Given our success in acquiring fellowship aid from the central administration, further deepening the pool will likely

require additional efforts to identify and land external funding. Already, the fellowship associated with *Modern Intellectual History*, and the TAH program (funded by a U.S. Dept. of Education grant) provide funding for 2-3 additional students per year. In addition to a smaller, better-supported cohort, we expect to improve time-to-degree through the new Dissertation Studio program, which offers more structured supervision of advanced graduate students.

We also intend to bring the entire faculty into graduate education. In the medium-to-long term, this project might mean offering graduate degrees in more and different fields. In the immediate future, it means re-conceiving graduate education across geographic boundaries to deploy our intellectual resources more fully and involve the entire faculty in graduate training. Faculty in Asian History, Middle Eastern History and Latin American History not only possess important subject knowledge (in such relevant fields as the history of religion, women's history, the formation of national identities, intellectual history, etc) but can also contribute distinctive approaches to historiography and research methods.

Undergraduate Education. While enrollments and the number of concentrators have dropped over the past two years, the long-term trend, over an 8-10 year period, remains healthy. With a vigorous rethinking and repackaging of the curriculum to better reflect the work that faculty actually do and create more broadly thematic, transnational courses, the department aims to restore enrollments and concentrators to the levels achieved before the economic downturn and, especially to enhance the department's contributions to undergraduate education at Boston University.

Measures for Evaluating Progress. For scholarship and faculty development, we can use indices of productivity, such as books per faculty member; grant activity; prizes. The existing rankings (such as *U.S. News*) are sketchy and deeply flawed, but an external review of the department might offer a rigorous assessment of its comparative status. For Undergraduate Education: enrollments, concentrators, surveys of graduates and alumni. For the doctoral program: year-to-degree, admission selectivity, percentage of students funded and placement of Ph.Ds. For outreach, tracking web activity and participation in public events. Compiling this data over the long term requires a major investment in staff time and effort.

3. Five-Year Goals

Over the next five years, we should move aggressively to refine the department's presentation of itself—to students, to the profession, to the community. At the same time, we must build clusters of expertise and curriculum around core goals. In pursuit of these objectives, specific five-year targets include: restoration of undergraduate enrollments and majors to 2007 levels; strengthening our contributions to the global university through new hires and coordinated initiatives in Asian history and proleptic rebuilding in African history; funding all incoming Ph.D. students; developing faculty resources and programs that augment our role as "Boston's University"; adding a colonial historian with expertise in New England.

Department of International Relations
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Boston University's Department of International Relations (BUIR) has a three-pronged mission:

- To provide a rigorous, multi-disciplinary education for aspiring and practicing international relations professionals and global citizens.
- To produce high-quality research that advances the scholarly and public understanding of contemporary global issues.
- To contribute to the solution of global problems through public engagement and participation in the policy process.

Over the next ten years the primary goals of the department are: to be a ranked school of international relations (which will entail reducing student-faculty ratios); to maintain excellence in teaching, research, and public engagement; and to formalize a program that brings senior-level practitioners to the department for teaching and service, among others outlined in this plan.

B. The Present

To fulfill its mission, BUIR offers a special blend of academic and practical applications in international affairs. To over one thousand undergraduates and one hundred and twenty-five graduate students, BUIR offers a multidisciplinary curriculum which encompasses not only the traditional study of international politics, but also draws on history, economics, environmental studies, and sociology and anthropology in order to advance the understanding of global issues. Like its peers, BUIR also maintains a strong commitment to hosting practitioners of international relations in the fields of intelligence, diplomacy, military affairs, and economic development. BUIR's overall faculty composition is approximately one-third political scientists, one-third other social scientists, and one-third practitioners. The majority of professors do not fit solely in one of these categories. Indeed, the majority of social scientists in BUIR actively engage in the policy process and many of the practitioners are prolific writers in academic and other venues.

BUIR has excelled in each of the three pillars of its mission. On teaching, our professors have averaged evaluation scores over 4.0 at every level. On scholarly output and prestige, our professors rank very well relative to our peers, especially in core fields of security studies, political economy, environment, religion, governance, and regional studies. Through public engagement, BUIR faculty serve on numerous public advisory boards and are seen as leading opinion-makers in the media and beyond.

Identification of Academic Peer Group. BUIR scores very strongly relative to its peers, but does not show up in the *Foreign Policy* rankings because it has not been a member of the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA). APSIA membership is the closest thing there is to accreditation in this field, and virtually all ranked programs are members or affiliates of APSIA. Our peer group consists of APSIA members that have both graduate and undergraduate programs. We specifically identify five schools to be our key peers: The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy (ranked 4 for graduate school, 10 for undergraduate), Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service (1, 5), George Washington University (7, unranked), American University (8, 17), University of Denver (11, not ranked). We perceive the Fletcher School and Georgetown to be much stronger programs than BUIR at present, but our analysis reveals that BUIR's quality is equal or superior to the others, even though we are not ranked. We have validated these claims through both quantitative analysis and through focus groups with students. These are the schools to which our MA students apply. They often pick BUIR over George Washington, American, or Denver (or transfer to BUIR from these places), but tend to choose Georgetown and Tufts over BUIR.

Our major deficit relative to our peers is that BUIR has the worst ratios both of full-time and part-time faculty to total students and of staff members per student or faculty. On average, BUIR has a similar number of total students as its peers, but operates with 65 percent fewer faculty, 88 percent fewer practitioners, and 85 percent fewer staff members. There are 44 students per full-time faculty member at BUIR, versus 21 on average for the comparative group.

Despite these comparisons, BUIR teaching evaluations have consistently averaged over 4.0 at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Perhaps most impressive is the fact that BUIR outperforms most of its peer schools in terms of scholarly output. BUIR ranks second in books, first in book chapters and edited books, and second in academic articles. This is a key finding that stems from the strategic planning exercise, revealing that with the establishment of a school structure for its graduate programs and proper marketing BUIR could quickly rank among the top programs in international relations in the nation.

Faculty. BUIR, like its peers, has both a multi-disciplinary faculty and a number of former ambassadors, cabinet ministers, intelligence officials, and other practitioners. Of thirty faculty, ten are political scientists, while thirteen have anthropology, economics, history, sociology, and environmental studies as their primary academic backgrounds. Seven are practitioners.

As shown in Tables 2.1-2.3, BUIR faculty are highly effective teachers and researchers. Table 3 shows that the BUIR's average teaching score is 4.2, with smaller higher level courses scoring exceptionally well. BUIR faculty have received four teaching awards since 2006.

In terms of research, BUIR's active tenure-track and tenured professors have produced 74 books, 294 academic journal articles, and 376 book chapters, better than most of our peers. Another indicator of faculty research quality is sitting on editorial boards. BUIR faculty members sit on the editorial boards of 43 peer reviewed academic journals and have received numerous awards including honorary doctorates, Fulbrights, visiting professorships, and book prizes.

Despite the lack of a formal PhD program, BUIR faculty has been successful in raising research funds. More than half of the 22 research (non-practitioner) faculty together held \$2.8 million in research grants, or \$125 thousand per research professor over the past three years, averaging \$41,000 per professor per year.

Media and Public Engagement. Whether by serving as advisors and experts for governments and international organizations, or engaging with the media, BUIR maintains a prominent public profile that helps to enhance the reputation of CAS and BU. As an example, one member of our department serves as a Speaker of the House - appointed member of the United States Commission on Religious Freedom. A former member of our department chaired the commission that created the World War II Memorial on the Mall in Washington. Another presently serves as Pakistan's ambassador to the United States. One serves on the US Department of State's Advisory Committee on International Economic Policy. Members of the department make frequent media appearances to help explain and interpret developments in world affairs. Indeed, since 2006 members of BUIR have had over 1,200 "media hits" in the form of opinion articles, quotes in major newspapers, and radio and television appearances. Reporters from major publications routinely call on members of the IR Department to comment on the events of the day.

Teaching Programs: BUIR offers an undergraduate degree, eight master's degrees, and participates in PhD programs with the Departments of Geography and Environment and Political Science.

Undergraduate. The Department of International Relations at Boston University offers a Bachelor of Arts degree in International Relations and administers the Bachelor of Arts degrees in East Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, and East European Studies, through the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS). BUIR is the

most popular undergraduate major in CAS. The department attracts many students who complete double majors or minors in IR and related majors such as political science, economics, business administration, and foreign languages. The major's multidisciplinary nature allows students to integrate these other majors and minors into their IR curricula without requiring extra semesters of study.

In terms of enrollment history and projections, the department has reached approximately 1,000 students by mid decade, up from 700 in 2000. As shown in Table 4, our faculty-student ratios for the undergraduate program have stood at 1:51 and our faculty-student advisees are at the same level of magnitude. Table 6 shows that our average class size is very large at the introductory levels but gets smaller as students get into upper-level courses. These averages however mask how BUIR compares to CAS and the range of class sizes at each level. The last column in Table 6 exhibits average class size for CAS as a whole. BUIR has four times the average in 200-level courses, two times at the 300-level, and three times at the 500-level. In terms of range, Table 6 shows that 200 and 300-level courses often have well over 300 students. Perhaps most striking is that numerous 500-level courses have close to 50 students—a source of constant complaint among graduate students and seniors.

Student outcomes. Table 6 exhibits that after graduation that approximately 20 percent of students work in some government entity, over 20 percent go on to graduate school of some form, and just over ten percent work in the private sector or in non-governmental organizations each.

Graduate programs In the “One BU” tradition, BUIR offers eight master's degrees with four different schools on campus. The department recently went through a significant curriculum that led to the creation of a new degree, major overhaul of an existing degree, and repositioning of a third. These international relations programs prepare students for a variety of careers in the international arena, including work in the U.S. and foreign governments in the fields of diplomacy, security, and intelligence agencies; jobs in the non-profit sector, such as non-governmental organizations, policy think tanks, and international charitable organizations; and a variety of careers in the private sector, such as consulting, finance, international journalism, and marketing.

Table 9 exhibits that upon graduation 32% of BUIR students go on to work in various government agencies, and 20% into non-governmental organizations, while 12% go into the private sector. The remainder go on to PhD programs (recently MIT, University of Vermont, and Michigan), into journalism, or into the legal field. Table 3 shows that BUIR's teaching evaluations since 2006 score the highest (4.5) for the graduate programs. As shown in Table 8, BUIR currently has 137 graduate students. Our maximum capacity is projected to be 175 students, so the department looks to gain 38 students largely through our new MAIA, GDP, and LAS programs.

Facilities: BUIR has three main buildings, 152, 154, and 156 Bay State Road. However, the department does not currently have an office for each faculty member. Several faculty members with primary BUIR affiliations are forced to maintain offices outside the department, while others use temporary or substandard (e.g. unlockable) offices within the department. This problem will get worse as BUIR hires needed new faculty members. The department also has only one operating classroom equipped with ample audiovisual equipment.

Centers and Collaborations with other departments-schools. In addition to our MA programs with SMG, SPH, COM, the Law School, and CAS' Economics, African Studies, and Geography and Environment departments, BUIR also cooperates with numerous centers and institutes. These include: [African Studies Center](#), International History Institute [African Presidential Archives & Research Center](#), [East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies](#), [Center for Energy & Environmental Studies](#), [Center for the Study of Asia](#), [Center for Global Health & Development](#), [Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Global Future](#), [Global Development](#), [Institute for the Study of Conflict, Ideology, & Policy](#), [Institute for the Study of Muslim](#)

[Societies & Civilizations](#), [Institute for Human Sciences](#), [International Health](#), [International History Institute](#), [Latin American Studies](#), and the [Social Science & Religion Network](#)

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

In ten years, BUIR would like to be described as a strong ‘beyond the beltway’ school of international affairs that is home to the leading scholars in a variety of disciplines, attracts top notch professionals to serve in its professors of practice program, and consistently delivers solid graduates who serve in government and beyond. To get to this point we articulate the following goals:

Overarching goals

- To become a school of international affairs at the graduate level, that is housed within the College of Arts and Sciences
- To be ranked among the top APSIA schools
- To improve our relationship with alumni for job networking and fundraising opportunities

Faculty goals

- To build on our strengths in security studies, political economy, environment, religion, governance, and regional studies
- To formalize and stabilize a program that brings senior practitioners to BUIR
- To maintain a faculty composition balance of approximately one-third political scientists engaged in our strength areas in a policy-oriented manner, one-third other social scientists, and one-third practitioners
- To continue to improve the scholarly output of faculty
- To continue to engage in the major policy debates through service and communications outlets
- To further enhance the diversity of our faculty in terms of background, gender, experience, and perspective.

Teaching goals

- To continue to provide high quality teaching to IR students
- To reduce the faculty-student ratios and class sizes at the undergraduate level by 25 percent
- To expand the number of master’s students to a level of approximately 175 students
- To improve the academic quality of incoming graduate students
- To formalize and market our “existing” PhD offerings

Facilities

- To provide every faculty member, whether permanent or visiting, full-time or adjunct, with an adequate office, minimally defined as a safe, lockable room, suitably furnished, and large enough to accommodate students for advising and counseling.

Resources: to achieve these goals the department will need to replace each retiring line and expand the number of faculty and staff, and devote significant funds to marketing, alumni relations, and facilities upgrading.

Five-year goals

Over the next five years we aim to make significant progress toward our overarching goals discussed above. First, we aim to win CAS and University approval for the formation of a School of International Relations/Affairs and to put in place a strategy that will result in BUIR being ranked in the top 20 U.S. schools

of international relations in the first five years. In these first years we will also implement a Professor of Practice Program and formalize our relationships with the departments of geography and environment, history, political science, and religion. We will also work to replace each professor that retires and have a net expansion of at least three to five professors beyond the searches already underway in 2009-10. Some of these may come through joint hires with departments/schools such as economics, geography and environment, history, political science, and/or the School of Public Health. All the while, BUIR will maintain our strong teaching record and continue our stellar scholarly output.

School and Rankings: It is exciting to learn that we already compete with many of our peers. Indeed, it is clear on the basis of scholarly output alone that BUIR would rank somewhere between 6-12 in the *Foreign Policy* IR rankings. Unfortunately, BUIR has never even been considered in the ratings because BUIR is not a school and because it has lacked a marketing effort. In 2010-11 BUIR will establish a committee to develop a new proposal for a school that works closely with the Dean's office to usher it through the proper committees. BUIR will simultaneously develop a marketing plan and appoint a liaison to APSIA who will participate in APSIA's regular meetings and recruitment drives. Funding permitting, BUIR will consider having an external audit conducted by APSIA schools to point the department in these directions.

Faculty: Over the next five years BUIR aims to build on our scholarly strengths in security studies, political economy, environment, governance, and regional studies through recruiting top-notch replacement and new faculty members, as well as coordinating with other departments and schools.

To measure this success, we aim to secure replacement for all faculty members retiring and secure 3-5 new hires in strength fields such as political economy and Africa. On scholarship, BUIR will receive a list from each faculty member of the top journals, book presses and popular publications in their field. For the portion of merit pay increases linked to scholarship, there will be an effort to link merit requirements to performance in the publications outlined above.

Practitioners: Consistent with larger university-wide efforts in this area, BUIR will formalize and stabilize a practitioner program where practitioners teach in all IR programs, graduate and undergraduate. In so doing, BUIR will commit to maintain a ratio of practitioners equivalent to approximately 25 percent of the total faculty. These professors will be senior-level practitioners. BUIR should have at least one representative in each of the following fields: diplomacy, intelligence, military, and economic development. These professors will receive appropriate contracts on a case-by-case basis with renewals based on evaluation. In terms of evaluation, practitioners will be evaluated on their teaching and service. Those who publish and contribute substantially to policy discourse will be more apt to secure renewal contracts. These professors will be full voting members of the department on all matters except tenure and promotion decisions.

Teaching: In terms of teaching, BUIR fully expects to maintain strong teaching evaluations averaging at least 4.0 or better. Thus, a more important goal in terms of improving instruction will be to reduce the faculty-student ratios and class sizes by approximately 25 percent. This will get BUIR closer to its peers but still far from the average. This will be accomplished by new hiring, as well as by conducting curricular audits with the departments of economics, history, geography and environment, and political science as well as the international health program at the School of Public Health. The audits will examine all courses at the graduate and undergraduate level with an aim of identifying courses in other schools and departments that are suitable to be cross-listed or accepted as courses for BUIR students. BUIR will also increase average GPA and GRE scores of those accepted to the MA programs from 3.3 and 1100 to 3.45 and 1250 respectively as a measure of improving the quality of our graduate students.

Facilities: Over the next five years BUIR will work with the administration to ensure that every faculty member in the department will have an office and that there will be ample room for visiting and adjunct faculty to hold office hours. In addition, BUIR will strive to ensure that BUIR teaching facilities will be

equipped with network services, projection capability, and related necessary technology. Thus, within ten years BUIR will need an additional building comparable in size to the three BUIR currently occupies. This will be needed to accommodate our growing faculty, to provide adequate teaching and seminar space, and to enable us to house all full-time BUIR faculty, as well as adjuncts and visiting scholars.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The mission of our department is the discovery and communication of mathematical and statistical knowledge. We conduct world-class research in our areas of strength in pure and applied mathematics and in statistics and probability. We engage in synergistic collaborations with other disciplines to promote scientific progress. We educate all BU undergraduates in basic numeracy and cultivate interest in the mathematical sciences among our majors and all other receptive students, including, through outreach, the K-12 mathematics community. We support the educational missions of other departments through our service courses. We prepare our graduate students for advanced careers in the mathematical sciences.

B. The Present

1. *Quality of Faculty Research*

We in Mathematics and Statistics are proud to be a Group I Department since 1995, in the rankings compiled by the American Mathematics Society (AMS) and the National Research Council (NRC). This places us in the top 23 mathematics departments at private universities, and reflects first and foremost on the quality of our faculty research. More recently, in its latest ranking in 2007, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* ranked our department seventh among all mathematics and statistics departments for faculty productivity. Further evidence of quality is provided by the research awards our faculty have received. Highlights include seven Alfred P. Sloan Foundation Research Fellowships, two Guggenheim Fellowships, two National Science Foundation Career Awards, one MacArthur ‘Genius’ Award, two faculty who are fellows of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, a fellow of the American Statistical Association, a fellow of the American Heart Association, one a member of the US National Academy of Sciences, as well as a host of other prestigious prizes. Six of our full-time faculty are women, which translates into a high, albeit unsatisfactory, percentage for a Group I department.

Because of the small size of our department, indeed we have fewer faculty than any of our peer departments, we have chosen to build strong and active groups in selected important subfields of mathematics and statistics, rather than have representation in every subfield. Our principal groups are in Dynamical Systems, Geometry and Mathematical Physics, Mathematical Biology, Number Theory, Probability and Stochastics, and Statistics. Within each of these groups, we have established and continuously strive to maintain sufficient faculty to have a strong national presence, and a unique niche in the Boston area, so as not to duplicate other local universities.

Currently, our faculty have over \$15 million of external research funding, which is approximately half a million dollars per faculty member, and which does not include the \$100 million of Framingham Heart Study funding devoted to statistics. This research funding has been obtained by faculty in all groups, and supports key areas of our missions for research, training, and outreach. The average number of refereed, original research articles in archival journals per FT faculty member per year is 3.3 (a median of 2.0), as measured over the period 2006-2008. Our success with grants and numbers of papers published per faculty member places us highest among all of our peer departments.*

Citations offer a further measure of our faculty’s scholarly productivity. The most up-to-date available comparison data ranked us 15th among all mathematics departments as measured by average number of citations per faculty per year (NRC 1995). We also collected data from the Web of Science for 2006-2008. For our Full and Associate Professors, the median is 17.5 citations per faculty member per year, and the mean is 254 (mean reflects the high citation counts of a number of our senior faculty). Also, in the short time that

* Northwestern (Math, Applied Math), Courant Institute, NYU (Math & Stats), USC (Math & Stats), Brown (Math, Applied Math), Duke (Math, Stats), CMU (Math, Stats), UC Berkeley (Math), U Washington (Math, Applied Math)

our assistant professors have been with us, the median rate at which their work is cited is already at 7 citations per faculty member per year. These citation counts are high in mathematics and statistics.

2. *Quality of Undergraduate Education and Programs*

The mathematical sciences are a central pillar of a liberal arts education and a necessary part of training in many fields. Our department has taught nearly 7000 students every year for the past 10 years, with enrollments in Fall 2009 alone numbering over 4000 students. This translates into approximately 130 students per full-time faculty member per semester — a ratio that is more than *triple* the average of Group I mathematics departments at private universities and higher than the average over all universities, public and private, at all levels, over the period 2003-2008.

The overwhelming majority of our students are in service courses, which run the gamut from 100- and 200-level up through the 500-level, and even the 700-level. These service courses fulfill divisional studies requirements and provide material necessary for majors throughout CAS, ENG, SMG, and other colleges, as well as for many graduate programs. By faculty choice, the responsibility of teaching all UG courses is spread throughout the department. This year, more than two-thirds of the FT faculty teach 100-200 level courses, and many others teach courses with significant service components at the 500- and 700-levels. In addition, we provide tutoring to students in all undergraduate mathematics and statistics courses five days a week by our TFs in the department tutoring room, and evening tutoring by our resident faculty in Claflin Hall.

The department has consistently had 250-300 majors at any given time. We provide multiple pathways for our majors, with specializations in pure and applied mathematics and in statistics, as well as joint majors for students wishing to complement their study of mathematics with computer science, economics, mathematics education, philosophy, or physics. We also offer a series of four honors courses at the freshmen and sophomore levels to our most talented majors; research opportunities through UROP, an NSF-REU supplement, and RUMBUS; coaching for the national W.L. Putnam Competition in mathematics; and other activities through the Undergraduate Mathematics Association and a student chapter of the Mathematics Association of America.

We have also been extremely active in curricular innovation, having created and helped to create a broad array of new courses for UGs over the past three years. These new courses address important issues being raised in discussions for enhancing the ‘First Year Experience’ of all of our students. For the University Honors College, we developed three new 100-level courses, which are investigation-based courses in fundamental areas of coding theory, number theory, and geometry. We have also joined with a variety of departments to create new courses, as well as new tracks for majors in other areas. Just two of the highlights are CS/MA109, jointly offered with Computer Science to provide training in numeracy and quantitative reasoning for undergraduates in the social sciences and other areas, and MA196 in the new track for undergraduates in quantitative biology. In this new decade, enrollments will increase further due to the ever-growing need for quantitative skills.

We take considerable pride in our long tradition of teaching excellence. Thirteen of our FT faculty have received university and national teaching awards. Moreover, several of the recent hires at the assistant professor level have won awards for their teaching before coming to our department. The large numbers of students whom we teach makes these awards all the more impressive, and in this respect we note that our department has the fourth highest ST/TTK ratio of all CAS departments.

Another quantitative measure of our teaching excellence is provided by the student course evaluations. The average score of all of our FT mathematics and statistics faculty is consistently over 4.2 on a 5 point scale. An overwhelming majority of our students rate the faculty as very good or excellent lecturers. Student course evaluations and faculty curricular innovations are reviewed annually by the department Merit Committee. Teaching performance is very important in our merit review process.

3. *Quality of Doctoral and Masters Programs*

To assess our doctoral program, we start by observing that our ranking as a Group I department is also

based in significant measure on the quality of the research of our PhD students and their job placement. Our recent graduates have been offered jobs at Group I departments and major foreign universities, including U. of Amsterdam, Brown, Carnegie-Mellon, UCLA, Harvard, Imperial College London, the Max Planck Institute in Bonn, U. of Michigan, Princeton, McGill U., and Rice. Additionally, two of our PhDs in the past three years were awarded NSF Postdoc Research Fellowships (with approximately 30 being awarded nationally in the mathematical sciences), and two received prestigious Clay Institute Liftoff Fellowships.

The success of our doctoral program is also critical for our undergraduate education mission. Many of our PhD students are teaching fellows, and on average each TF has responsibility for over 100 UG students each semester. The success of our TFs in teaching these large numbers of students is a crucial component of the “First Year Experience”, since a substantial amount of the contact time that an UG receives in 100- and 200-level courses is via the TF.

Over the past twelve years the department has been quite successful in obtaining GAANN grants from the U.S. Department of Education. Our most recent award will provide funding for five American graduate students. Our success with the GAANN grants can be viewed in part as recognition for our success in training women in mathematics and statistics. Indeed, during the period 1995-2003 our department led all other Group I departments for the proportion of mathematics doctorates granted that went to women, and we are presently in the top five.

In addition to our doctoral program, we have created and offer a series of successful MA programs, which provide valuable additional credentials for students preparing for a multitude of careers in which quantitative tools from mathematics and statistics are useful. First, we have an active MA program in statistics, and our students routinely find jobs in industry, with recent graduates landing high-paying positions with companies such as ESPN, Biogen Idec and Genzyme, and United Airlines. We also offer a BA/MA program with specialties in pure and applied mathematics and in statistics, as well as joint programs with BA/MA programs in Economics and Cognitive and Neural Systems. Next, our Masters of Mathematics for Teaching and associated CAGS is a new program jointly administered by the School of Education. Finally, to underscore our historical success with MA programs, we note that over the past 25 years our faculty have created and incubated MA programs in Actuarial Sciences (MET), Biostatistics (SPH), and Mathematical Finance (SMG).

4. Quality of Interdisciplinary Research Activities

To place the intensity of our current commitment to interdisciplinary research activities into proper context, we observe that over the past few decades our faculty have created and incubated entire new departments at Boston University, including Actuarial Science (Austin Lee, retired), Biostatistics (Ralph D’Agostino), Cognitive and Neural Systems (Gail Carpenter, Steve Grossberg), and Computer Science (Steve Homer and Leonid Levin, whose initial appointments were in mathematics), as well as the Mathematical Finance Program (Marvin Freedman, deceased, Andrew Lyasoff, now in SMG).

At present, our interdisciplinary research activities continue at full throttle, spanning many departments, schools, and centers in the University, as well as off-campus institutions. We are perhaps best known for our research efforts in the bio-medical sciences, bioinformatics, integrative biology, and neuroscience, which include joint grants, research projects, and sponsored training programs. Many of these activities are carried out by the Statistics and Consulting Unit, the Center for BioDynamics, and the new Boston-area Cognitive Rhythms Collaborative, all of which are led by and have substantial involvement of our faculty. Other collaborations in this direction are with the Center for Memory and Brain, the Center for Adaptive Systems, and the Center for Neuroscience. Additionally, we have faculty deeply involved in research and training endeavors with bioinformatics, computer science, CISE, engineering, geography, mathematical finance, and physics. Our reputation for interdisciplinary work is national in scope, and international especially in the directions of medicine and neuroscience.

Five of our recent hires (Carvalho, Eden, Isaacson, Kramer, Ray) are assistant professors whose research programs in mathematics and statistics involve substantial interdisciplinary components. In addition to their being essential to our core missions, which was our main reason for hiring them, these new faculty

create critical bridges for campus-wide initiatives in bioinformatics, systems biology, and neuroscience. In this direction, strong administration support for the interdisciplinary hire of Kramer was also appreciated.

The significant level of involvement among our faculty in interdisciplinary work also has a substantial impact on our educational and service missions. Not only do we ‘service’ both undergraduate and graduate students from partner departments in our upper level courses (e.g., MA561, 565, 568, 575, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 590), but we also are increasingly involved in the development of courses specifically designed as part of major multi-disciplinary educational initiatives, e.g., MA/BI196 for neuroscience and MA770 for integrative biology.

5. Quality of Outreach Activities

The quality of and demand for the department’s extramural outreach efforts can be measured by external funding, on the order of ten million dollars in the case of Focus on Math (FOM). In addition, our outreach activities have dramatically improved visibility of the University in the broader scientific community and nationally. Our 20-year old Program in Mathematics for Young Scientists (PROMYS), and its companion PROMYS for Teachers, have made the University a household word among mathematically-gifted high school students and high school teachers throughout the country. PROMYS alumni are now popping up as staff mathematicians at institutions such as Oak Ridge National Laboratory, NASA, and Microsoft Research.

Besides FOM and PROMYS, our faculty also sponsor Math Field Days (which has helped to attract 35-45 new undergraduates to the University every year for the past 17 years), the Differential Equations Reform Project, AFRAMATH symposia, a new Math for America chapter in Boston, two STEM Pipeline programs (joint with physics), the Masters of Mathematics for Teaching, as well as activities with the state of Massachusetts Mathematics and Science Advisory Council, at the Center for Talented Youth (at the middle school level), and a host of others.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future: What Remains to be Done to Become Great

We plan to continue to blaze a unique trail for achieving our education and research missions — a trail that reflects (1) our fundamental commitment to discovery in strategically chosen areas of pure and applied mathematics, and of statistics and probability, and (2) our passion for the effective communication of mathematical sciences at all levels of the university, and beyond, as quantitative reasoning continues to become infused into nearly every aspect of the fabric of the information — and knowledge-centric society of the 21st Century.

1. Achieving Greatness in Our Research Mission

Discovery is at the heart of our research mission. We have benefited from strong growth (largely via strategic hires to replace retiring faculty) in our groups in statistics, mathematical biology, and probability and stochastic processes. In addition, our dynamics group has maintained its status as an internationally-recognized group. We are grateful for the administration’s support in helping us achieve these goals, as set forth in our 2005 strategic plan.

Unfortunately, during this same time, we have fallen below critical mass in the number of faculty in pure mathematics. As recognized by all of our faculty, this is a serious threat to the intellectual coherence of our research, our undergraduate mission, our PhD training mission and our Group I status as a top tier mathematics and statistics department (since pure mathematics plays a dominant role in the rating). There is a strong, unanimous consensus that our top priority is the restrengthening of our pure mathematics research groups, before the situation deteriorates irreparably, with the understanding that our mathematical biology, probability, and statistics groups still have natural directions for growth in this decade.

Building on our existing strengths, we urge that 4 new hires be made in the coming one-five years in the core research areas of (i) number theory and (ii) geometry, the latter linked to mathematical physics. While

number theory and geometry are classical subjects, studied already by the ancients, their current importance and vitality is reflected in the fact that five of the seven million-dollar “Millennium Prize Problems” announced by the Clay Mathematics Institute in 2000 are problems in these fields. Moreover, advances in number theory and geometry have led and will continue to lead to important applications in technology as diverse as cryptography, coding theory, computer vision, and data mining.

New hires in these areas are essential to bring these two groups up to critical mass, to maintain a coherent research program in pure mathematics, and to maintain a top-notch doctoral program for students across the entire department. Ultimately, we think they are the single most important action item for us to stay in Group I.

The coming one to five years is the ideal time period to make these new hires in pure mathematics. Our other groups (e.g., dynamics, statistics, and stochastics) have recently hired; there are many outstanding candidates available in this difficult job market; and the Boston area is a major drawing card. Perhaps most significantly, the age distributions within our number theory and geometry groups are such that all of the active faculty are now in their research primes. By contrast, in six to ten years, a number will be at or past retirement age, and it will be harder for us to attract the best new faculty.

In the area of number theory, our research goal is to develop a group with critical mass, unique in its focus, unmatched in the Boston area or nationally. Of the many intellectual threads currently being pursued, two are and will continue to be particularly active and central: Galois Representation Theory and Automorphic Representation Theory. These threads are heavily intertwined, in a program known technically as the Langlands program, with ideas and methods from each field cross-pollinating the other field. The Langlands program is a, if not the, central driving force behind a large portion of international research in number theory. Our faculty (Pollack, Rohrlich, Stevens) have produced a series of seminal results in Galois Representation Theory; and, while it is a small group, it is recognized internationally for its research, including in Iwasawa Theory. The hires we propose endeavor to help our number theory program to attain critical mass. By hiring two experts in Automorphic Representation Theory, including one who specializes in modular forms, our group can take a more balanced approach in pursuit of these two inter-related threads. In fact, the group as a whole would then be far greater than the sum of its parts, since intuition and results from either side cross-fertilize the other side.

In the area of geometry, our aim is to achieve critical mass of faculty at the interface between geometry and the mathematical physics of string theory and quantum field theory (QFT). This intellectual interaction has produced outstanding recent research by Fields Medalists Connes, Kontsevich, and Witten - research that has both confirmed important laboratory results and led to surprising, deep connections between mathematics and physics. For example, Connes and our colleague Dirk Kreimer have produced breakthrough work on the algebraic structures underlying QFT calculations. We are convinced that with the right two new hires in geometry linked to mathematical physics we could offer a coherent program in this field, a program not matched by any other Boston-area institution or nationally. In particular, we think that it is most advantageous to make the first new hire in algebraic geometry and the second in analytic and geometric aspects of QFT. Moreover, we think that the ideal candidates in both areas would be ones who could also serve as critical bridges, linking the top quality, but somewhat disparate threads of, research of our current faculty (Kimura, Kreimer, Previato, Rosenberg, Szczesny) in a manner that would make this group also have critical mass and be greater than the sum of its parts.

While pure mathematics is our first priority in hiring for the next one to five years, in the longer term, say three to ten years, it will be critical that our faculty grow in certain other natural directions as well, both to maintain our strengths within the fields of mathematics and statistics and to meet additional significant quantitative needs emerging within the university. Specifically, two-four new hires in statistics and probability will be needed to build on our interdisciplinary strengths and ties in support of on-campus efforts in bioinformatics, computer science, infectious diseases, spatial analysis, and the social sciences. Similarly, one-two new hires in mathematical biology will be needed to maximize our multi-disciplinary research and interaction on campus in relation to areas like biomedical engineering, ecology, embryology, neuroscience, and physiology. Finally, in the area of pure mathematics, we also envision long-term the need to hire a third faculty member in number theory, with expertise in trace formulas, which would allow the full group to be

well-balanced across both sides of the Langlands program, and well-poised internationally to tackle central questions in number theory.

In summary, we propose 8 - 11 new hires to expand the department in the coming decade. As stated above, the new positions in number theory and geometry are essential in the short term to get these groups up to critical mass, and they are the single most important step for us to maintain our Group I ranking. The new positions in statistics, probability, and mathematical biology are requested for years three-ten, and they will be crucial components of broader campus-wide initiatives, such as in systems/integrative biology, neuroscience, and bioinformatics. In addition to these expansion hires, replacement hires will be needed when senior faculty retire, in order to maintain the strengths of our main groups. In this respect, we observe that eight years from now a quarter of our faculty will be more than 40 years past their PhDs.

2. *Enhancing the UG Experience*

The continued success of our educational mission depends on the subjects we teach and the quality of our teachers. During this new decade, we will endeavor to enhance the quality of the UG experience by pursuing: course development (so that undergraduates have more options to complete their degree requirements); a reduction in our over-reliance on instructors; further beneficial postdoctoral developments; and improvements in our TF program.

a. Enhancing the UG Experience Through Course Development. We will lead (jointly with Computer Science) a concerted effort within CAS to equip *all* Boston University UGs with a requisite level of quantitative literacy. This has already begun through MA/CS 109, and the plan for expanding on this initial success is contained in the document entitled “Quantitative Literacy at BU” (a.k.a. Numeracy), our joint response to the Extra Credit question.

We will continue to work actively with departments and programs across the university to supply the quantitative infrastructure necessary for successful interdisciplinary learning and research. Foremost, we will actively monitor the success of the three new courses for the University Honors College with emphasis on how they enhance exploratory learning and adjust them as we gain experience from the initial offerings. Second and of equal importance, we plan in the short term to create one or two new courses at the 100- or 200-levels for the new track in Quantitative Biology, as well as to monitor MA/BI 196 this Spring. We also intend to create some new advanced UG courses centered on stochastic effects in various areas of biology and on computational techniques in cellular and systems level modeling. In addition, involvement of our faculty with campus-wide curriculum development in integrative biology (bioinformatics) and neuroscience is increasing even further. Finally, in the long term, we are eager to expand – in a synergistic manner with interested colleagues – our curricular innovation efforts in directions relevant to chemistry and the social sciences.

b. Enhancing the UG Experience Through Decreased Reliance on Instructors. We think it will be very beneficial for the experience of the UGs in our courses to reduce our over-reliance on instructors. This is especially true for our large lecture courses at the 100- and 200-levels. Our instructors often teach over 300 students per semester. Hence, there is little possibility for any sense of individual attention, no matter how talented the instructor. Moreover, the average teaching evaluation score is 3.8 for our instructors, over the past four years, and this is significantly below the average of 4.2 for our FT faculty.

We think that the best way to achieve this reduction is to replace a number of instructors with postdocs. Foremost, our best (NSF and CBD) postdocs have teaching evaluations that are as high as the FT faculty average. Hence, the UGs will benefit immediately by having better teachers. Moreover, the UGs will benefit from the youth, energy, and enthusiasm that our postdocs typically bring to their teaching. Also, postdocs devote their full attention to a single class each term, so that students can get more face time. The postdocs realize that their success on the academic job market at the tenure-track level depends on their teaching credentials, not just their research.* Hence, they are

* For reference, our former postdocs already hold tenured positions at U. of Alaska, Amherst College, Cornell, U. of Houston, U. of Leiden, U. of Marseille, U. of Minnesota

anxious to work with our faculty who have been nationally recognized for their teaching excellence to gain the experience they will need to secure their next job. In summary, with the goal of quality teaching in mind, it is clear that Postdoctoral Fellows are an excellent way for us to reduce our over-reliance on instructors, and we suggest an increase from the current two to four departmental postdocs in the near future.

c. Further Beneficial Postdoctoral Development. In addition to increasing the number of postdocs from two to four in the short term, we would like to increase the duration of postdoctoral appointments from 2 years to 3 years to further improve our success in attracting the best candidates. Three-year positions are the norm at all Group I math departments, making this restriction a severe recruitment handicap. Indeed, the shorter duration of our positions was the primary reason we lost two top candidates to peer institutions in our latest search. Lengthening the duration will greatly improve our ability to attract the best the best teachers and researchers. In this respect, the CBD has been more successful in hiring by offering 3-year appointments.

We would also like to provide more support for NSF Postdoctoral Fellows. These fellowships are given to the very best US citizen Ph.D.s in Mathematics and Statistics, and recipients are welcomed as a measure of the department's research and training standing. These Postdoctoral Fellowships provide full salary for one year and half salary for two additional years with the understanding that the university will pay the other half of the salary for two years in return for 1+1 teaching. From our previous experience, NSF Postdocs are enthusiastic teachers, working hard to prepare for careers in academia, and on average the teaching evaluations of our NSF postdocs have been as high as those of our FT faculty. They are exactly the sort of people we would seek to hire, "the best of the best", and they come at half-price because of NSF support.

Finally, two additional actions will help us attract the best postdocs: (i) to name the departmental postdoctoral positions, as is the norm at our most of peer institutions. Possibilities include the Marvin I. Freedman Visiting Assistant Professorship in memory of our deceased colleague, or the XYZ Visiting Assistant Professorship if wealthy donor XYZ endows the position; and, (ii) to permit advanced postdocs to be the lead PI on grant applications.

d. Enhancing the UG Experience by Improving our Teaching Fellow Program: Our TFs are central to our UG teaching mission. The large lecture/discussion section format of many of our courses implies that most of the personal interactions UGs have during the semester are with the TF. At present, each TF is responsible for an average of more than 100 students per semester. This high number negatively impacts the experience of our UGs, especially the freshmen and sophomores in 100- and 200-level courses. The data and our TF evaluations show that, while our TFs do very good work in their highly-demanding jobs*, we could significantly enhance the UG experience by improving our TF program in the following ways:

- in the coming one-three years, provide TF support for most freshman classes with 50 or more students. This is consistent with what other major science departments in CAS provide and requires only a modest investment of five additional TFs (beyond the current 28). Moreover, this will give us greater flexibility scheduling TFs so that they can first develop their teaching skills before they are assigned to large UG classes, rather than the current necessity of "on the job" training.
- in the coming five-ten years, reduce the student/TF ratio to 75. Decreasing the ratio will require a total of 42 TFs. Most importantly, it will lead to substantial enhancements in the UG experience, in a manner that is desired by the College and the University, since TFs can spend more time with students who need help.
- place more PhD students, who serve as TFs during their first and second years, on grant support during their third and fourth years. This new additional grant support will come in the short term (one-three years) from the new research grants that our young faculty (Eden, Isaacson, Kardaras, Kramer, and Ray) have obtained and from the 2009 renewal of our GAANN grant. In the next two-six

(Duluth), NJIT, NIH, and NCSU, as well as tenure-track positions at Aix-Marseille I Univ., Duke, U. of Edinburgh, U. of Rochester, SUNY Buffalo, and US Naval Academy.

* The number of hours our TFs work is 20% more than the average among our peer departments, see Appendix H.

years, we hope for additional support from the grant proposal Kopell has been asked to submit to NSF for the new Cognitive Rhythms Collaborative, as well as from a number of other pending and planned grant submissions.

- increase the stipend for TFs so that it is commensurate with stipends offered by our peer institutions, with whom we compete for the best all around PhD students. As our track record of TF training shows, many of our better PhD students are also our better TFs.

3. Our Facilities

The increasing physical deterioration of our facilities in the MCS building and the severe space limitations hurt our ability to carry out our core missions of research and education. As a consequence:

- in the short term, we are interested in upgrades and repairs to the roof and HVAC system of our current building. Upgrades and repairs will alleviate the disruptions to our teaching and research activities due to leaks, burst pipes, and nonfunctioning AC, which have made some offices periodically unusable.
- in the coming one to three years, we are also very interested in obtaining an additional 10 offices for TFs, postdoctoral fellows, and new faculty. Ideally, we would be able to get additional space in the basement of MCS, in the area recently vacated by the PCSC. Currently, our TFs share offices with three others, and postdocs share with two other fellows. This makes it extremely difficult for them to hold office hours in their offices, because of the lack of space when students arrive and because of the disruption caused for their office mates. Providing adequate space for the TFs and postdocs will significantly improve our teaching environment.
- in the five to ten year time frame, we look forward to continuing our active involvement in planning for the new instructional building on Commonwealth Avenue.
- in the three to five year time frame, we plan to submit a SCREMS grant proposal to the NSF to update our computer facilities. Most of the current main hardware was purchased through the 1999 SCREMS grant.

Conclusion

The success of this ambitious, multi-faceted strategic plan requires tremendous will, focus, and desire, and also significant resources. Our department has the former characteristics in abundance, as well as a keen ongoing commitment to work with other departments and centers on campus, but will need help from CAS and the University for the latter. We believe, however, that our track record speaks for itself; especially since College and University support enabled us to attain the important goals stated in our 2005 strategic plan. Working together again in this new decade, we think that well-planned and well-executed investment in Mathematics and Statistics will produce abundant returns for our research and education missions. Now is an opportune time, given the high quality faculty, postdoc and doctoral student candidates available in the current economic climate.

Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Literature (MLCL)
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Modern Languages and Comparative Literature aims to produce important scholarship on the world's great literatures and cultures, past and present, including scholarship in Comparative Literature; to help students develop the critical and imaginative skills and cultural awareness needed to understand literary texts in the complexity of their aesthetic, social and historical contexts; and to prepare students to function linguistically and culturally as world citizens by acquiring competence in world languages. MLCL's courses in language and in literature have a central role in the general education of undergraduates in all BU's colleges and schools. Our scholarship and our teaching of literature, culture and language are closely intertwined, so that we take all these missions as primary.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Group

Absent comparable departments, peer comparisons within subfields are more useful. Subfields could be sliced many ways in MLCL, e.g., by classical/modern or by methodology. However, for this exercise we use region. *East Asia – peer:* Wesleyan, Tufts, Brown, and Dartmouth. *Peer-plus:* Minnesota, Wisconsin-Madison, Oregon, Wash U. St. Louis, and Ohio State. A peer-plus institution we could aspire to pull even with in East Asian is Minnesota (Asian Languages and Lit. model), which has a respected PhD program. They have 4 professors in Japanese and 3 in Chinese, all of extremely high quality; Korean is taught; the department also includes 2 South Asian literature professors. Although UMN faculty outnumber ours, a hire in Korean-cum-comparative and one more in Chinese or Japanese will put us within their range, particularly in light of BU's strength in Asian studies outside MLCL. Library resources are deeper at Minnesota: BU needs to appoint a part-time East Asian bibliographer and continue to acquire the important reprints, microfilms, and electronic materials (the Humanities Foundation has supported library purchases of this type). *German – weaker:* Tufts, Williams, BC. *German – peer:* Bryn Mawr-and-Haverford, Reed. *German – stronger:* Wellesley. Chief determinants are number of research-active faculty; German-specific support such as recurring visiting professorships, internal scholarships for students of German, and German houses with good facilities; library collection; and density of faculty working in German area studies outside the language/literature department. *Middle East – peer:* Washington University St. Louis (2 literature lines in Arabic, 2 in Hebrew, 1 in Persian); *Middle East peer-plus:* NYU (1–2 more literature lines than MLCL, notably in classical Arabic literature; area studies PhD; with the addition of a Classical Arabic scholar we will be within striking range). Only large Near Eastern Languages departments with PhD programs, such as Chicago or UCLA, offer our range of languages.

2. Faculty

10 T/TT + 16 FT lecturers (will be 12 T/TT + 19 FT lecturers as of Fall 2010).

(i) T/TT.

a. *Scholarly/research quality (aggregate 2006–09).*

(1) Refereed Scholarly Publications. T/TT faculty published 8 books (authored or edited) in 2006–09 (norm: 0.8). Also: 11 articles in refereed journals, 15 book chapters in edited collections (most of which are refereed at the same standard), and a number of translations. (Article/chapter norm: 2.6) (2) “High quality” journal publications. Journals in literary studies are not systematically ranked either overall or within subfields. (3) and (5) Grant activity / awards. 1 CAS Templeton advising award; 2 additional CAS Advising awards. Grants and other fellowships are awards in the humanities: MLCL faculty won 2 major external fellowships and numerous significant grants (total \$762,000) as well as 1 Peter Paul Professorship, 2 Humanities Foundation Junior Fellowships, and from internal sources

another \$70,000, chiefly Humanities Foundation, for libraries and special projects. (4) Rankings: n/a. (6) Citation indices are not reliable in literary studies.

b. Scholarly/research quality (subfields)

MLCL has clusters of expertise on gender and sexuality, visual culture, translation, modernism, and other subfields; but these are difficult to compare with other institutions, so here we list regional clusters. Regional subfields in MLCL are 1. East Asian; 2a. German and 2b. Middle Eastern; and 3. Russian: the three tiers are listed in decreasing order of faculty numbers and hence of aggregate research productivity. Comparative Literature is an emerging strength. (1) Refereed Scholarly Publications. East Asian: 3 faculty, 4 books, 11 articles/chapters (norms: 1.33 books, 3.75 articles). German: 2.5 faculty, 2 books, 8 articles (norms: 0.8 books, 3.2 articles). Middle Eastern: 2.5 faculty, 2 books, 7 articles (norms: 0.8 books, 2.8 articles). Russian: 2 faculty, 0 books and 1 article (norms: 0 books, 0.5 articles). (5) Awards. *East Asia*: 1 CAS Advising award; ca. \$70k grants; 1 HF Jr. Fellowship. *German*: 1 CAS Advising award; ca. \$580k grants; 1 HF Jr. Fellowship. *Middle East*: 1 Peter Paul Professorship; 1 external fellowship; ca. \$113k grants. *Russian*: 1 Templeton Advising Award.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate).

(1) Course evaluations and (2) Teaching awards. Faculty include a winner of the Metcalf Cup, a past finalist for the Metcalf, two CAS Honors Outstanding Teacher awardees. Average instructor rating for all T/TT 2006–2009 was 4.51; no faculty member averages below 4.0. (3) Enhancement activities. UROP projects; performer visits; cultural activities with regional cultural groups. Sedgwick Symposium (principal co-organizer in MLCL) combined vigorous local and national outreach with a major academic conference, and closely involved undergraduates in professional scholarly debates. (4) Curricular and pedagogical innovation. Spring 09: Comparative Literature major, minor and curriculum created; Major in Chinese approved; Minor in Arabic approved. New courses are regularly introduced in MLCL; existing courses are continually revised and updated and periodically (especially in the language sequences) gutted and rebuilt entirely. MLCL submitted three proposals for UHC seminars and two were chosen for the pilot program. One faculty member, in collaboration with CAS RN colleagues, developed a three-course sequence on secular Judaism with Posen Foundation grant.

d. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Field).

(1) Course evaluations do not show significant variation across subfields. (2) East Asian: 08-09 Share of literature enrollments 61% German: 08-09 Share of literature enrollments 9% Middle Eastern: 08-09 Share of literature enrollments 21% (using 07-08 figures for Persian to avoid LOA issue) Russian: 08-09 Share of literature enrollments 10% . (3) Not sensibly divisible by subfield. (4) Curricular and pedagogical innovation in literature courses is lively across subfields.

f. Professional and public service contributions

Faculty curated two art exhibitions at Sackler Museum (Harvard), serve as reviewers for many presses and journals and on editorial boards of several leading journals.

(ii) FT Lecturers

a. Scholarly/research quality (aggregate 2006–09).

(1) Publications. 4 scholarly books; 5 literary book translations, two of these on bestseller lists; 6 refereed scholarly articles and book chapters; one memoir.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate).

(1) Course evaluations. Faculty regularly earn excellent teaching evaluations from students as indicated by written comments and numerical measures alike. Average instructor rating for all FT Lecturers 2006–2009 was 4.51 (average identical to T/TT faculty); no faculty member averages below

4.0. (4) Curricular and pedagogical innovation. Numerous new courses or course/curriculum overhauls in Arabic, Chinese, German, Hebrew, Japanese, Korean, and Turkish. Frequent review of textbooks and supplementation of curriculum.

d. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Field).

(1) Course evaluations do not vary significantly by language. (2) Share of language enrollments (2008): East Asian 53%, German 18%, Middle Eastern 22%, Russian 6%.

e. Major professional and public service contributions.

Director and Administrator, Arabic Academy for Teachers. Secretary of American Association of Teachers of Turkic; outside evaluator for Turkish program at NYU; referees for numerous language scholarships.

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate

(1) Goals and purposes. See Mission Statement. Most courses serve concentrators and nonconcentrators alike; we also train students to read, think and write critically. (2) Vitality and quality. Undergraduate education drives MLCL; courses and programs are of very high quality. The curriculum in eight of our ten areas has been recently revised or is under constant development; reviews of Hebrew and Russian are planned shortly. A comprehensive revision of course numbering is underway. We create new programs and courses quickly and we collaborate freely. Curriculum is also distinguished by solid breadth: no comparable university offers even two years' instruction in such a range of languages, while MLCL offers three years nearly across the board; and our range of literature and culture courses is rare. (3) Enrollment history and projections. From 06-07 to 08-09, overall enrollments have increased significantly in Korean (45%), Arabic (24%), and Chinese (15%); the decrease in Japanese (-13%), partly due to the death of a popular instructor who taught a large lecture course, seems to be leveling out now. When language classes are considered alone, growth is noteworthy in Korean (up 43%), Arabic (up 31%), Chinese (up 22%), and Hebrew (up 20%). German enrollments are holding flat. Comparative Literature is too new to have relevant statistics. We expect Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean to grow and German to contract modestly as even more high schools drop German programs. Hindi-Urdu begins in 2010-11. Student quality past language-requirement level: high average GPA, high proportion of students winning scholarships abroad or admission to graduate/professional schools. Students have won Case scholarship, Trustee scholarship, Buck scholarship, Humanities Foundation fellowships, CAS Writing Award, Best Senior Essay in the Religion Dept., Fulbright scholarship, DAAD scholarship, Redhouse award in Turkish, and JET acceptance; they have entered graduate programs at Stanford, Cornell, Wash U, Harvard, SOAS, UT Austin, London School of Economics, Keio University in Japan, Yale, Penn, etc. (4) Student outcomes. We will study outcomes assessment across all language programs in the next two years. We do not systematically collect information about what majors do after graduation but wish we had the method, means and time to do so. (5) Student diversity. MLCL enrolls significantly more women than men, especially at upper levels. The presence of large numbers of heritage students in non-European languages makes for a diverse ethnic mix overall.

d. Other academic programs

MLCL does not run programs of its own other than degree programs, the Globally Speaking initiative, and our other grant-related programs. We provide significant faculty support to such programs as Core, UHC, Women's Studies, and Writing.

e. Interdisciplinary initiatives.

MLCL is key to the Asia Center (and its bid for Title VI funding), the Institute for the Study of Muslim

Societies and Civilizations (ditto), the Core Curriculum, European Studies, and Women's Studies; we run the Literary Translation Seminar and co-direct the Lectures in Criticism series. Project GO grant (including Globally Speaking) involves us with African Studies center. See Plan for Future on initiatives under development.

f. International/global initiatives

As the primary instantiation on campus of the university's global dimension, MLCL sees all its activities and missions as international in nature. We originated, administer and fund the Globally Speaking program for all students, faculty and staff. As of 2011 we have negotiated a new role as co-host of the Eastern Consortium for Persian and Turkish, a summer school for a dozen elite institutions funded by their Title VI grants. BU's study abroad programs in Morocco, China, Germany, Japan and Turkey all have depended on close involvement of MLCL faculty and we expect that any future India program will enlist Sunil Sharma similarly.

g. Outreach initiatives.

Project GO, bringing critical language education to ROTC students and providing the startup funding for Globally Speaking, connects MLCL to military education, also nationally through conferences organized by the agency in Washington, DC. Faculty have curated two art exhibits at Harvard University art museums; MLCL has a partnership with the Arabic program of Charlestown High school; our Japanese program has an indefatigable Director of Outreach connecting our students with Japanese cultural organizations, the Children's Museum, and so on; one faculty member regularly teaches at area synagogues.

4. Facilities

a. Space shortage is the primary hindrance to MLCL's fulfilling its missions. Offices: We ran out of office space two years ago. As of Fall 2010, 3–4 full-time faculty members will be housed off site, we don't yet know where. We are at the limit of what modest renovations can do to create additional office space. Unless an adjacent building can be annexed we or RO need to move. A seminar/conference room is a top priority. Ours is being sacrificed to create more faculty offices. Classrooms: Peer-plus language programs, especially in MLCL's difficult languages, have meetings five, six, or seven hours weekly. Limitations of classroom stock and schedule restrict MLCL courses to 4 hours per week. Also dorms: Colleges identified with language excellence have language residences that (i) include common rooms, (ii) exclude students who have no knowledge of the language, and (iii) are attractive to live in. BU language houses consistently meet none of these criteria and accordingly *do not function* as a component of BU's international profile. This is primarily a space issue: what's needed are renovations creating common rooms, and enough beds elsewhere on campus that non-language students need not be shoehorned into the language houses. Language Commons: a sizeable and comfortable space on campus (with a kitchen attached) would become a magnet for language students and a focal point for co-curriculars. This space could be time-shared with non-language units, though being chiefly identified as a language center would help it flourish. Library is not adequate for undergraduate study outside of European languages and literatures. Mediated classrooms are far too few for current instructional methods. Geddes Language Center is a relic of the 1970's; it has excellent plans for targeted modernizations but they need funding.

b. Language houses (dorms) are attractive potential prospects for donors, as is a Language Commons area for events, with kitchen. Reenvisioning and renovating the Geddes Language Center and mediated classrooms likewise.

6. Collaboration

Multi-year Leisure in Asia grant from Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft links us to Heidelberg University. See also (3d-e-f-g) above.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year Plan

a. Summary.

Institutionally, integration will be MLCL's watchword. MLCL aims to be a hub, a hospitable site for collaborative humanistic work reaching across the university, joining with Core, English, other languages, linguistics, other humanities departments, Women's Studies, etc., but also SED, COM, ENG, SMG in a variety of common projects. In ten years MLCL should be recognized as a nationally prominent site for the study of comparative or world literature as well as of our regional literatures. Our unusual profile is attracting notice: most Comparative Literature programs have struggled to reach beyond their European centers of gravity, and conversely scholars of non-European literatures are generally housed in "Area Studies" units where they're isolated from other literary scholars and play second fiddle to the social sciences. MLCL, by contrast, is building a powerhouse of literary scholars in non-European languages who pursue sustained dialogue with other literary scholars inside and outside the department (German, Russian, Romance Studies, English, Classics) as well as collaborations with nonliterary fields (Art History, Religion, History, Women's Studies, others). Top-quality language instruction is a primary goal in MLCL as well. BU's steadily rising profile in languages will help BU recruit students for whom language study is a priority, a virtuous circle.

b. 10-year goals.

(1) Faculty: (i) LECTURERS. Impending arrival of CAS Assistant Dean and Director of Language Instruction will do much to further alliance with other language units and promotion of following goals. FT lecturer hires need to keep pace with demand, carrying forward BU's commitment to shrink reliance on part-time lecturers to the minimum. Based on current enrollments and trends, our next consolidations (after filling current searches in Arabic and Japanese) should be lecturers in 1. Japanese, 2. Chinese, 3. Arabic, 4. Korean. A new FT lecturer line in Hindi-Urdu is already needed. Reducing class size is essential and may, depending on enrollment trends, require a few additional full-time lecturers. CAS will uphold its commitment to maintaining, for broader strategic purposes of the university, two-year-plus programs in some languages that will always be lightly enrolled, and its concomitant commitment that these languages should be anchored by at least one full-time lecturer. The number of Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer-Master Level positions must increase as quickly as possible to be commensurate with the number of lecturers who deserve them, so that promotion becomes truly merit-based. Curricular and pedagogic innovation and revision should proceed at a consistently lively rate and should extend more consistently to all language sections. Some lecturers should hold grants, benefiting instructional quality in critical languages and raising our profile. Strong support for language lecturers' professional development (conference travel, outcomes-assessment [OPI] and other training, summer curriculum-development grants, course release for major curricular overhauls or heavy administrative duties, etc.) will be a hallmark of BU's commitment to language education as a central component of its international brand.

10-year goals continued. (1) Faculty: (ii) T/TT FACULTY. MLCL's distinctiveness is its emphasis on inter-regional studies (comparative) and its concomitant fostering of dialogue among scholars of literature, non-Western as much as Western. We began life 3 years ago as the only CAS department without a graduate program. Our T/TT faculty has grown rapidly and is now near the point where graduate programs can coalesce with approximately four more faculty positions. East Asian is the cluster within MLCL that, taken together with the outstanding faculty in this area around the university, is closest to being able to start or co-develop a graduate program, one marked and marketable by its comparatist profile. We tentatively rank hiring priorities

as follows (one of the five represents the likely reallocation of a current line at retirement to a new field): (1) Korean and comparative literature (Foundation support likely for initial years of this position); (2) Classical Arabic and comparative literature; (3) East Asian popular culture (emergent, non-canonical cultural forms); (4) South Asian literature and comparative literature; (5) Language pedagogy research (combined, probably, with another field). MLCL's next two professorial retirements are likely to be in Russian (and there are only two Russian professors); it is likely that one of those lines would be best used for one of the new areas of need. The other Russian position must be replaced as Russian.

Undergraduate education. MLCL will intensify its efforts to bridge more smoothly between its own language and literature offerings, in part through a greater focus on culture, in part through new hybrid courses reading challenging texts in English translation alongside short excerpts in the original language. We will continue to pursue curricular coordination with other units within CAS and across BU with the aim of reaching more students. The Comparative Literature major and minor have just started and should significantly shape MLCL as it grows. We expect new tracks in Russian studies and German studies, revisions of the Comparative Literature and Chinese majors, revisions to the Hebrew curriculum; and new degree programs both within the department (major in Arabic; possibly Persian, South Asian) and interdisciplinary (film studies; new area studies; history and literature; religion and literature; literature and linguistics). Language: again, progress will be speeded by arrival of Director of Language Instruction. The difficult languages that MLCL teaches require that we reduce class sizes to the ADFL recommendation of 15 students (this will also help lower BU's class-size statistic in US News rankings). Language classes should meet five or more hours weekly as is standard at peer institutions. A system for training students to assist in language classes should be in place. We intend to broaden MLCL's language offerings slightly while maintaining the commitment to running each language as a stable program. Our mid-size and large language programs will continue to be distinguished by the variety of courses we offer at the upper levels. New language tracks or classes meeting the distinctive needs of heritage learners will exist wherever possible. MLCL will have thoughtfully studied how best to incorporate outcomes assessment and standards-based learning into all our language curricula and acted to implement its findings.

Doctoral education. Contingent on a small number of new hires, MLCL expects to create at least one collaborative doctoral program, likely emphasizing Asian literatures in comparative context. Planning is still in the very early stages.

Masters education. MLCL will create one or more MA programs, with a regional focus cum Comparative Literature, in collaboration with other units at BU (e.g., the Muslim Institute; the Asia Center). Planning for collaborative Arabic and Chinese MAT programs with SED is already well advanced.

Other academic programs. Our Globally Speaking initiative, bringing excitement about language study to the broader BU community, is mostly grant supported through FY11 or FY12, but we are also systematically expanding it beyond the grant. Helping Globally Speaking grow is a high departmental priority and will require shifting its funding base to internal sources or gift funds so that this signature of BU's international orientation is maintained and supported. MLCL faculty and curricula should continue to be significant contributors to Core, Writing, Women's Studies, and UHC. Hosting summer Persian/Turkish consortium (Summer 2011, 2013) will lend us luster in Middle East studies nationally.

Interdisciplinary initiatives. A Global Classical Literatures initiative is under discussion, with its appropriate form to be determined. Closer collaboration with Core could result in curricular changes or a new minor. Performance Studies could connect scholars of drama and music with the Playwrights' Theater and CFA programs. Mentioned earlier: Joint MAT programs with SED in Arabic and Chinese; film-studies program; several new interdisciplinary major/minor programs noted under "Undergrad Ed" above.

Facilities. MLCL's ability to meet its goals depends crucially on space. First, we plan to improve quality of language teaching by lowering class sizes and making class meetings more frequent as warranted,

and we need a classroom stock and class schedule that can accommodate those and other pedagogical improvements. Second, MLCL must have enough offices in one place for all our language and literature faculty, ideally in the same building as cognate units in the humanities. A seminar/conference room will allow for internal colloquia as well as seminars with invited speakers etc. The use of a large common area with kitchen will support cultural events and student functions. Finally, students across the languages should have access to language houses (dorms) in varying sizes; these must have common rooms, exclude non-language students, and be attractive to students. (9) Collaborations. MLCL will be a vital participant in the effort to secure a Title VI center in 2013 for Turco-Persian studies, a project being spearheaded by the Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations. See also “interdisciplinary” under (6) above.

Resources

SALARIES: Language lecturer salaries are already low in comparison to our Boston-area competition. MLCL has increased meeting frequency from 3 to 4 times a week with no increase in pay for lecturers. *When language classes meet 5 or more times per week we will have to increase pay.* Tenured faculty salaries, now markedly below the competition (increasing the odds of faculty leaving BU), will need to catch up. Both needs can be addressed without enormous expenditure. STAFF POSITIONS: In 2007 MLCL was created with two support staff members for 20 FT faculty. As of Fall 2010 MLCL full-time faculty numbers have increased by 55% (to 31); already two staff members are insufficient. An additional support position must come. FACULTY: See 4 new T/TT lines, priority-ranked, and 5 lecturer slots, under “10-year goals: Faculty.” Increasing the number of Senior Lecturer and Senior Lecturer-Master Level positions available is a top priority; well before ten or even five years there must be enough slots that promotion is merit-based. Consolidations of lecturer positions is also paramount (see priorities under “10-year goals: Faculty.”) PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: Language lecturers require funds for conference travel, course release for major curricular overhauls, summer materials-development stipends, and other elements supporting their professional development and movement up the new “lecturer ladder.” GLOBALLY SPEAKING: Budget will need to be shifted to internal sources as described under “Other academic programs” above. Donor funding can be sought. Other possibilities are joint support from various other entities at BU, or sponsorship by Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. LIBRARY: Any future development of an MLCL graduate program, as well as appropriate service of existing undergraduate programs, requires targeted development of the library collection, particularly in non-Western literatures and in electronic databases and resources.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

Generally: hiring, tenure, promotion and retention of superlative faculty; quality of publications; faculty fellowship awards and prizes; number and importance of invited lectures; creation of new degree programs; development of collaborations within BU; enrollments; number and quality of majors and minors. For language specifically: reduced class size, increased class-meeting frequency, and increased focus on outcomes which should in turn allow us to evaluate our programs’ own performance.

3. Five-year goals

New degrees: MAT’s, German Studies, Arabic Studies, Film Studies, Russian Studies. Appropriate enrollment in all MLCL programs. Three T/TT hires, with offices, and final draft of MA program as step toward PhD program. Tenurings in German, Japanese, Chinese, Arabic; promotions in Chinese, Japanese, German; major fellowships, grants, retentions; top-quality publications. Solidifying profile as department with regional-comparative strengths. Globally Speaking funded by BU after end of Project GO grant. Outcomes assessment in languages; reduction of class size; 5-day/week classes; added Senior and Master lecturerships and professional development funds; at least 1–2 common rooms restored to language dorms; Hindi-Urdu supported by FT lecturer; at least 3 more lecturer consolidations, with offices. Half-time additional staff support. Progress on library collections.

Music Department
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

Introduction

The following statement is a revision of one approved by the faculty of the School of Music, including the subset of that faculty constituting the CAS Music Department. While it is designed for the School of Music, it provides the context for the department.

A. Mission Statement

- 1) To prepare its students for the rigors of a profession in music as scholars, composers, performers, and teachers, and
- 2) To prepare Boston University students to lead lives engaged with music's aesthetic, cultural, and intellectual riches.

Purpose

The Department is committed:

- 1) to maintain the highest artistic and professional standards in performance, teaching, composition, and research;
- 2) to contribute actively to the musical life within and beyond Boston University;
- 3) to enrich intellectual, artistic, and educational life through collaborating with other organizations and institutions;
- 4) to support the continued growth of the art of music and to promote the fullest understanding of its history.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

2. *Identification of Academic Peer Group*

Determining a peer group requires considering not only the music department itself, but the sum total of all music services routinely available to CAS students as majors, minors, and students who are studying music as an elective. The School of Music provides most of these services. We concentrate on programs offering both Bachelor of Music and Bachelor of Arts in Music degrees, primarily as a partnership between a professional school and a college (or school) of arts and sciences.

- University of Southern California, Thornton School of Music: the professional school confers the Bachelor of Arts in Music and its professional degrees. The program is larger and better known than ours, and it offers a model for consolidating all music degrees in the music school.
- Oberlin College, Musical Studies Department: confers both BA in Musical Studies and a five-year double degree (BA in other majors and Bachelor of Music) as a partnership between the conservatory and the college.
- Homewood/Peabody double degree program at Johns Hopkins University offers BA in other majors with MusB, however there is no BA in Music.
- New York University: the Music Department of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences is completely separate and independent from the Steinhardt School, where only professional degrees are conferred.
- Catholic University of America: the Rome School of Music offers the Bachelor of Music, and the Bachelor of Arts is awarded by the School of Arts and Sciences.

NB. The peer group of BU CFA's School of Music is almost entirely different. Compared with the CAS BA in

Music program, Oberlin is stronger, USC is likely on a par, and the others are not as strong as ours given the enormous strength of our School of Music and the multi-level connections to it.

3. Faculty

The Chronicle of Higher Education, November 16, 2007, ranked Boston University as ninth among the top ten most productive music faculties. Their Research Universities Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index surveys 375 universities awarding the Ph.D.

<http://chronicle.com/stats/productivity/page.php?bycat=true&primary=10&secondary=197&year=2007>

Books per faculty .5

Journal articles per faculty .79

Citations per faculty 7.71

Faculty with a grant award 7%

Productivity of this small faculty has not decreased appreciably since 2007, in fact there has been an increase in the level. Of concern is the small number of grants.

4. b. Scholarly/research quality (Subfields): Subfields represented in this unit are Musicology, Ethnomusicology, Music Theory, and Composition. Of these, Musicology has the highest rate of publications and books, with Music Theory close behind. Ethnomusicology has several large projects in process that should appear soon, and Composition continues to produce at a high level under commissions for professional ensembles. Scholarship in composition is being generated internationally and nationally. The department in aggregate will soon be able to post numbers even higher than the base line of 2007 referred to in #2.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate):

- (1) Course evaluations indicate average or better than average numbers, with no indications of serious problems. Evaluations are collected each semester and reviewed at each reappointment term, or more frequently as need indicates. Some problems are surfacing, however, related to our necessary reliance on adjunct and temporary faculty.
- (2) Teaching awards: one of our number has been recently nominated for the Metcalf award, and another has already received the Metcalf Cup and Prize.
- (3) One musicology faculty member has recently published a volume of research with students from a seminar.
- (4) New courses and ensembles for World Music have been developed and implemented. One faculty member has developed a Freshman seminar for the UHC. There are future plans to sustain and increase this development.

d. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Field):

- (1) Course evaluations (see above)
- (2) With only one undergraduate major and three graduate majors (Music Theory, Music Education, and Musicology) and very low numbers of each, the share of enrollment as a percentage is not significant. Of greater concern is the generally low population of undergraduates.
- (3) Participation in successful academic enhancement activities (see above)
- (4) Curricular and pedagogical innovation: Several courses have been added in popular music and in world music. Participation in UHC is ongoing.

f. Major professional and public service contributions: Most notable is the Haydn-Landon Conference, an

international conference celebrating the tremendous legacy of former faculty member and Haydn scholar H. C. Robbins-Landon. The conference attracted international interest and focus for recent Haydn scholarship.

5. *Academic Programs*

a. Assessment of undergraduate education:

(1) Goals and purposes:

As given in the undergraduate bulletin, these should be updated to reflect the new volatility in music dissemination and media of transmission.

(2) Vitality and quality. The curriculum was last reviewed during 2005, the self-study period of the accreditation review of the School of Music by the NASM. We found the program unbalanced and in need of adding some practical training and experience in performance, and we made the adjustment. The curriculum is due for a second overhaul, in light of emerging trends in music education and the enormous impact of new media.

(3) Analysis of enrollment history and projections; student quality measures: Only 54 undergraduates have earned the BA in music in the last ten years. With only small numbers participating in the music major, variations are not indicative. Increased numbers of CAS Music Majors would indicate a new vitality.

(4) Student outcomes: The main measure of student outcome is successful placement into a graduate program. We do not have much information here, but will use the current class as a base line against which to measure future growth/decline.

(5) Student diversity: Again, with such small numbers this is a difficult thing to measure. A larger sample will be needed before such analysis can be significant.

b. Assessment of doctoral programs:

(1) Mission: goals and purposes

These need revision. As given in the Graduate Bulletin, they are somewhat out of line with current developments in the fields of their majors.

(2) Vitality and quality. These curricula were reviewed during the 2005 re-accreditation review of the School of Music by the National Association of Schools of Music. The credit structures of the graduate programs are very loosely defined. They remain flexible and can be tailored to a student's individual strengths and weaknesses. The number of credits for many of the seminars and upper level classes has been regularized at 4 (formerly some of these were 3-credit courses). Students can now complete the same number of credits by taking fewer courses. The range of offerings is compromised by the short-handed state of faculty. This results from an unresolved search, the move of one faculty member to the administration, and the impending retirement of a senior faculty member.

(3) Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment In the past five years we have doubled the number of graduate students in our programs in the Graduate School, including the Ph.D., from about 7 to about 14. Because some of these programs have professional degree counterparts at CFA, they compete against other BU programs for very limited spaces, teaching assistantships and scholarships.

(4) Student outcomes: Historically, only 15 Ph.D.s have been awarded since about 1980 [Whitaker's analysis] with an average time to completion of 9.1 years. An additional 11 students did not complete the degree. [Whitaker]

c. Assessment of masters programs. Discuss strengths, weaknesses, areas needing improvement.

(1) Mission: goals and purposes The mission statement needs updating.

(2) Vitality and quality. The latest review was in 2005 in connection with the NASM self study. There are new developments chiefly in ethnomusicology concomitant with new faculty resources.

- (3) Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment As Whitaker's report indicates, since the early 1980s only 3 students have earned the MA in musicology. Current enrollment, though small represents a new energy particularly in ethnomusicology. The Graduate School's chief competitor is the nearly identical MM at CFA's School of Music. With its greater financial aid resources, CFA's MM also prepares for the Ph.D.
- (4) Student outcomes: The three students averaged 2.8 years to complete the MA.
- (5) Cite any available rankings relative to peers.
- (6) Student diversity: The sample is insignificant.

6. *Facilities*

- a. Discuss the adequacy of facilities for the mission of the unit Facilities are, by and large, adequate, especially given the new access to classrooms and offices at the Fuller Building. Several classes given at Mugar Library have benefited from minor upgrades. However, class capacities are limited by these small spaces.
- b. Identify any plans for addressing issues, including the financial model for funding the plan. CFA's general plan includes the expansion of instructional space at 855 Commonwealth Avenue. Its successful completion is closely tied to the college's fund raising plans and the university's overall capital campaign.

7. *Collaboration with other academic units and institutions*

- a. Discuss key ongoing collaborations with other departments Collaboration between CFA's School of Music and the College of Arts and Sciences is at the heart of the music department's structure. Every department of the music school undertakes responsibility for instructing CAS and other university students. Full analysis of the scope of this involvement is underway, and will be provided in future revisions. CFA music courses that have significant CAS populations include at least the following:
 - The CAS-conferred Bachelor of Arts with a Concentration in Music depends on School of Music faculty for most of the music credits.
 - Graduate degrees in Musicology and Ethnomusicology, conferred by the Graduate School, also depend heavily on School of Music faculty.
 - The Music Minor, for all university undergraduates depends on School of Music faculty.
 - The newly configured Performance Minor, likewise, depends entirely on School of Music faculty.
 - BUMO and its many activities: orchestra, bands, jazz ensembles, accessible to all university students is staffed by School of Music faculty connected to the Music Education Department.
 - MU111, 112 Elements of Music Theory (for non majors) four sections fully subscribed every year
 - MU411, 412 Electronic Music: courses are completely subscribed every semester by students from across the university. This program has benefitted greatly by the construction of a new facility, now one of the best in the area.
 - CAS students are significantly enrolled in the following CFA courses (all MU): 101, 102, 107, 108, 201, 202, 207, 208, 222, and 224 (undergraduate sequences in music theory, aural skills, and music history).
 - An increasing array of CAS/CFA courses and ensembles in ethnomusicology and world music are offered in every semester.
 - Many students, every semester, receive class guitar instruction
 - University students, including many from CAS take private instruction in studios
 - Department faculty (Cornelius, Heimarck, Coelho) have already participated in UHC and plan to remain engaged with its development.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten year plan

- a. A balanced department able to address a wide variety of research goals laying the groundwork for the music of the new century, and preserving and transmitting the core values of musical research and praxis of past and present.
- b.
 - (1) Faculty An expansion in numbers both of CAS/GRS faculty (10-year totals/current) in music and of CFA faculty in musicology (8/4), ethnomusicology (3/2), music theory (4/2), and composition (8/7). All ranks would be represented, with the highest numbers as Assistant Professors. All will be on tenure track or with tenure. There will be appropriate age, gender, and racial diversity. Contacts between the two colleges will become more robust, and faculty from disciplines other than music will collaborate to enrich musical instruction.
 - (2) Undergraduate education Numbers of BA in Music students will increase, along with larger cohorts in the Bachelor of Music. We seek to launch a viable point of origin double degree (Bachelor of Arts (non music) and Bachelor of Music). We are also planning a five-year BA/MA in Music Education, leading to state licensure, in parallel with a similar program now leading to the MusB/MM.
 - (3) Doctoral education A new Ph.D. in Music Theory will accompany the Ph.D. in Musicology, and both will receive adequate support from faculty resources. The doctoral programs will remain small (about double current levels) and highly selective. Time to degree will decrease from the almost unacceptable average of 9.1 years to something between 5 and 6.
 - (4) Masters education (research and professional) See above comment on five-year programs. The MA programs can sustain higher numbers than currently, but this will require additional financial aid. Specialties within the MA will be refocused as Musicology, Ethnomusicology, and Music Theory (MA is a more appropriate preparation for the Ph.D. in Music Theory). MMs in these areas will become less important. The MM in Music Theory may be recast as a pedagogically oriented degree.
 - (5) Other academic programs The CFA/CAS Music Department will continue its association with STH and its engagement with the Master of Sacred Music. It will seek additional opportunities to engage non-music faculty in collaborative teaching, and cross listing of courses where fruitful. UHC will not be the exclusive arena for this. Students in professional programs cooperate with students in academic programs on studies of common interest.
 - (6) Interdisciplinary initiatives As music impacts and is impacted by work in other disciplines, new avenues of research emerge. Some examples are
 - music and neuroscience
 - computer science for music analysis, signal processing, algorithmic composition, and performance
 - anthropology and ethnomusicology
 - art history and critical issues in music
 - poetry (creative writing) and art song composition
 - (7) Facilities A brilliant new Arts Center offers a full range of instructional spaces from large lecture halls, equipped with pianos, multiple screen displays, and multimedia playback facilities, to small seminar rooms. Performance spaces support orchestral and chamber music with a real (not “enhanced”) acoustic. There is a sensible balance among programming, instructional capacity, space and time.

c. Resources

Full time Faculty positions: Now		Ten years
Musicology	4*	8
Ethnomusicology	2	3
Music Theory	2	4
Composition	6	8

(* Coelho has gone to administration, Sheveloff is retiring, Shenton is shared with STH, and Rifkin is seeking major change in his terms of appointment. Planning is extraordinarily difficult at this stage. An unresolved search further complicates the process.)

Staff positions: Now 1 Ten years 2 or 3

Facilities: increased office space, increased and larger instructional space.
Operational support: proportionately increased operational budget

2. *Measures for evaluating progress*

- a. Base line for productivity of faculty as established in 2007 in Chronicle of Higher Education report. Faculty numbers and progress through the ranks. Increase in numbers of undergraduate students, and MA students. Decrease of the average time to degree for Ph.D. students. Point of origin double degree program approved and established. Five year BA/MA in Music education likewise. More levels of reciprocal connection between School of Music and CAS.
- b. UIS data such as contributed to this report. Analysis and data from alumni tracking, both CFA and CAS. HEADS surveys and reports from NASM. Admissions group (ICCAM) reports. The School of Music needs to be able to track the percentage of credit hours taught to CAS students, as well as students from units other than CFA.

3. *Five-year goals*

a. It is critical for the department, the college and the School of Music to plan and implement successive searches for existing faculty vacancies. Coelho has never been replaced. Sheveloff's retirement necessitates timely and effective action. Other personnel issues facing the department need solutions. We are not ready to begin progress on the plan until these issues are carefully resolved.

Nevertheless, within five years, we should see several open lines filled, as well as to increase our faculty resources in music theory and in historical musicology first, and then address composition and ethnomusicology.

Department of Philosophy
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Department of Philosophy's mission is to cultivate philosophical thinking and research, to foster habits of rigorously analyzing ways of thinking and acting, to introduce students to diverse historical and contemporary conceptions of philosophy, to educate future thinkers, teachers, and researchers, to contribute to learning across the university curriculum, and to advance public institutions, from arts and sciences to governments and global relations, through philosophical criticism.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Group

Comparable departments of philosophy with pluralist programs and strengths similar to those of the Department include: *Stronger*: Yale, Berkeley, Chicago, Toronto; *roughly equal*: Indiana, UIC, Northwestern; *weaker*: Georgetown, Rice, Emory, USF, Purdue.

2. Faculty

2a. Scholarly/research quality (aggregate). Every full-time member is expected to research and teach. Every tenured or tenure-track professor has an active research program, as is evident from the quantity of faculty publications from 2006-2009: 9 books, 8 editions, 41 articles, 98 invited papers (including book chapters), 1 translation, and 17 book reviews. During the same period, faculty members gave 226 public addresses. For a faculty of 22 (19 Philosophy FTE, 2 half-time, joint Law and Philosophy) with full time teaching responsibilities, these numbers are impressive, indicative of intense research across the faculty.

2b. Scholarly/research quality (subfields).

The department excels in three clusters of sub-fields: (A) history of ancient, modern, and twentieth century philosophy (including phenomenology, pragmatism, and early analytic philosophy); (B) logic, epistemology, philosophy of language, mathematics, and science; (C) ethics and political philosophy. The department also conducts significant teaching and research in (D) metaphysics and philosophy of mind, and (E) aesthetics, feminist philosophy, and philosophy of religion. The department has publications in these groups as follows: A: 86, B: 39, C: 34, D: 9, and E: 4.

2c. Educational/pedagogical contributions

The effectiveness of the department's contribution to the educational goals of the University can be judged from a variety of perspectives, some specific and others more contextual. From F06 through S09, the "Overall course rating" for Department courses was 3.877. For the same period, the average "Overall rating of instructor" was 4.069. The course ratings partly reflect teaching by professors no longer members of the department. But the department also plans to review and counsel teachers of any courses that consistently receive low scores. That said, student comments on evaluations offer additional and emphatic evidence that department courses have made a distinctive contribution to the quality of education offered by Boston University. During the past three years, two professors have received teaching awards.

Members of the faculty either conduct or contribute significantly to the following activities/groups: the Undergraduate Philosophy Association (UPA) and its schedule of lectures and discussions, the undergraduate philosophy journal *Arche*; Philosophy Graduate Student Organization and its Graduate Student Presentation Series; Faculty Colloquia; Philosophy Film Group; the Ethics Reading Group; the Feminist Philosophy Reading Group, the Neuro-philosophy Club ("Neuphi"); Boston Area Colloquium for Ancient Philosophy (BACAP); the Benedict Lectures on the History of Political Philosophy (BL); Institute for Philosophy and

Religion (IPR); Center for the Philosophy and History of Science (CPHS). Faculty are closely involved with the scholarly projects of graduate students in regard to both thesis/dissertation work and the large number of papers given by graduate students at professional conferences. Faculty members also guide undergraduate concentrators in preparing papers for presentation at conferences.

On both the undergraduate and graduate levels, the department has instituted several curricular refinements and changes in the past three years. Because of the high quality of teaching in the department, its faculty members are welcomed participants in various settings throughout the University. These include: CAS Honors Program, Core Curriculum, MET, and the Writing Program. The department recognizes a pressing need to increase the number of women and minorities on its faculty.

d. Professional and public service contributions. Members of the department have made professional and public service contributions, from election to offices in philosophical societies to serving as external reviewers of other departments, nationally and internationally.

3. Academic Programs

Overall enrollments from 2006-09 have been steady, averaging just over 2900 students per academic year and graduate enrollments have remained constant while undergraduate majors and minors have declined. Including adjuncts, the student-to-faculty ratio over the course of these three years was, on average, a comparatively high 18:1.

3a. Undergraduate.

3a1. Purposes. Our principal pedagogical purposes are (1) to provide all students with accessible, rewarding, and substantive treatments of important philosophical issues, (2) to offer courses on a wide range of philosophical issues of historical and contemporary importance, (3) to afford students the resources and opportunities necessary to pursue philosophical scholarship at the highest level possible, and (4) to equip our majors with sufficient philosophical knowledge and skills to pursue philosophy – or disciplines drawing on similar knowledge and skills – at the graduate level.

3a2. Vitality and Quality. The philosophical life of the department is enhanced considerably by regular departmental colloquia, colloquia organized by the CPHS, IPR, BL, BACAP, and regular meetings of the Ethics Reading Group and the Feminist Philosophy Reading Group. In addition, the undergraduates have formed the Undergraduate Philosophy Association, which frequently hosts events, and the undergraduate philosophy journal *Arché*, which the undergraduates referee, edit, and publish.

3a3. Analysis of Enrollment History. Over the past three years, our undergraduate enrollments have remained steady, averaging a bit over 2600 students per year. This figure appears to be holding steady, despite SMG's decision no longer to require either Reasoning and Argumentation (PH 160) or Introduction to Ethics (PH 150) for its students. However, the number of majors has dropped noticeably over the last two years, though there is no clear upward or downward trend with respect to degrees or minors awarded. Compared with most peer institutions, we have a high majors-to-faculty ratio.

3a4. Student Outcomes. We continue to attract some of the most outstanding students in the University. In recent years our graduates have gone on to pursue a PhD (or equivalent) at University of Pittsburgh, Cambridge University, the University of Chicago, Penn, DePaul, Emory, and UIC. Many of our graduates go on to attend law school and medical school. Many others go on to graduate school in disciplines other than philosophy, including the Department of Government at Harvard, the International Relations department at Yale, the Ph.D. program in Physics at UCSD, the Cinema Studies program at NYU, and the Ph.D. program in Developmental Psychology at Boston College.

3b. Graduate. It is clear that the Graduate Program has been consistently successful during the last 10 years. The PhD program typically receives 150-200 applications per year. On average the post-MA admission rate is 7% and the post-BA rate is 6%. We are a highly competitive and internationally recognized program.

Between 2000-2009 the average student population in the graduate program (MA and PhD) was 63.

Attrition rates in the PhD program were .19 for post-MA students and .43 for post-BA students. These numbers are “natural.” In the course of a long training some students discover they are not suited to this profession.

During this same time period the department awarded 65 PhD’s (average of 6.5 per year) and 32 MA’s (average of 3.2). Please note: MA students pay tuition and so this latter number should be construed as one way the department contributes to the health of the Graduate College.

The PhD program has had a successful record of job-placement, with an average of 3.6 tenure-track placements per year over the past ten years. Our students have positions at research universities (e.g., South Florida, Auburn, Texas El Paso, Boston College, New School of Social Research), liberal-arts colleges (e.g., Wellesley, Colby, Vassar, Luther, Stonehill, Brooklyn, Xavier, Marquette, Suffolk), and international institutions (e.g., the Technion Institute in Israel, University of Rome in Italy, York University, and Saint Thomas College in Canada). We have also placed an average of 2.5 PhD’s per year in adjunct positions. (These are comparable to “post-docs” in other fields.) In effect, approximately 95% of our PhD’s have found employment in their field during the past ten years.

Compared to other PhD programs, ours falls short in stipends and length of fellowship. We offer a 4 year fellowship, while other elite universities typically offer 5 or 6 years. Nonetheless, we continue to attract excellent students, in part due to our distinctive pluralist make-up. Students come here to get an education not available elsewhere.

3c. Interdisciplinary programs. Philosophy is in certain respects a quintessentially interdisciplinary subject and, not surprisingly, the department offers joint undergraduate degrees with the following departments: CL, Linguistics, Math, Psychology, Political Science, Religion. It also offers graduate degrees in joint programs with the CL, DRTS, and the Law School. There is solid demand for these joint programs, though the quality is uneven, principally due to the need for renewal and reinvigoration of links with some departments (Psychology, Political Science), particularly at the curricular level.

3d. International initiatives. A member of the department is the director of the Institute for Human Sciences in Vienna, a program from which several graduate students have profited. Members of the department also actively participate in international advisory boards and cooperation with researchers. The department is exploring possibilities of closer collaboration with specific European philosophy departments.

4. Facilities

The department currently has adequate office space for its faculty members but, with the arrival of two new faculty members in the coming year, it will need one additional faculty office. However, the department lacks sufficient office space for its teaching fellows, particularly for them to hold office hours for their students. At least one additional office is needed for this purpose.

5. Collaboration and Outreach

The department collaborates with MET, IPR (the director is a member of the department), the Humanities Foundation, and CPHS. Our faculty have been interviewed in print and radio. A member of the department has successfully run the Boston Wittgenstein Workshop, in collaboration with Harvard and Tufts.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year Plan

1a. Aspirations

In the next decade, if our plan is successful, we aspire to be one of the leading pluralistic programs of philosophy in the English-speaking world, with a faculty known for excelling both in its research and in its

capacity to educate undergraduates and graduates in the history and arts of philosophical thinking. We also aspire to remain a cornerstone of a liberal arts education at Boston University, actively and productively integrated with many other departments, programs, and divisions of the University.

Ib. Goals

(1) Faculty. In light of the foregoing aspirations, we have three principal goals regarding our faculty: first, facilitating excellence in teaching and research among the current faculty; second, strengthening our program by increasing the overall number of faculty specializing in one or more of the five subfields outlined in B2b above; and third, developing a sense of common purpose through increased interaction and collaboration in teaching and research, both within and beyond the Department. In regard to this last point, the department aims to continue the strong inter-subdisciplinary ties among its members and foster new interdisciplinary initiatives (see C1b(4) below).

(2) *Undergraduate education*. Given the department's aspirations, its most proximate and pressing goal is to restructure its undergraduate program in order both (a) to better serve the appropriate interests of our undergraduate student bodies and (b) to develop a more unified major with more consistent instruction in core philosophical areas. With regard to (a), this restructuring will require rethinking how, in consultation with other departments and schools, we best serve our non-majors in large introductory courses, in particular, our strong constituents at Sargent, COM, and ENG and how we can best provide an introduction to philosophy for students in other areas of the university (for example, science majors through ongoing initiatives with physics and science education, business majors through courses in business and professional ethics, aesthetics and philosophy of film and literature courses for CFA and COM students.). With regard to (b), this restructuring will require significant alterations to both our joint concentrations and the structure of the major, changes that permit majors to focus their studies on a sub-field (see B2b above) that is a departmental specialty. Another major goal for undergraduate education is to improve the student-to-faculty ratio. Pursuit of this goal is yet another rationale for additional faculty but this step is a *sine qua non* for the department to meet its aspirations to be among the leading philosophy departments in the world.

(3) *Graduate education*. In order to meet its aspirations, the department has six principal goals in regard to graduate education: first, increasing the stipends of its fellowships from a guaranteed four to a guaranteed five years; second, creating a more favorable student-to-faculty ratio through additional hiring; third, enhancing the quality and range of graduate offerings, through curricular co-ordination and faculty development and hiring; fourth, doing a better job of placing doctoral students in teaching positions in high-level universities and colleges; fifth, strengthening and, in some cases, developing those interdisciplinary ties within the University that graduate study of philosophy in particular subfields demands (e.g., classics and ancient philosophy, cognitive science and philosophy of mind, linguistics and philosophy of language, political science and political philosophy, aesthetics and fine arts), and sixth, to sustain our strong Master's program.

(4) *Interdisciplinary collaboration*. The department's goal in this connection is twofold: first, to sustain its current strong engagement in several interdisciplinary programs (see B3c above); and second, to develop new initiatives of this sort in several areas, including (i) a political theory major and program, (ii) ethics education across BU, (iii) a joint BA/MA and MA with Linguistics, (iv) enterprises with law, (v) collaboration with the administration on professional and research ethics for scientific researchers funded by NSF and NIH, (vi) new programs with Cognitive and Neural Systems, (vii) new collaboration with Women's Studies, and (viii)-(ix) programs combining departmental studies in aesthetics, film, philosophy of literature with COM and CFA.

(5) *International initiatives*. The department's goal is to establish programs of collaboration with specific European philosophy departments.

(6) *Facilities*. As noted above, the department needs additional space, both in the short run for an additional hiring in the coming year (AY10-11), but also for our many teaching assistants to hold office hours. Should the department be allowed to meet its goals for additional faculty, it will need an additional five rooms for offices over the coming decade.

(7) *Other infrastructure*. One of the department's goals is to acquire and establish space on the 5th or 6th floor of STH that could serve as a common room for faculty and students to have informal discussions,

interactions, luncheons, receptions, and so on.

1c. Needed resources

In the coming decade we shall need resources (a) to replace expected retirements, (b) to increase graduate student stipends, and (c) to increase the number of faculty members. Re (c), resources are needed to reduce our comparatively high student-to-faculty ratio *at all levels*. In order to be able to compete with our peers and better serve several interdisciplinary programs (European Studies, Modern Languages, Mathematics, Linguistics), we need to grow in the history of philosophy (Subfield A) and the systematic fields identified under Subfield B (see B2b). Given pressing current curricular obligations and longer term interdisciplinary initiatives, we also need to hire specialists in applied (medical, research) ethics and political philosophy (both falling under subfield C). For the sake of adequate curricular coverage and for a planned interdisciplinary initiative with Cognitive and Neural Systems, we need to add a specialist in the philosophy of mind with expertise in neuro-and-cognitive sciences. Also needed: additional office space and a common room.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

2a. Appropriate measures of progress toward goals of plan discussed in Section B:

#1: *Publishing*: more frequent publications in top philosophy journals and with top presses since citation indexes don't work well for a number of our areas of specialty. Quality is more important than quantity in this measure.

#2: *Advancement of graduate and undergraduate majors/minors*: (a) increased funding of graduate students and placement of more of them at better institutions (though with the understanding that success here is highly market dependent); (b) undergraduate majors' admissions into strong graduate and professional programs.

#3: *Teaching*: (a) enrollment increases; (b) student evaluations at or above current level of satisfaction (the current average of 4 on scale of 5); (c) improved student-to-faculty ratio.

#4: *Inter-disciplinary cooperation within and outside BU*: measured by the quantity and quality of the following: service to curricular needs (esp. medical ethics and research ethics), joint-teaching, conferences, collaborative research, participation in BACAP, BL, IPR, CPHS, CAS Honors Program, Core Curriculum, Metropolitan College, the Writing Program, the Humanities Foundation, the feminist reading group, the ethics reading group, and the planned interdisciplinary initiative in ethics.

2b. Resources for collecting and analyzing data (corresponding to #1-4 under 2a).

#1: Annual lists of publications in faculty annual reports;

#2: Annual data for funding, placement and admissions of former majors are gathered from Placement director, DUS, and DGS and included in chair's annual departmental report;

#3: Enrollment figures supplied by CAS and satisfaction determined by evaluations;

#4: Records in chair's annual departmental reports.

3. Five-year goals

3a. Expectations

In five years we expect to continue to be (a) a department that facilitates a rich and rigorous education in philosophy at all levels through well-designed course offerings and strong commitments to teaching, (b) a key participant in inter-disciplinary collaboration across the university, and (c) an internationally recognized place for advanced research and graduate studies in our first three subfields (see B2b).

3b. Steps

In order to achieve (a), the department must revise its undergraduate curriculum, regularly scrutinize the quality of undergraduate teaching, and improve the student-to-faculty ratio. In order to achieve (b), the Department must strengthen current interdisciplinary programs (see B3c), implement new such initiatives with Linguistics (joint BA/MA and MA programs), Cognitive and Neural Systems, political theory, research ethics, and CFA (see C1b (4)), and meet curricular obligations in medical ethics. Given these objectives and current

lack of adequate staffing, the department's top two hiring priorities are #1: a specialist in medical/research ethics and #2: a specialist in philosophy of neuro-cognitive sciences (by contrast, there are faculty competent to teach courses needed in conjunction with Linguistics and CFA). In order to achieve (c), it is imperative that the department sustain its time-tested practice of alternately hiring in historical and systematic fields. In keeping with this strategy but with the understanding that any such projection is revisable, the department's additional priorities are #3: a medieval philosopher, #4: a political philosopher, #5: an historian of 17th century philosophy, and #6: a specialist in logical theory. Historians of medieval philosophy and 17th century philosophy are needed to fill gaps in the department's otherwise impressive history of philosophy program (Subfield A); the department needs a political philosopher for teaching needs and the planned interdisciplinary ethics and political theory projects (Subfield C); and an expert in logical theory (Subfield B) to provide gateway courses for a range of advanced systematic courses and for the growing collaboration with Linguistics.

3c. Method of evaluation

We plan to hold every September a meeting of the faculty devoted to comparing the foregoing year's data (see 2b above) with the expectations (3a), measured by the specific indicators of progress identified (2a and 3b).

Department of Physics
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission

The mission of the Physics Department is: to conduct advanced research into the physical principles underlying the natural world; to train the next generation of physicists by engaging students in that forefront research; to teach the fundamentals of physics to students in the natural sciences, biological sciences and engineering; and to introduce the principles of physics, quantitative scientific reasoning and the latest discoveries to a wide audience.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Peer Group

A selection of departments similar to ours is listed below with their number of regular Physics Department faculty and notes as to their structure (note: unlike at BU in some universities physics and astronomy are in a single department):

Departments usually ranked higher overall:

- Yale University (52):
- Univ. of Pennsylvania (37; Physics + Astro):
- UCLA (62; Physics + Astro):
- Johns Hopkins (32; Physics + Astro):

Departments usually ranked comparable overall:

- Rutgers (90; Physics + Astro):
- Michigan State Univ. (60; Physics + Astro):
- Brown University (28):
- New York Univ. (36; Physics + Astro):

2. Faculty Assessment

Our faculty is distinguished; it includes a Nobel Laureate, two members of the National Academy of Sciences and 17 Fellows of the American Physical Society. They play leading roles on national and international committees as well as various panels. The department has 33 senior faculty, 4 junior faculty, and 1 Master Lecturer. The primary services of Profs. Ruckenstein and Whitaker are in the University and College administration respectively.

2a) Scholarly/Research Quality (aggregate for the last 3 academic years)

Publications: 630 refereed papers, 1 book and 4 book chapters essentially all in high quality, refereed journals of international standing (e.g. *Physical Review*, *Science*, *Nature*, *Journal of Applied Physics*, *Applied Physics Letters*, etc.).

Research Grant Activity: (aggregate for the last 3 academic years) \$21.20M in outside funding has been obtained through the Physics Department directly or otherwise by projects having Physics faculty as PI or CoPI. In addition \$4.72M has been awarded to Physics faculty through the Polymer Center and \$1.98M to Physics faculty through the Center for Computational Science, with a total funding of \$27.91M.

Rankings: The most recent National Research Council Assessment of Doctoral Programs (1995) ranked the Physics Department 38th in the country. The current *US News & World Report* ranking of Physics graduate programs ranks the Department tied for 36th in the nation.

Major Awards and Recognitions (during the last 3 academic years): The Julius Edgar Lilienfeld Prize of the American Physical Society (Stanley), Miller Visiting Professorship at UC-Berkeley (Castro-Neto), DARPA Young Faculty Award (Averitt), NSF Career Award (Katz), Sloan Foundation Fellowship (Katz,

Polkovnikov), election as President of the Aspen Center for Physics (Cohen), five faculty elected as Fellows of the American Physical Society (Chamon, Goldberg, Kearns, Sandvik, Smith), and two chosen as Jefferson Science Fellows at the US State Department (El-Batanouny, Stone).

Citations (aggregate for the last 3 academic years): Approx. 36,000 as measured by citations from isiknowledge.com and SPIRES (the standard High-Energy Physics Literature Database.)

2b) *Scholarly/Research Quality (Subfields)*

Physics as a discipline has a unified core of knowledge, and the research of many faculty members straddles or defies the classification of traditional subfields. For the purposes of this document, however, we identify four primary subfields of research in the department: condensed matter/biophysics experiment (11 faculty: Averitt, Bansil, El-Batanouny, Erramilli, Goldberg, Ludwig, Mohanty, Rothschild, Skocpol, Smith, Tsui), condensed matter/biophysics theory (7 faculty: Castro-Neto, Chamon, Klein, Polkovnikov, Redner, Sandvik, Stanley), particle physics experiment (10 faculty: Ahlen, Bose, Butler, Carey, Kearns, Miller, Roberts, Rohlf, Stone, Sulak), and particle physics theory (7 faculty: Cohen, Glashow, Katz, Lane, Pi, Rebbi, Schmaltz). Currently 4 of our faculty members are women (10.8%), who are traditionally underrepresented in the field. The American Institute of Physics reports that the national average of women physics faculty members nationwide in 2006 (the most recent year for which data is available) was 13% (aip.org/statistics/trends/highlite/women3/faculty.pdf).

Subfield Publications

- Cond. Matter/Biophysics Experiment: 153 papers/2 chapters/1 book; 13.9 papers per faculty
- Condensed Matter/Biophysics Theory: 260 papers; 37.1 per faculty
- Particle Physics Experiment: 182 papers; 18.2 papers per faculty
- Particle Physics Theory: 35 papers/2 book chapters; 5 papers per faculty

Subfield Citations

- Condensed Matter/Biophysics Exp. (from isiknowledge.com): 4700; 427 per faculty
- Condensed Matter/Biophysics Th. (from isiknowledge.com): 16996; 2428 per faculty
- Particle Physics Experiment (from SPIRES): 19450; 1625 per faculty
- Particle Physics Theory (from SPIRES): 5180; 740 per faculty

Research Funding

- Condensed Matter/Biophysics Experiment: \$7.82M; \$710.7k per faculty
- Condensed Matter/Biophysics Theory: \$6.41M; \$915.6k per faculty
- Particle Physics Experiment: \$9.68M; \$967.8k per faculty
- Particle Physics Theory: \$4.0M Total in 3 years; \$571.5k per faculty

2c) *Educational/Pedagogical Contributions (Aggregate)*

Department faculty members teach across the diverse spectrum of course levels: general education, introductory and service courses, undergraduate classes for physics/astronomy majors, introductory-level graduate courses and advanced-level graduate courses. Teaching assignments are not broken by subfields at the undergraduate or introductory graduate level.

3. *Academic Programs*

In line with our mission, the physics department offers courses in general education, foundational science and engineering courses, and a range of physics courses spanning upper division undergraduate through advanced graduate. The department is actively engaged in the participation and development of outreach programs and activities.

3a) *Assessment of Undergraduate Education*

Mission: goals and purposes: Our undergraduate courses provide students with knowledge and problem solving abilities that enhance their education and on which to build a wide variety of careers. Our largest effort is teaching physics to students in the natural sciences, biology, and engineering. Introductory

courses (PY105/106, 211/212, 241/241, 313, 354) provide a rigorous foundation critical for further study in fields from chemistry to mechanical engineering. In addition, we offer general education courses such as PY231 “Physics in Music” and the recently introduced PY103 “Cinema Physics”, which we are taking steps to make a regularly scheduled course, that expose non-science majors to critical scientific thinking and demonstrate the ubiquity and relevance of physics in everyday life. Nearly 1000 non-physics majors enroll in physics courses each semester.

Physics majors at BU receive depth and breadth training in physics allowing them to pursue graduate study, or to utilize their skills in such diverse areas as industrial research and development, environmental science, medical physics, computer science, and patent law.

Vitality and quality: Several metrics attest to the quality and vitality of our program including student assessment of our general education and introductory courses and placement of our BU physics majors in top graduate schools. To maintain quality and enhance our vitality, the department has an ongoing review of the undergraduate curriculum formalized as a committee - “Undergraduate Curriculum and Student Affairs” - which typically meets 4-5 times per semester. Several important topics of recent and current interest include: (1) Expanding our selection of General Education courses and participation of faculty in the core. We note that physics faculty (Prof. Cohen) have been intimately involved in the development of the University Honors Program.

(2) Maintaining Relevance in our introductory sequence courses. The rapid pace of innovation in science and engineering requires frequent assessment of our service courses to ensure the topics covered are well-aligned with the needs of students. To this end, we communicate with departments having substantial numbers of students in our introductory sequence courses.

(3) For physics majors, offering appropriate courses for multidisciplinary careers while maintaining sufficient depth in core areas is a considerable challenge within the constraints of a well-rounded liberal arts education. Some flexibility is provided by offering alternate tracks: Option 1 students have fewer required physics courses enabling greater breadth in their scientific and technical training. Option 2 majors pursue a more rigid program in preparation for the rigors of graduate study in physics. Recently, the one semester “Modern Physics” (PY354) course has been expanded to a two semester sequence (PY351/352) to provide more depth for sophomores, and we are moving towards greater integration of computational physics into the curriculum. (4) We are working on improved recruiting and retention of undergraduate majors, increasing the number of students with a minor in physics, and enhancing undergraduate research opportunities.

Analysis of enrollment history and projections; student quality measures: During the past five years the average number of physics majors graduating each year is 20. There is a trend towards higher quality students: during this five year period, the fraction of physics graduate who entered BU with an SAT score above 1400 has increased from 1/3 to 2/3 with an average GPA upon graduation of 3.3 (in 2009, the average was 3.55). One measure of effectiveness is provided by the number of students who go to graduate school and the quality of schools they attend. Of the 96 physics graduates during the past five years, 74 reported their status following graduation through our tracking survey. 32 of these were attending graduate school (43%), with more than 50% of these students attending top tier graduate schools including MIT, Caltech, Berkeley and others.

Student diversity: The five year average of female to male students is 3/8 and many have gone on to top graduate schools including Berkeley and MIT. This includes 3 in 2008 and 3 in 2009. For the past five years, the racial breakdown is ~70% white, ~10% Asian, and ~20% other.

3b) Assessment of Doctoral Programs

Mission: goals and purposes: The mission of the doctoral program in Physics at Boston University is to provide excellence in advanced physics research and prepare students to become independent researchers in academia, national laboratories or industry.

Vitality and quality: The last review was conducted in Fall 2009 as part of a continuous process. We reviewed the impact of major curriculum changes that were introduced over the past 4 years, to address shortcomings in mathematical preparation.

Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment: In 2009, out of 318 applicants from 24 countries, our

entering class size was 17. The yield rate was about 25% (i.e. 68 of the 318 applicants were admitted with 17 accepting). A remarkable improvement in the caliber of our entering American students has occurred in the past decade, with nearly a 30% increase in their average Physics GRE scores. Self-assessment indicates that the improvement is partly due to aggressive recruitment, and stellar faculty. We project that entering class size will increase to the historical average of approximately 20.

Student Outcomes: The average time to PhD for post-bachelors students is 6.5 years, comparable to the national average reported by the AIP. Our most significant effort over the past 3 years has been to engage with our Physics alumni, in annual events and reunions, in helping to place our students and in consultation about the curriculum. Physics alumni relations are a strategic asset, with approximately half of our students finding post-doctoral research or teaching positions, and the others working in industry or government.

Rankings: As discussed above, the Physics Department's graduate program is ranked 36-38th in the country by the National Research Council and the *US News and World Report*. Moreover, the rankings do not reflect the fact that we are extremely competitive in the fields that we do excel in, and have successfully enrolled students who have rejected offers from universities such as Cornell, Brown and MIT.

Student Diversity: In our most recent entering graduate class of 17 students, 4 were women. Our yield rate for women accepted to the program (4 out of 11, 36%) was higher than that for men (22%). Our recent entering class percentage of ~ 25% women is slightly higher than the most recent available national average (20%) reported by the AIP for PhD-granting institutions.

3c) Assessment of Masters Programs The Physics Department does not normally admit students for a Masters program by itself. Exceptional quality students for the Masters program have included Fulbright Fellows, who have been attracted specifically by the chance to work with a well-known faculty member. Students who cannot pass the PhD Qualifying examination can choose to leave with a terminal master's degree.

3e) Interdisciplinary Initiatives The department has a joint undergraduate major in *Astronomy and Physics*, and in *Physics and Philosophy*. At the graduate level, department members have served as thesis research advisors for graduate students in Chemistry and Electrical Engineering, while Physics graduate students have performed thesis research with faculty in Biomedical and Electrical Engineering. Department faculty members have helped develop and steer the new Division of Materials Science and Engineering in the College of Engineering.

3f) International/Global Initiatives The department (Sulak) has developed a unique new study-abroad option for junior physics majors in Geneva. The program will begin this spring and offer both classroom instruction at the Université de Genève and hands-on research experience at nearby CERN. Due to the nature of physics research, many of our doctoral students do a major part of their research at international laboratories, including CERN and the Paul Scherrer Institute (Switzerland).

3g) Outreach Initiatives The department is involved in numerous outreach activities which include *Project ITOP – Improving the Teaching of Physics*, *GK12 Outreach*, *LERNet*, *Immersion for Elementary Teachers*, and the *High School Honors Summer Internship Program*. Several of our faculty and graduate students have expended considerable effort in our outreach efforts. Both the faculty and graduate students have been involved in teacher training. About 45 teachers from high school to elementary school participate in our programs per year. In addition our faculty and students mentor, teach and tutor in the Boston public schools and the BU Academy.

4. Facilities

The Physics Department manages the Electronics Design Facility (EDF, 2198 sf) and the Scientific Instrument Facility (SIF, 9275 sf). During the past 18 months, the EDF and SIF have had approximately \$400,000 and \$475,000 in revenues, respectively.

5. *Other Infrastructure*

The Physics Department has a small Research Computer Facility with two staff members who handle the diverse needs a large department. The department (including the Polymer Center) occupies about 74,000 square feet in three buildings: SCI, PRB, and PHO. Approx. 11% of this space is occupied by faculty offices, inclusive of seminar and meeting rooms, 6% by staff offices and related spaces, 59% for research, including laboratories, offices and seminar/meeting rooms, and 24% for teaching laboratories, TA offices, a departmental classroom and other small common spaces. Space is flexibly committed, not “owned” by individuals.

6. *Collaboration with Other Academic Units and Institutions*

Department members collaborate with Chemistry, Biomedical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and the School of Medicine. The department has 18 joint faculty members whose primary appointment is in another department, mostly in Engineering, while 4 faculty members whose primary appointment is in Physics have joint appointments in Engineering or the School of Medicine. In addition, the department has ties to the School of Education through the teacher education programs discussed in “Outreach” above. Physics Department faculty members play a major role in University centers and maintain collaborations worldwide.

C. **Strategic Plan for the Future**

1. *Five and Ten Year Plan*

In the near term the Physics Department will have 36 tenured or tenure-track faculty who are engaged in research in the four core areas: of condensed matter/biophysics experiment, condensed matter theory; experimental particle physics and particle theory; Several faculty carry out computationally based research contributing to the University's leadership in advanced scientific computing. All faculty are actively engaged in teaching and are expected to be able to teach any non-highly specialized course (i.e. ~ up to 500-level). Higher level courses are taught according to the field of specialization. As we move forward during the next decade we have specific goals:

- Maintain strength in core areas: As is evident from the metrics presented above, we have considerable strength in the core areas that are internationally competitive at the highest levels. It is important that we maintain our strength in these areas.
- Expand into new research areas: We believe that increased diversity in our research program will lead to an increase in our visibility and ranking and will impact our teaching mission in a positive way: it will allow us to increase the number of highly qualified graduate students and undergraduate majors, and facilitate the development of courses at the interface between disciplines. In addition it will provide us greater flexibility in raising the scientific literacy of the general student population. Several areas are being considered; our department has begun an expansion of our effort into biological physics, which the University has identified as primary direction of thrust. The department is also considering other areas including materials physics, another University thrust area, cosmology/astrophysics, atomic and molecular physics and quantum information, entanglement and de-coherence.

Our planned expansion into new research areas is under active discussion. In the scenario of a constant number of faculty, constructing new research groups will require some realignment. In the next five years, we anticipate a small number of retirements (of order five) so our ability to restructure research priorities is limited in the short term. This presents some problems in that increased effort in biological physics, and possibly materials physics, should be coordinated with the increased efforts in other departments in CAS and Engineering to implement the Universities thrusts in those areas. There are two possible paths to expansion in thrust areas in the next five years: 1) The possibility that the Administration is willing to advance the

department junior faculty lines in expectation of future retirements. 2) Joint appointments, possibly at a more senior level. Examples: The joint appointment of a condensed matter/materials scientist in Physics and Engineering, or of a biological physicist/systems biologist in Physics and Biology or Biomedical Engineering. Our department would welcome such joint appointments and we believe that they would serve the overall interests of both CAS and the University.

Over the next ten years, the Physics Department will have a unique opportunity to substantially change its makeup. The form of our reorganization will be guided to some extent by the relative importance of various areas of physics in the overall goals of the University, priorities at the national level and, most importantly, the interest and importance of the science itself. As we have indicated, we plan to actively contribute to the University's efforts in systems biology and are considering other areas as well. However, while the details of our plan are important our overriding guiding principle is to strive for excellence in research and teaching. To achieve excellence we will strive to hire the best possible teachers and research scientists.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

- *Teaching:* Increased diversity in our course offerings on all levels; undergraduate majors and general scientific education, and graduate, both basic and advanced. Increased number of undergraduate majors and joint majors and increased enrollment in general education and outreach courses. Achieve consistently high student evaluations.
- *Research:* Higher placement in various rankings of Physics departments, increased cross disciplinary collaborations, faculty at the forefront of their fields as measured by the usual metric of publications, awards, citations etc.

Department of Political Science
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Department of Political Science's missions:

--to impart to undergraduates— majors and others —an understanding of politics in the broadest sense, as a matter of humane and civic education, and preparation for citizenship, taking the discipline in its several aspects from the philosophical/theoretical to the quantitative/analytic, with other modes of approach ranged between, as a core of a liberal education

--to provide high-quality graduate education in a PhD program that fits our graduate students with the knowledge, research/analytic skills and professional socialization necessary for careers in college/university teaching and research, and in other research/analysis contexts

--to advance knowledge within the discipline, and disseminate the results of research through scholarly publication, teaching, and broader communication in public for a and the media

B . The Present

1. Academic Peers

BU is a large, private, research university, with a very small political science department: the total of political science PhDs, even counting those in other departments/schools, is still quite small. With 16 faculty members on departmental salary lines, we are much smaller than equivalents with which BU is commonly compared-- (Syracuse--34; NYU--44; American U.--30; George Washington U--43) USC, with 16 faculty listed in its department is the only exception.

2. Faculty

February 2010 is an exciting time for CAS/PO. Over the past three-four years we have recruited four outstanding assistant professors—more young faculty than we had for some time. At the mid-career level, we have some members of extraordinary visibility in the field. But--of eleven full professors on PO salary lines, five will retire between 8/31/2010 and 8/31/2013—(three cease teaching in 2010). Defining the “faculty” is then an interim matter, with major change guaranteed. As of 1/1/2010, there are sixteen tenured/tenure track PO faculty who are 100% on PO salary lines. This number, very modest for a PhD-granting department, constitutes the “core” in the analyses below. (In addition, we have four members who, though on CAS/IR salary lines, are also “in” PO—three of these tenured, voting members of both departments. The impending departure of so many signals a need to continue recruiting, and also provides a unique opportunity for deciding on the structure and orientation of the future CAS/PO

a./b. Scholarship and research: Measurement here, for ourselves and peer departments, is complicated. No indexes (SSCI, Google Scholar) deal consistently with “output,” precluding systematic comparison. Nor are peer departments consistent in listing individual CV's on department web pages, as both we and IR have found in addressing productivity.

Basic facts: over the whole academic career—“lifetime” productivity thus far—the 16 core PO faculty average 3.25 books, 16.8 journal articles, 13.9 book chapters, and 0.94 edited books (leaving aside books reviews, non-journal reports, etc.)—significant output by what seem reasonable disciplinary standards. Recent performance, over the 2006-7-8 calendar years that are the focus of the strategic plan inquiry, was again

strong—an average of 0.6 books, 2.5 articles, 2.1 book chapters, and 0.2 edited books over that time.

c./d. Education and pedagogy: Though we are small, we cover all the major subfields—American, comparative, public policy, international relations, and political theory—in our teaching. Our courses combine instruction in the substance of politics (e.g., how Congress works) with exposure to various modes of analysis.

Though high student demand and our limited numbers mean that many of our courses have large enrollments, our faculty excels in the classroom with average rating over “4” for *all* our 300-level and above offerings.

3. Academic Programs

At the undergraduate level, PO offers major and minor concentrations, and participates with the Department of Philosophy (CAS/PH) in the joint political science/philosophy major. PO courses attract large numbers of undergraduates beyond the “major” population. On the graduate level, we concentrate on our PhD program, awarding the MA degree mainly as a marker of progress toward the doctorate (exceptions are the BA/MA program in which relatively few students participate, and—rarely-- the MA “for professionals” (i.e., those not pursuing an academic/research career—the most recent product of which is CEO of a technology/ground sensing firm dealing with refugees, evacuations and natural disasters.)

Undergraduate education: The core mission of the political science department’s undergraduate program is twofold: to provide non-majors with the knowledge to be informed citizens with a solid understanding of political processes in an increasingly interconnected world; and to train majors in the systematic study of politics, while equipping them with the analytic skills essential to succeeding in the varied career paths they choose after graduation. Demand for political science courses both within and outside of CAS is great. The department averages nearly 500 majors, who come from a diverse range of backgrounds (2/3 women, 11-12% Latino, 9% Asian-American, 3% African American). Large non-major demand, from outside as well as within CAS, pushes PO credit hours to an average of roughly 10,000 per year. The department services a particularly high demand from COM students; this year 731 declared PO to be their CAS concentration. Meeting this demand with limited faculty resources while simultaneously covering the full range of topics offered at peer institutions is the department’s greatest challenge.

Over the next five to ten years, faculty turnover gives PO a unique opportunity to re-conceptualize its core mission in undergraduate education and to reposition itself both to meet the nature of undergraduate demand and to further develop our strengths to achieve departmental goals in research and teaching. Over the next 1-2 years, the department will re-examine the entire undergraduate curriculum in an effort to insure that it: offers the most comprehensive core curriculum in political science possible despite PO’s small size; provides students with the proper balance between breadth of exposure to all of the subfields of political science and the opportunity to pursue their interests within any subfield in depth; aligns our course offerings both with changing norms within the discipline and with undergraduate demand. One concrete example of curricular review is our commitment to work with IR on auditing all courses offered in both departments and cross-listing all appropriate courses. However, while the department believes it is important to highlight exciting opportunities in other departments we retain sole responsibility for providing the disciplinary grounding that PO majors require. A primary objective of our curricular review is to identify areas of greatest need that can be filled by faculty hiring. We know that, despite recent junior hires, we still lack the ability to meet the demand in American politics from majors and non-majors (particularly COM) alike. Judicial politics is also a particularly acute area of concern given the incredibly high demand for legal courses from our majors, almost half of whom go on to law school, and the department’s current meager resources in that area. By restructuring our curriculum and targeting new searches to both fill curricular holes and build strategic areas of strength in what will undoubtedly remain an under-sized department, PO plans to bolster significantly its capacity to meet the needs of a diverse undergraduate program. Only an expansion in our ranks, however, will enable PO to offer a curriculum commensurate with its peer institutions in terms of breadth and depth.

Graduate Education: As noted above, our primary purpose is to train Ph.D. students for careers in academia and, a lesser extent, in NGOs and government. .

The Student Body. The PhD program generates a high degree of external interest: 156 applications in 2009, 160 in 2008, and 141 in 2007, a considerable increase over totals from a decade ago. Many applicants are extremely highly qualified as demonstrated by their GREs, GPAs and letters of recommendation. For example, recipients of our Teaching Fellowships in 2009 all were above the 95th percentile in at least one section of the GRE. The average GRE percentiles for the entering class as a whole are 85th verbal, 69th quantitative and 66th analytical. Shortages of funding opportunities (we have only two awards to distribute this year) restrict our ability to enroll more of the superb students interested in studying with us. We enroll about ten to twelve students a year and believe that this represents the appropriate size for an entering class. Smaller entering classes might result in us having too few students in core courses under College guidelines on the minimum size of seminars. The student body is strikingly diverse including 43 males, 21 females. We have 29 Caucasian Americans and three African Americans. The other students come from all over the world – China, Japan, Moldova, Turkey, the UK and Columbia to name only a few of the countries represented in our program.

Goals Relating to the Composition of the Student Body Our primary goal is to raise the quality of entering classes so that the class average is closer to that of the best of our applicants and of our financial aid recipients. We will seek to make our Ph.D. program more attractive to the very best applicants through a variety of means.

- to seek to recruit and retain superb faculty, a key factor in attracting graduate students.
- to make clearer to potential applicants and their advisers the true strength of the discipline of Political Science at Boston University.. Existing structures tend to conceal from the outside world how many excellent political scientists the university has even though colleagues from other departments, notably International Relations already play a crucial role not only in teaching courses taken by our students but in directing Ph.D. dissertations. We will seek to create a format acceptable to our colleagues in other departments that publicizes rather than obscuring BU's strength in our discipline.
- though well aware of the shortages of resources at BU, we note that the most effective means for raising the quality of our entering classes is to offer more funding packages; thus, to explore with CAS all means, including development activities, through which such funding could be obtained.

Program Structure The Ph.D. program follows one similar to that in all major departments combining course work leading to Comprehensive exams, requirements for methods training and a dissertation. We believe this structure is sound and have no plans to change it.

Staffing. We have emphasized above our wish to make more effective use of resources already available at BU, especially political scientists in other units. Retirements are expected to provide the department with many opportunities to recruit new faculty at the forefront of their fields. It is vital for the graduate program that we have a faculty able to train graduate students to the highest level in American politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations and probably Political Theory. No other unit at BU has this responsibility Although other departments—notably IR—contain excellent political scientists, they do not have the responsibility for maintaining graduate level instruction at the frontiers of our discipline. The Strategic Plan of CAS/IR notes, theirs is a “problem orientated” approach while we seek to deepen collaboration with colleagues in that department, we have a continuing need to recruit faculty in International Relations and Comparative Politics.

Promoting Excellence in the Student Body

The primary means by which we promote excellence among our students through our teaching and advising. We will take additional steps to promote the success of our students by

- Holding seminars on professional development and skills

- Increasing the proportion of our students who present papers at major political science conferences
- Increasing the proportion of our students who publish in important political science journals including in partnership with our faculty.

Measurement of Progress

We will monitor progress in pursuit of these goals--

Placement

The ultimate test for a graduate program is how well it places its students. Many of our overseas students return to excellent positions in their home country e.g. UNAM Mexico, the University of Algiers, Nanyan Technical University China. We have placed students in tenure track positions in the US at Clarkson, Kings College NY and Suny-Oswego. We are not satisfied with the number or level of these placements and believe that with the changes in our faculty, facilities and with better financial support discussed above, we can improve on them.

4. Facilities

PO's two-floor share of 232 BSR is chronically inadequate for our instructional and research purposes, for housing the faculty during on-campus hours, and in "representational" terms: plumbing, heating, wiring are all marginal to worse. We need radical improvement *in situ*, or relocation to a new building. CAS is quite aware of the needs, and "funding the plan" is beyond PO's capabilities—it is a CAS matter.

C. The Future

Ten-Year Aim

We aim to be a nationally-ranked department, its "profile" much-elevated above that of today, with particular strengths in American politics (public policy) "on its own" and a recognition of PO and IR resources together as providing a strong base for PhDs in the disciplinary subfields of comparative politics and international relations. PO is at a "critical juncture" right now: retirements and recent recruitment have built a base upon which additional PO appointments, and better coordination with IR, promise to "pay off" by making the *discipline* of political science at the "one BU" an enterprise of national and international standing. We cannot get there without the needed additional resources and attention. These, given the relatively modest costs of PO as opposed to the natural sciences or economics, are *not* expensive at the all-BU level.

Faculty --we look over the next decade

--to incorporate more effectively into our Ph.D. program top level political scientists at BU whose tenure homes are outside our department

--to develop within the department a faculty that includes winners of prominent awards and prizes (e.g. from the APSA) for research achievements in at least the fields of International Relations, American Politics and Comparative Politics

In pursuit of these goals, both retirements (5) and new hires (4) are moving in the right direction, but PO is *not* growing on a net basis—and we must, if we are to balance between faculty numbers vs. some 425-475 undergraduate majors, the sum of PhD candidates "in residence" who require attention, and the demands of scholarship as well as those of teaching.

Recruitment of new faculty must take account of *all* PO subfields. As noted above we have hired exciting young faculty in American politics, and need to hire more. However, for the sake of students graduate

and undergraduate as well as our own external reputation, PO needs to be strong in comparative politics and international relations. need attention as well to increase PO's effectiveness at its unique tasks. We are at present dependent, effectively, for coverage of public policy and political theory, on a single faculty member for each, an obviously undesirable situation in view of the need to maintain stability and variety in course offerings.

Recent junior-level appointments have helped redress a tilt toward a departmental composition weighted with late-career faculty. In the future, however, there is a strong case for the appointment of one of two high profile senior scholar/teachers as well—in connection with which we should be alert to emergent “targets of opportunity.”

Over 10 years, a PO salary-line faculty of 16 should at a minimum have risen to 22. In line with our possibilities and direction, and recognizing that the following list has to be “administered” with flexibility; we will look for, specifically--

- TWO junior Americanists, one in judicial politics/constitutional law, other open as to specialty—here we are building strengths newly developed over three recent hires
- ONE junior political theorist (or senior “target of opportunity”) to allow us to stabilize and broaden offerings in theory for our undergraduates
- ONE specialist, likely junior, in IR *theory* (the subject remains PO's responsibility)
- ONE senior, likely an Americanist and/or public policy specialist, to contribute to leadership and mentoring within the department
- ONE junior comparative politics specialist, able to offer upper division and graduate courses in the field, with a regional focus that adds to the university's strengths

THUS—the 2020 GOALS:

--in scholarship and research, a 22-member PO salary-line faculty, whose productivity record over calendar 2017-8-9 should be roughly double that for the three recent years noted above, p. 2

--in undergraduate education, an effective use of an augmented resource base to continue a tradition of excellence in undergraduate instruction: our objectives here are “*constant*,” lacking have been the resources to afford PO *flexibility* in their pursuit. Increased faculty, better classroom/seminar facilities, relocation to a new “headquarters” will allow PO in 10 years to improve the very good job it does now with limited resources

--in graduate education, we would aim in 10 years, for

--significantly higher GRE scores—average verbal of 700, quantitative average 750+

-- placement of four graduates per year in top level (as defined by customary means) liberal arts or research university departments.

Pursuing national ranking for our PhD program, we note a need for more fellowship support allocated on a regular basis, to increase the attractiveness of the offers we can make. We have also “raised the bar” in recent times on GRE scores, and other indicators, increasing our selectivity, and plan to go further in this regard. We will develop effective ways to indicate to prospective PO PhD students the true strength of BU as a whole in the discipline, and bring more effectively into our programs political scientists in other units., with interests in comparative and i.r. subfields, and an enhanced degree of organization/coordination, especially in graduate education, between PO and IR.

AND—on the way—the 2015 INDICATORS:

the retirements noted plus 2-3 of six appointments; a facilities “fix” completed (in next 4 years) and 1 new FT office staffer; significant additions to GS support; scholarly productivity by 2005 1.5x the 2006-7-8 level noted earlier; AND a more comprehensive context/organizational template for PO-IR cooperation at PhD level.

Department of Psychology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Our mission is to advance understanding of the mind from three perspectives: mental disorders, social and cognitive development, and cognition and the brain. We advance this mission through large undergraduate and graduate training programs and cutting edge research. We attract and retain outstanding undergraduates by providing them with well-taught, relevant, and stimulating classes providing a solid foundation in scientific psychology and by engaging many in research with faculty mentors. We prepare the next generation of academic psychologists through apprentice-like doctoral programs. Finally, we make important contributions to human knowledge through successful faculty research programs. Research accomplishments attract and retain the best students and excellent students facilitate faculty research.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

Academic Peer Group

Our peers are other large urban private research universities. (e.g., NYU, USC, Penn, GWU, Northwestern, Syracuse, and Columbia). For publications and citations, we are ranked #47 and USC, Northwestern, Penn Syracuse, and Columbia are ahead of us and we are ahead of NYU, and Emory. We are behind most of our peers in the NRC rankings with a somewhat inexplicable ranking of #97. In federal R & D funds expended, only NYU is ahead of us. Among our peers that are ranked ahead of us, the most significant difference seems to be the size of the faculty.

Scholarly/research quality (Aggregate): Among our tenure track faculty the total number of publications during the three year period was 517 which yields a mean of 19.9 publications during the period or a mean of 6.6 per year per faculty member. The range is substantial – from 0 (only 1 person) to 60. Many publications appeared in high impact journals

Research grant activity: PS does an outstanding job of attracting external research support. 77% of our tenure track faculty currently hold grants (almost exclusively, federal). During the last three AYs the number of grants have been 63, 68, and 74, which yields normed rates of 2.25, 2.43, and 2.64. The total costs were: \$11.3M, \$12.3M, and \$13.8M, for an average per faculty member of \$404K, \$440K, and \$494K. During FY2009, PS was awarded more grant funding than any CAS department except the Center for Space Physics.

Citations over the most recent 3-year period: Among tenure track faculty the mean number of citations over the past 3 years is 746 (range 26 to 2,842). Annual average is 249.

Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate): The level that is identified as excellent in our department is 4 or higher on a 5 point scale. Faculty whose ratings are below 3 would be identified as needing improvement. For AY 08/09, on overall course rating, over 68% in fall 08 and 76% in spring 09 were in the 4-5 range. Only 2% in fall 08 and none in spring 09 were rated below 3. On overall rating of instructor, 71% in fall 08 and 76% in spring 09 were in the 4-5 range. Only 2% in fall 08 and none in spring 09 were rated below 3.

Participation in successful academic enhancement activities: In addition to offering a wide range of PS courses in many different areas, we provide our undergraduates an opportunity to be involved in research with our faculty beginning as freshmen. During the 2007-08 AY we had 109 undergraduate students enrolled in directed studies or Work for Distinction and during the 2008-09 AY there were 107. PS has 2 very active undergraduate organizations, the Undergraduate Psychology Association and Psi Chi, the National Honor Society for Psychology.

Educational/pedagogical contributions (Field): Our department is not subdivided by field at the undergraduate level.

Assessment of undergraduate education: Our goal is to provide undergraduates with a strong foundation in

psychological theory, to help them develop critical thinking skills, and to help them learn, understand and apply basic research methods. We are among the largest majors in CAS, servicing as many students as some entire colleges at BU. We have approximately 850 majors and 108 minors and advise over 1000 students each semester. Our enrollments are over 6500 (S 09 n=3274, F 09 n=3322) in undergraduate courses and more than 530 (S 09 n= 266, F 09 n=267) in graduate courses each year. We not only accommodate our huge number of majors and minors in our undergraduate courses but also the hundreds of students from other majors/minors and other colleges within BU. Regrettably, only 56% of the undergraduates enrolled in our courses in fall 09 and 49% in spring 10 are taught by tenure track faculty. Full-time lecturers taught 24% of our undergraduate courses in fall 09 and 22% in spring 10. Part-time lecturers teach the remaining percentages of our student (20% in Fall 09 and 29% in spring 10). Although we have not formally evaluated our curriculum recently, we continually review our course offerings. Next year we will conduct a formal review of our curriculum.

Analysis of enrollment history and projections; student quality measures: The enrollments in PS courses are consistently very high. Over the past five years, the annual average enrollments were 6660 in undergraduate courses and 549 in graduate courses. We, therefore, project that our enrollments will be as high, if not higher, in future years. 80% of our majors are female. 52% identify as Caucasian, 15% as Asian, 8% as Latino/Hispanic, 2.5% as African American/Black, .5% as American Indian, .3% as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 3.5% are listed as 'other.'

Assessment of doctoral programs

Brain, Behavior, & Cognition Program: The 2007 report in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* lists BU as 4th in Cognitive Sciences, after CMU, MIT, and the University of Rochester. This ranking (based on 41 faculty members), cannot be attributed fully to the BBC program, but speaks to the quality and international reputation of the BBC faculty. The goal of the BBC program is to provide graduate students with highly specialized research training in understanding the connection between the brain, behavior, and cognition. The BBC program is highly competitive with over 100 applications per year. For the BBC program (13 total): 9 women, 4 men; 7 white, 2 African-American, 1 Hispanic, 3 Asian

Clinical Program: The mission is to conduct research, to provide educational experiences for graduate and undergraduate students, and to ensure high quality clinical training for doctoral students. The program has a long-standing commitment to the scientist-practitioner "Boulder" model for doctoral training. As such, graduates of the program are expected to be competent in clinical assessment and intervention skills as well as in general research skills and the ability to apply these skills to the investigation of problems of interest to clinical psychologists. We expect that our graduates will become leaders and innovators in the field of psychology in clinical, research, or academic settings. In part due to the multiple licensing requirements related to our Clinical Program, we regularly undertake [every year] a review of the curriculum. Our program continues to be the most competitive program in the country based on number of applications. We regularly receive over 600 applications a year with this year's total exceeding 680! The BU Clinical Program was ranked 8th out of 166 clinical psychology programs based on total publications by Stewart et al.

(2007). [*Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 14, 157-171]. It was ranked 32nd in the nation by *USNWR*. We currently have 72 clinical students [55 female, 17 male]. Currently we have 9 Asian females 5 African American females, 2 Latina Hispanic females, and 3 international students.

Developmental Science Program: This program is currently being revised. The newly revised program, Developmental Science, is designed to provide students with advanced training in the field of developmental psychology, with an emphasis on early childhood. The program represents the breadth of the discipline, offering research opportunities across different developmental domains using multiple methodologies, and exploring the integration of basic developmental science with practice and policy. There are 15 doctoral students in the program.

Masters Program: PS offers an eight-course program of study leading to the M.A. in Psychology. This Program in General Psychology provides the flexibility to pursue a variety of areas in psychology, building on a common foundation of scientific methodologies. A one time follow up study of graduates had indicated that 50% of the respondents had pursued doctoral or other professional training.

Interdisciplinary Initiatives: PS faculty are major participants in multiple interdisciplinary neuroscience initiatives. These include two major research initiatives: the NIMH funded Center for Memory and Brain

(CMB) which also includes faculty from Mathematics and BNE and focuses on the neurobiology of memory and CELEST. PS faculty are also major participants in the graduate Program in Neuroscience, and the Undergraduate Concentration in Neuroscience. The Undergraduate Concentration in Neuroscience is less than a year old but already has approximately 140 majors.

Facilities

Our very successful research programs are suffering from a shortage of space that has reached a critical level. Without significant additional space it will not be possible to sustain the progress that we have made in the last decade, let alone make further progress. Every program within the department has stretched available research space beyond any reasonable limit. The Department contributes resources towards providing new space through the tuition associated with our teaching and the overhead derived from our research grants.

Other infrastructure

The department needs infrastructure improvements, such as greater server capacity, additional internet switches, AV equipment in classrooms, a machine shop, additional wireless access, and improved venting in laboratory spaces.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

Ten year plan

No function in PS is more important than undergraduate education and it is an area in which PS can make important contributions to enhancing the stature of BU and its attractiveness to prospective students. The role that PS plays in undergraduate education is reflected in the fact that during the last 10 years more BA degrees were awarded in PS (2,981) than any major in CAS. For AY 08/09, students in CAS enrolled in 16,781 PS credit hours and those in the colleges outside of CAS enrolled in 10,803 credit hours. The ratio of credit hours to tenure track faculty is an astronomical 985 to 1. In addition to being an extremely popular major within BU, the *Princeton Review* identified psychology as the second most popular college major (first in arts and sciences). A recently circulated BU document reported that PS had the most inquiries from HS seniors of any major in CAS. Only Mathematics with 1,071 inquiries and PS with 3,661 inquiries experienced an increase this year.

Dr. Hebden Palfai, Director of Academic Affairs, holds orientation/advising sessions, each semester, for all students who are new to PS. These meetings welcome students to the department, familiarize them with the CAS and PS major requirements, and discuss research opportunities. We believe they are helpful in terms of students' adjustment to college and to the department, as well as in terms of retention, particularly for our freshmen.

In 2020 the BU PS should be ranked in the top 25 or higher nationally in every ranking system. As mentioned earlier, the PS's poorest ranking (#97) was in the NRC Assessment of Doctorate Program, which collected data by questionnaire. Such opinion-based indices are "lagging indicators", i.e., it may take some time for the actual merits of a department to be reflected in questionnaire data. BU PS fared much better using more objective indicators. Specifically, we ranked #47 according to the number of faculty publications and citations as reported in *Research in Developmental Disabilities* in 2005. In the 2007 ranking of total federally funded research, BU PS ranked #6 among universities when excluding large state systems with multiple campuses. {From 2007 to 2008 we increased by 9.0%, and from 2008 to 2009 we increased by 12.2 %}. Grant funding, publications, and citations are "leading indicators" and the more subjective, opinion-based measures of prestige will eventually reflect similar improvements, albeit at a slower pace. PS has been on a steep trajectory of improvement, especially over the last decade or so, which takes time to be reflected in public perceptions. Because PS is such an attractive major for current and prospective students, supporting PS's efforts in areas that will be reflected in improved rankings and prestige will naturally translate into

substantial effects in attracting and retaining the best students.

The Role of Neuroscience within the Department: A critical trend over the next ten years will be the growing centrality of neuroscience in PS. This trend is already evident in work in the Clinical and Developmental programs. Indeed, earlier this year 85% of the PS faculty reported that their research involved neuroscience and/or cognitive science. The department has already begun a discussion that will lead to proposing a new name for the department, such as the “Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences” in order to reflect the reality of what the discipline is becoming. By acknowledging and strengthening the role of neuroscience in PS we will ensure our position at the forefront of the field. In December the faculty voted unanimously to request that we be re-designated as a Natural Science. The majority of the PS faculty pursue the cognitive and biological mechanisms that underlie behavior. Few study societies or social behavior. Our major scholarly activity is experimental research, requiring the need for substantial laboratory space. Our faculty are evaluated largely on research productivity in projects funded by NIH, NSF, and other agencies, research journal publications, and mentoring of students in research, similar to the other natural science departments. We are aware that PS is designated a social science at many universities, and this assignment is appropriate in institutions where a large proportion of the faculty pursue the field as a social science. However, we firmly believe that we do not fit this model and re-designation as a natural science follows a major trend in the evolution of the field in general and our department in particular.

Specific Issues for the Next Ten Years: The Developmental program is the area of the PS in greatest need of change and growth. The program has several very senior faculty members with a relatively diverse set of intellectual and research interests and a core of relatively junior faculty members whose research interests are sharply focused on early childhood with an emphasis on cognitive development. The most promising approach to improving the stature and increasing research and educational accomplishments will be to develop a ‘critical mass’ of faculty members in the area of early childhood development.

3.2 Research and scholarly excellence

We hope that the clinical program will be considered one of the top programs in terms of scholarly quality and productivity, grant activity, clinical training and teaching. One of the greatest opportunities for the Clinical Program is with interdisciplinary research. Due to the nature of the work that focuses on interventions and understanding psychopathology, the Clinical Program is uniquely positioned to engage in collaborative research across the university. Many investigators have taken advantage of this opportunity and have collaborated with departments such as general medicine, neuroanatomy, and psychiatry in BUSM, SPH, and Social Work. The development of cognition and emotion is a good area of focus for BU because the study of human development has many natural ties with cognitive science, neuroscience, and clinical psychology, areas that we have strengthened considerably during the past several years. Developmental psychology has also become an area of considerable government investment following the increased interest in the science of learning and improvement of education. In addition, developmental psychology is also a research area of intense interest to undergraduate concentrators, particularly women. Concrete goals: 1) Expand core faculty; 2) Create a unified Child Research Labs with centralized resources and an expanded identity; 3) Expand and enhance undergraduate curriculum and educational experiences and create connections for students with interests in child development in other colleges (e.g., Education; Sargent); 4) Create stronger connections with neuroscience programs; 5) Application for funding to support post-doctoral trainees in developmental psychology within our unified Child Research Labs; and 7) Plan and implement strategies for attracting targeted developmental funds (philanthropy).

Five-year goals: Over the next 5 years our rankings should improve as perceptions catch up with objective measures of quality.

The Role of Programs within the Department

Faculty members work within a hierarchy of environments – their own laboratory, their program, the department, CAS, and BU. Various activities are conducted at various levels. Research and mentoring take place at the laboratory level. Issues of graduate education (e.g., admissions & qualifying exams) are addressed at the program level. Undergraduate education (e.g., requirements & curriculum) and governance issues (e.g., recruiting, promotion, & tenure) are addressed at the departmental level. PS faculty also participate in college and university activities through work on committees and in interdisciplinary programs. The organization of the department follows the three doctoral programs. Faculty within each program tend to be united by research interests and common methodologies. Each program has its own set of requirements that necessitates participation of program faculty in regular meetings which promotes cohesiveness within program. Important resources are distributed through programs (e.g., space & graduate teaching fellowships) which further reinforces the importance of programs. Program salience is also promoted by the geographical separation of the three programs. However, there is a very strong sense of identification with the department. At an intellectual level, we are all interested in the scientific study of behavior. The department holds well attended monthly department meetings for the discussion of issues affecting the department as a whole, such as strategic planning. It is desirable to have more opportunities for interaction among faculty members in different programs, but currently the relationships among faculty members are quite positive and there is a high level of mutual respect. There is also a significant number of collaborations across programs. If the department had a building that could accommodate all three programs the proximity would undoubtedly foster greater collaboration and yield significant synergy. Another factor that is likely to enhance interactions among programs is the increasing prominence of neuroscience in the Clinical and Human Development programs which will foster closer ties with BBC. While it is an important goal to promote greater interaction among the programs, it is also important to consider that the status quo is outstanding faculty productivity and generally good faculty morale.

Problem Areas to Address in Next Ten Years:

Space: Inadequate space is the greatest problem that we face. It would be a very positive development to have one building to house all PS faculty, staff, and graduate students. A suitable building would provide space for faculty and staff offices, research labs, and teaching spaces including large lecture halls and smaller seminar rooms. Having the department in one building would undoubtedly promote synergistic interactions. However, at a minimum, each program urgently requires more space, regardless of its location. Although we have a very large number of undergraduates interested in psychology who ‘live’ in our department, there is no common area where the students can congregate. I think such an area would improve the morale of current students and foster an identification with the department and university that would lead eventually to more supportive and engaged alumni.

Faculty: We are currently recruiting for two junior faculty members. If these searches are successful, we will have 30 tenure track professors next year. In order to achieve our goals for the Department, we will need to increase our faculty by 3 in the Clinical Program, 3 in the Brain, Behavior and Cognition Program, and 3 in the Developmental Science Program, for a total of 39 tenure track professors. We would also need to hire two additional full-time lecturers, for a total of 7. In addition, we anticipate that 3-4 faculty will be retiring over the next ten years. These faculty will also need to be replaced. PS will never be large enough to do a credible job of covering the entire breadth of the field, so we must focus our efforts in areas where we can be excellent. We must be careful to avoid adding any faculty affiliations to our departments that would detract from our ability to make a strong case for hiring additional faculty that would not only help with our teaching mission, but also contribute to the developing excellence in our three programs. As we propose specific recruitments on a year-by-year basis over the next decade, we will provide detailed and specific information about the type of individual we wish to recruit. Providing this type of detail now would be premature because the exact needs of the department will evolve. However, we believe that the size of our teaching load and the current faculty-student ratio alone provides an extremely compelling rationale for our proposed growth.

Teaching load: A significant threat to faculty morale is the disparity in teaching load that exists between our department and comparable departments within CAS. As described above, the appropriate comparison groups for PS faculty are natural science departments and it is obvious to everyone in our

department that our loads are not equitable. Comparing ourselves to peer departments at BU, PS has among the highest grant productivity and is among the most productive in teaching, number of majors and teacher:student ratio. Although, new faculty members have a 3-course teaching load, most faculty members still have a 4-course teaching load. The significant progress in reducing disparities with other departments that has been achieved in recent years is appreciated, but we look forward to continued progress in this area.

Maintaining the Integrity of the Department: We must be particularly thoughtful about anything that would siphon off resources from the core mission of PS to enhance resources in alternative programs or departments. We are very interested in potential collaborative efforts that would produce synergy and/or leverage our resources but it is imperative that this not weaken PS by diluting the efforts of the limited faculty that we have. As we have argued elsewhere in this document, we believe that we have been exceptionally successful in fulfilling our teaching and research missions in spite of having too few faculty members and too little space. In general, proposals that would divert faculty resources away from the PS, such as “equally sharing” faculty members between two departments, would necessarily reduce the already inadequate size of our faculty. Furthermore, if such an arrangement were to reduce the ability of our cognitive neuroscience faculty members to fully participate in the life of the department, we would be depriving the department of individuals who are at the cutting edge of the field. However, PS must make even greater efforts to contribute to the curricular needs of the undergraduate and graduate neuroscience programs. Because of the critical importance of PS to undergraduate education at BU, any action that would weaken PS would have a deleterious effect on our ability to attract and retain the best undergraduate students.

IRB: As described elsewhere in this plan, PS has a very large portfolio of funded research, primarily human research. A key element in human research is approval and oversight by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). The CRC IRB has been very helpful in facilitating PS research. The CRC IRB is merging with the BUSM IRB. If this merger is not managed effectively and if the necessary staff resources are not provided to the CRC, the merger would have serious adverse consequences for PS research.

Salary Equity: Although the faculty appreciates the progress that has been made in raising faculty salaries, BU still seems to be behind our peers and this affects morale and retention.

Measures for evaluating progress

To identify our progress toward these goals, we will rely on publications that rank programs (e.g., *USNWR*; scholarly journal articles on the topic), but more importantly, by utilizing markers of productivity. We hope to see increases in total scholarly output, total number of publications and grant activity that would be commensurate with the proposed increase in faculty. Through the development of collaborative research programs and the ability to expand individual labs with additional space for post-docs and students, we hope to see similar increases in median publications and grant support per faculty member by 10-15% over this time frame. We will also use evidence of undergraduate and graduate student involvement in research activities [UROP, directed study, publications/presentations] and course satisfaction ratings to gauge improvements toward our educational mission.

Department of Religion
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Department of Religion serves as Boston University's central location for the study of religion in its many manifestations, incorporating theoretical, social, historical, and cultural approaches. In a world where the power of religious ideas and institutions is evident, we work to develop essential literacy in the world's religious traditions and to cultivate deeper understanding of the nature and function of religion in human society, historically and in the present. This mission has three primary components: 1) teaching undergraduates and training graduate students in the academic study of religion, 2) producing cutting-edge research in the field, and 3) contributing to broader discussions of religion within and beyond the academy.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

While some of the best programs in the country are found at institutions with longstanding traditions of excellence and prestige (Chicago, Princeton, Columbia), others in the top tier reflect an institutional decision to pour resources into the construction of a dominant religious studies program (UC Santa Barbara, UNC Chapel Hill). Our department finds its peers among the second tier programs in the country, including Emory, Indiana, Brown, Toronto, Duke, Stanford, Vanderbilt, Syracuse. Those programs that are stronger than BU (Toronto, Emory, Indiana) have larger faculties, broader coverage of religious traditions and methodological orientations, and stronger institutional support for the humanities. Those programs that are similar in standing or weaker (Duke, Vanderbilt, Brown, Stanford, Syracuse) generally have fewer faculty and less breadth. Most peers have better libraries and grad funding; some benefit from intangibles such as perceived prestige of institution. Some of our peers (Vanderbilt, Duke, Brown) still reflect the Christian orientation of the field as it first developed, with disproportionate strength in Christianity and ancient Judaism, biblical studies, and philosophy of religion. Others are more fundamentally diverse in focus and theoretical and comparative in orientation (Indiana, Stanford, Emory, Syracuse, Toronto); the most dynamic programs reflect this development in the field. Not long ago, we fit into the former category, but over the past ten years our profile has changed considerably, and we now may be classed with the latter group, although still working on the transition. Our standing is strengthened by the research productivity of our faculty; unusually strong emphasis on religious interactions across multiple traditions and explicit address of theoretical & methodological concerns at the heart of our discipline; interdisciplinary conversation fostered by CURA, the Program in Scripture and the Arts, et al.; strong commitment to excellence in undergraduate teaching; the resources of STH; and the combined academic resources of the Boston area. That Harvard, BC, and Brandeis lack religion departments gives our program added importance in Boston.

2. Faculty

21 faculty: 7 tenure track assistants (1 w/ primary appt. in STH); 4 tenured associates; 10 tenured full professors (5 on ¼ or ½ arrangements).

Scholarly/research quality

1. refereed scholarly publications last 3 years

The department has collectively published 11 books, edited 14, contributed 42 book chapters, and published 24 journal articles.

2. "high quality" journal publications

Of the 24 journal articles published in the last three years, three quarters are in major/high quality journals.

3. research grant activity (past three years)

Japan Foundation Short-Term Summer Research Grant; American Philosophical Society Franklin Research

Grant; NEH Summer Stipend; American Institute of Sri Lankan Studies Grant; American Academy of Religion Research Award; Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship; ACLS Fellowship; Sackler Institute for Advanced Studies at Tel Aviv University Fellowship; BU Humanities Foundation Junior Faculty Fellowship; BUHF Jeffrey Henderson Senior Research Fellowship; BUHF Publication Assistance Grant.

5. awards

In addition to the Quill Award in Religion/Spirituality, Prothero's *Religious Literacy* received recognition in a number of important venues, including Best Non-fiction books of 2007, Washington Post; Best Books of 2007, Amazon.com; Best Books of the Year, Publisher's Weekly; Top 10 Religion Books, Booklist; Editor's Choice, NY Times Book Review; and the NY Times Bestseller List. Zank received the Journal for the Study of Religion and Ideology Prize, and Katz received a National Jewish Book Award.

c. educational/pedagogical contributions (aggregate)

1. course evaluations

Average instructor ratings by semester are consistently above 4.4. For assessment purposes, 4.5 and above marks excellence, 4 or above is good, 3.5 to 4 is minimally acceptable, and below 3.5 calls for serious attention. Of 127 courses in the last three years: 52 (41%) of instructor ratings were excellent, 49 (39%) were good, 24 (19%) were minimally acceptable, and 2 (1%) were in need of serious improvement. No instructor was rated less than 3.2. More telling are narrative comments, which occasionally register complaints but most often praise faculty for commitment to both subject and students.

2. teaching awards

We've received two Metcalf Awards in recent memory and have had a faculty member nominated for a Metcalf each of the past three years. We've also received College and Honors Program teaching awards, and one colleague was selected to serve as NEH Distinguished Teaching Professor in the Humanities.

3. academic enhancement activities

Faculty bring guest speakers into class, visit museums, attend theater programs, etc. We also make contributions to the broader student body: e.g., a university-wide forum on Mel Gibson's *Passion of the Christ*; an undergraduate component to symposium honoring RN scholar Eve Sedgwick, etc. 1 GUTS project and 1 UROP project approved in the last 2 years.

4. curricular and pedagogical innovation

Faculty continually update existing classes to reflect the changing landscape, changing technologies, and changes in our students; we continually find new ways to teach "old" classes and develop new classes. In the last 3 years, we have added 25 new courses to the curriculum and substantively revised 6. We submitted several proposals for UHC seminars, and one was chosen for the pilot program. 2 faculty members, in collaboration with a MLCL colleague, developed a 3-course sequence on secularization and Judaism for a Posen Foundation for Cultural Judaism grant (to run 2009-13).

f. major professional and public service contributions

3 faculty members are on the AAR Steering committee for their respective subfields, one heads up the AAR Book Award committee, and 6 are currently editors or book editors for major journals. 1 is co-director of BU's Paideia Project, while another serves as the Academic Chair of the EU's Task Force on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research. 100% of our full time faculty is involved in service of some substantive kind.

3. Academic Programs

a. assessment of undergraduate education

We are a small major, graduating 15-20 students each year, with about the same number of minors. Given that we enroll upwards of 2000 students in classes each year, our strength lies in our work as a service department for students in other majors.

1. goals and purposes

To provide students with an understanding of religion as a central facet of human culture; to provide excellent cross-cultural grounding in the humanities and social sciences in preparation for further study or for any number of careers requiring advanced critical thinking, writing, and rhetorical skills, including law, journalism, social work, government, education, or professional service in religious institutions; to provide literacy in

religious traditions and issues for students in other majors and schools/colleges.

2. vitality and quality

We are currently conducting a curriculum review. We offer a wide range of courses from a variety of theoretical and methodological perspectives with a good balance of introductory to advanced levels and a particular strength in interdisciplinarity. With new hires we have new curricular strengths, notably in Asian religions (and S. Asian religions esp.), in RN and gender, and RN and Lit. We need to capitalize on these new strengths. There are important areas we don't cover at all that are considered essential among our aspirational peers, including Native American/indigenous religions, African-American religions, and African & Caribbean religions. Recent hiring has built new strengths, but this has come at the expense of Christianity and RN in America, and we no longer are able to meet student demand in those areas. We are concerned about the practice of piggybacking grad seminars with undergrad, as it seems not to be in the best interests of the undergrads. Our curriculum was written with the needs of RN majors in mind, but as we recognize how few of our students are majors, we see the need to reshape the curriculum to reflect that (see below).

3. analysis of enrollment history and projections; student quality

Enrollments in RN courses have increased by 21% since 2000 (from 6825 credit hrs to 8246). Actual enrollments are consistently about 10% beyond the figures indicated on the credit hour report when cross listed sections are added. A noticeable change in enrollment patterns in the last ten years is that more students outside of CAS are taking RN classes. 42% of RN credit hours were taken by non-CAS students in 2009 compared to 35% in 2000. The bulk of these students come from COM, but we also see strong interest from SMG, ENG, SAR, and SED. The pattern of increasing enrollments is something that we expect to continue, perhaps 10-20% over the next ten years. Quality: while the average RN major GPA hovers around 3.2, our best students are truly stellar. We have consistently had two Humanities Foundation winners each year, we currently have two Harold Case scholars, a Buck scholar, we've won Ada Draper Awards, two CAS Writing awards, Phi Beta Kappa, etc

4. student outcomes

Many of our students go work in the non-profit world, some enter the corporate world, some go off on adventures. Many go to law school (Michigan, Suffolk, Harvard, Drexel, et al.). We have an excellent track record getting our students into top graduate programs. In the last five years, we have had students enter into Ph.D. history programs at Yale, Northwestern, and UC Santa Barbara, the linguistics program at Oxford, religious studies at Yale, Penn, and Chicago. Our recent Rhodes Scholar is now pursuing a doctorate in anthropology at Oxford. Some train to become clergy: we currently have three alumni in rabbinical school and several in Protestant seminaries.

5. student diversity

We do not have as many underrepresented minority students as we should. We do have a very diverse population in terms of cultural/ethnic background and religious identity. We have significantly more women than men in most classes.

b. Assessment of Doctoral Programs

As our Ph.D. program is housed within the collaborative DRTS, which has submitted its own plan, we will not repeat information here. Cross-appointed RN faculty support doctoral programs beyond the DRTS, supervising and reading dissertations in other departments; all of us open our seminars to students from other doctoral programs.

c. Assessment of Masters Programs

1. mission: goals and purposes

The MA in Religion and International Relations is designed to provide a sophisticated understanding of religion as it pertains to international relations, preparing students for academic and policy careers dealing with the intersection of religion and world affairs. This program was just completely revised; in 2009-10 we admitted the first group of students under the new program, and it is too soon to evaluate quality, recruitment, and so on.

d. Other Academic Programs

The Program in Scripture and the Arts (PSA) is a successful program that provides a venue for exploring the role of sacred text in broader culture; develops intellectual community for faculty, grad students, and

undergrads; connects depts, schools, and programs at BU and other area institutions; and that brings the fruit of intellectual discourse to the general public. The EWCJS depends upon the resources of Religion. The Center has completed its own strategic plan. RN would like to see greater visibility for JS across the university—current strengths need to be drawn together more effectively.

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives

Faculty participate in the Institute for Philosophy and Religion and CURA.

g. Outreach Initiatives

The PSA and the EWCJS both have outreach as part of their mission and they have been very successful in this. Our Annual Lecture also puts the department in a public spotlight. Most outreach initiatives represent the effort of individuals, and include public speaking, documentary films, contributions in the popular press and online journals, museum exhibitions, the Toleration Project, etc. Through the BUCSA, RN faculty have worked with schools in the Boston area. These activities bring attention to Boston University and serve to increase respect for the institution.

4. Facilities

Our building is filled to capacity; we meet our space needs by putting faculty offices in the top 2 floors of the adjoining EWCJS at 147 BSR. At present the responsibility for the physical space at 147 BSR is in the hands of JS, which makes it difficult to manage RN needs. Clarity about accommodating RN faculty in that space would be helpful. Our seminar room is wonderful, but competition for scheduling fierce. We need more seminar space. We also need more/better large lecture spaces. An important concern is lack of accessibility. While 143 BSR has ramp access and an adjoining hallway; access is barred by locked doors that require a card to open. The library is a vital tool in both teaching and research, and it is woefully inadequate in our field.

5. Collaboration with other academic units and institutions

We have joint majors with AN, CL, and PH, and have collaborated with MLCL, IR, HI in particular. Faculty contribute to Core, the Writing Program, Honors Program, and UHC, BUCSA, SMSC, CURA, and STH (DRTS). Through the DRTS we participate in the Boston Theological Institute.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten Year Plan

a. brief summary

As the only unit in the College dedicated solely to the study of Religion, we would like to play a stronger role in the College and University as a focal point for others with interest in Religion. With recent hires, we have new strengths in South Asian religions and religion and lit and those areas should receive considerable attention over the next decade. We have resources in Judaic Studies across the university that are not fully utilized at present, and we need to make improvements there. We are interested in increasing collaboration with the Medical School, and exploring collaboration with the School of Education.

b. 10 year goals with respect to each of categories discussed above.

1. Faculty

We are looking for two new lines: one to hire in modern Christianity as soon as possible to fill immediate, existing needs and one to hire in indigenous religions to bring our program in line with the best peer institutions (it seems unlikely that a replacement line will open up that could be converted to this purpose). As faculty retire, we will hire new colleagues who combine expertise in a specific tradition with the broader comparative, often interdisciplinary work that makes our department distinctive. In Judaic Studies, American Judaism is a need, and Levine's eventual retirement should allow us to hire there. The fate of Philosophy of Religion remains uncertain; the faculty is passionately divided about the field, and we must resolve those

differences before we can move, but Hart's retirement should allow for replacement there. Allyn Russell gave a major donation to establish a Chair in American Religion, but the account is short of the amount necessary to initiate the professorship. The development office expects that it will take c. 10 years for the fund to reach the level required to hire the chair, but we look forward to improving our offerings in American Religion when that happens. In terms of working with existing faculty, there is strong consensus that we should do more to build intellectual exchange into the life of the department. The majority of our peer institutions do maintain colloquia and/or a departmental lecture series, and we are exploring options. We should continue and expand current efforts to reach out to colleagues with primary interests in religion elsewhere at BU: there are over 20 such faculty members in AN, HI, SO, MLCL, EN, RS, PH, AA, MED & LAW. Continue the practice of inviting faculty to participate in dept searches, lectures, etc.

2. Undergraduate education

Revise curriculum to reflect current faculty and the state of the field beyond BU. Direct our attention toward the non-majors who make up the bulk of our students and to non-CAS students who comprise almost half. In addition to our already successful introductory courses, we need more thematic offerings. Religion and science, religion and gender are already popular, but other courses in development include religion and film, religion and the environment, etc. Students in health sciences flocked to our course on religion and healing when Linda Barnes of the Med School offered it, and we would like to be able to staff it again. Continue our expansion of cross-listing in order to take advantage of faculty expertise in history, sociology, philosophy, MLCL, English, etc. Revise the major to bring students to theoretical considerations sooner (200 level) and add senior capstone. We have many strong teachers; build a culture where faculty routinely visit each other's classes to get ideas, give feedback, etc. Develop consensus on quality in curriculum and teaching.

3. Doctoral education

See the DRTS plan.

4. Masters education

Nurture and grow the new IR/RN MA degree.

5. Other academic programs

PSA has been exceptionally successful. Recent hires and collaboration with MLCL have made RN and Lit very strong here, and we stand out from peers in that we branch out beyond Christian and Jewish literature. We should continue to integrate programming with undergraduate and graduate curriculum. The recent interdisciplinary reorganization has been very effective and the program should enjoy continuing CAS support. Continue to develop ties between RN and SMSC. On Judaic Studies, see separate report.

6. Interdisciplinary initiatives

Revive RN involvement in the Institute for PH & RN so that RN faculty who work in the field continue to find it a meaningful venue for conversation. Increase collaboration with CURA.

7. Facilities

We should have a defined allocation of space under the supervision of the RN Dept. Chair sufficient for managing department business and faculty needs.

9. Collaborations

Strengthen connections with other programs and reach across disciplinary boundaries to use colleagues in other departments (e.g., African Studies, AA, MLCL, HI, IR) to help meet student needs with existing CAS resources.

c. resources needed to accomplish these goals and sources of resources

We need \$10,000-\$15,000 and a half time grad student position to continue to run the PSA. Funds could come from former director's stipend still in budget; the half time grad student position also remains in the budget – it

simply needs to be recommitted.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

Student enrollments, number and quality of majors, faculty productivity and teaching evaluations, retention of faculty, development of collaborations, attendance at sponsored programs. Develop department standards for assessing quality.

3. Five-year Goals

a. expectations for where unit should be in progress toward the plan in five years

Mentor our six assistant profs. through to tenure. As associates, they'll begin working with grad students in earnest and taking leadership roles in the dept. Our curriculum review should have been implemented, ideally resulting in higher enrollments and greater confluence of student expectation and reality, as demonstrated by narrative in teaching evaluations. We should have hired in Christianity and indigenous religions and begun some of our replacement hires. We should have a thriving colloquium/seminar/lecture series in place and collaborative efforts with other units in the college and university. We should know whether and what sort of collaborations with MED, LAW, and SED are possible.

b. steps unit will have to take to achieve five year goals. College and BU?

Department: mentor effectively; conduct curriculum review and make changes, conduct hires, continue practice of yearly retreat to assess program and make plans, share in service burden, adapt to changing student needs/expectations, engage in discussions with potential collaborators. College: authorize continuing funds for PSA, authorize searches. BU: Support Library.

Department of Romance Studies
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

We provide high quality education in Romance languages at all levels (thereby servicing language requirements throughout the university), literature and related art forms of the Romance-speaking world, and General and Romance Linguistics. The department offers undergraduate majors/minors in French, Spanish, Italian, and Linguistics (to which we hope to add Portuguese/Brazilian studies) and MA and PhD degrees in French and Spanish. We also aspire to provide graduate degrees in Italian (MA, BA/MA) and Linguistics (as described in a separate document). Through our academic programs, course offerings, and collaborative relationships with other departments/colleges, we seek to generate a language-rich, internationalized environment on the BU campus. We work closely with International Programs and encourage students to engage in study abroad, providing further opportunities for language and cultural study upon on their return.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

Identification of Academic Peer Group. We compare institutions identified by BU in its own comparative analyses (major private universities in large urban centers). For cluster-ranking, we considered such factors as the number of professorial rank faculty, degree of coverage of major areas of French, Italian, and Hispanic literature and culture, dependency on part-time faculty, level of scholarly achievements, and strength of graduate

programs (where applicable). Only BC, U.Penn., and Tufts have our configuration as a

below BU	similar to BU	above BU
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boston College • George Washington • Northwestern 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tufts • USC • Syracuse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emory • U. Penn. • NYU • Columbia

Romance department; at many institutions Romance is distributed over several departments, leading to different staffing configurations (e.g., greater overall number of professorial rank faculty).

Romance units:

Assessment of faculty quality involves professorial-rank faculty and lecturers (the latter evaluated here only for teaching, not for scholarship). The department has 23 professorial rank faculty members (several with joint administrative or academic appointments within BU) in Spanish, French, Linguistics, and Italian (in order of decreasing faculty size). The group is active in publishing, but in disparate fields (and therefore, also, journals). In 2006-2009, publications for the 21 faculty members then employed included: 8 books or monographs, 6 edited books/journal volumes, 2 scholarly translations, 4 volumes of creative writing, 26 journal articles, 51 book chapters, 15 refereed conference proceedings, and a variety of other types of publications. The French faculty was rated #1 nationally in the Chronicle of Higher Education's 2007 evaluation of faculty productivity.

Grant activity. Linguistics: 2 continuing plus 4 new NSF grants (2 as PI, 2 as co-PI). Total award amounts for grants active in 2006-2009 exceeded \$3 million. Spanish: Mellon grant (through BU Editorial Institute: \$5,394) and grant from the Fundación Federico García Lorca (14,000 Euros).

Awards, honors, and recognitions. J. Iffland: appointed Central American Visiting Scholar, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard U.; P. Lasarte: served as "corresponding member" of the Academia Peruana de la Lengua; C. Maurer: named "corresponding member" of the Real Academia Española de la Lengua (1 of 40 in the world, 1 of 3 in the US); J. Mehlman's translation of P. Bayard, *How To Talk About Books You Haven't Read*: designated "Notable Book of the Year" (NY Times); A. Pineda : named to Chaire des Amériques, Université de Rennes II, France.

Subfields. Spanish: solid coverage of all areas of Peninsular (except the 18th century) and most periods of Latin American (lacunae: Spanish linguistics, US Latino literature). French: solid coverage of most areas (lacuna: 16th century); problem: French faculty members fulfilling other University administrative functions. Italian: solid coverage of most areas (lacuna: 18-19th centuries). Linguistics, see the strategic report submitted separately.

Educational/pedagogical contributions

Awards for teaching and advising: 2 Neu Family Teaching Awards; 1 Metcalf Award; 1 Teaching Award, CAS Honors Program; 1 Templeton Prize for Excellence in Student Advising.

Student evaluations of teaching: uniformly strong across the department. See distribution of ratings in Figure 12. For Spring 2009, average rating for overall course quality was 4.2, for instructor, 4.4.

Distribution of enrollments: See Figures 1-11 for distribution of majors, minors, and enrollments across sections, both over the reporting period and in comparison with 10 years ago. Current numbers of majors and minors are: Italian: 5, 17; French: 56, 128; Spanish: 72, 142; Linguistics: 82, 17. Graduate programs: 27 students now enrolled in Spanish and 17 in French, almost all for the PhD.

Academic enhancement activities. Many professors have sponsored UROP students; one received a GUTS award. Faculty have developed online tools for course enhancement and advising. Spanish faculty facilitated an agreement with the Instituto Cervantes to establish a “Virtual Classroom” at BU in 2009. Many faculty serve as advisors for Work for Distinction projects (some resulting in publications). Faculty serve as advisors for undergraduate associations (e.g., BU Linguistics Association, Italian Student Association) and for students in the R. Warren’s Translation Seminar.

Academic programs

Undergraduate education

Mission: Excellent instruction in the languages, literatures, and related cultural areas of the Romance world (French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish), and in general linguistics.

Viability/quality: Italian shifted toward interdisciplinary “Italian Studies” with new options for majors (2002) and changes in the minor (1998). French: redesign of major (20 years ago); new discussions began in 2008-09. Spanish: undergraduate major/minor redesigned in 1991; new discussions began in spring 2009. Linguistics: reviewed curriculum 5 years ago, proposed several new courses and planned for others in the future, contingent on expansion of the faculty (now in process).

Enrollment history and projections: Over the last ten years: Linguistics and Spanish enrollments have risen; French enrollments remain relatively constant; Italian enrollments are decreasing; see Figures 1-11 for details. Overall enrollments have grown between AY 08 and AY 09 in all sections but Italian: French +1.7%, Spanish +8.6%, Italian –18.7%, Linguistics +28.0%. Over the last decade, the number of minors has increased sharply in all sections; the number of majors has increased in Spanish (41%) and Linguistics (by 291%), whereas the number of minors has declined slightly in French (–2%) and more so in Italian (–62%). Portuguese was reintroduced in the fall of 2009. These changes appear to reflect national trends as reported by the Modern Language Association in 2006 (http://www.mla.org/pdf/06enrollmentsurvey_final.pdf); see Figure 21. (For discussion of the rapid rise in Linguistics enrollments nationally, see the Linguistics strategic report.) Between 2002 and 2006, French enrollments in 4-year colleges had increased slightly (by 4.5% among undergraduates), and Spanish enrollments had increased more (for undergraduates, 13.9%). The biggest divergence between BU and the national trends is for Italian, where increases nationally had been quite large (24.3% for undergraduates). We will investigate the reasons for this anomaly.

Student outcomes: Program effectiveness can be measured partially by enrollments (see Figure 9). Students follow a wide range of professional/educational activity after graduation: graduate school, teaching, law school, medical school, government service, military service, publishing, etc. The diversity of the student population reflects that of BU in general. The presence of many “heritage speakers” of Spanish enrolled in our Spanish courses is noteworthy; majors and minors in Romance also show

a disproportion between males and females (the latter constitute a substantial majority).

MA/PhD programs

Mission: solid overall preparation in French and Spanish language, literature, and culture at a level to prepare students for college and secondary school teaching, careers in publishing, etc.

Vitality/quality: French redesigned MA exam format in 2009; PhD exam system 10 years ago; Spanish reviewed MA curriculum/requirements in 2008; redesigned PhD exam system 2 years ago. There is a need for a greater number of courses targeted specifically to graduate students, which will be made possible by the proposed increase in the number of professorial rank faculty members.

Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment: See Figure 17 for enrollments since 2000. On average, we have been receiving 16-17 applications each for MA and PhD programs in Spanish, and 9-10 applications each for the MA and PhD programs in French. Both programs land many of their top candidates but lose others to “branded” institutions (Harvard, Columbia, e.g.) with better aid packages. Many recent graduate students in French and Spanish come from high quality institutions in the US (e.g., Dartmouth, Middlebury, Oberlin, Wellesley, U. Penn., NYU, Amherst College, U. of Illinois) and abroad. The majority of enrollments are in the PhD, rather than the MA programs. This may change with revitalization of the MA curriculum currently under discussion.

Student outcomes: As shown in Figures 18 and 19, average time to degree in the MA and PhD programs in French and Spanish is comparable to that in GRS as a whole (6.5 and 7.2 years for French and Spanish, respectively, from time of first GRS enrollment to post-MA PhD degree, compared with 6.6 for GRS; for the MA, the averages are 2.3 and 2.0 years in French and Spanish, as compared with 2.1 in GRS). Nonetheless, the high teaching load for our graduate students (3 courses per year—as primary instructor—after finishing course work) hinders completion of degrees.

We have a strong record of placement of our students. PhD recipients have held tenured/tenure-track positions at Auburn, CUNY, Providence College, Wellesley, and Barnard, among others.

Diversity: Historically a much higher percentage of female students than male in our graduate programs (which reflects the national trend); few US Hispanics in our program; many native Spanish-speakers from abroad; 0 African Americans in either program going far back. Spanish could do more to attract US Latinos, e.g., through a hire in US Latino literature/culture (see Part C).

Interdisciplinary initiatives/ Collaboration with other academic units, institutions

New joint major in Philosophy and Linguistics. RS faculty also were involved in planning of new European Studies major and development of new MA program in Latin American Studies, and they participate in many existing programs: Latin American Studies, European Studies, Interdisciplinary Italian Studies, Women’s Studies, Judaic Studies, Core Curriculum, Applied Linguistics. Research collaborations with Computer Science, SAR Speech & Hearing Sciences, and other universities in the US and abroad.

International/global initiatives

New programs: Paris 8, Padova exchange. RS collaborates with/promotes a wide range of study abroad programs run by International Programs (e.g., Madrid, Burgos, Quito, Lima, Paris, Grenoble, Senegal, Padua). RS faculty do large amounts of research abroad in Romance-speaking countries, collaborate with colleagues in those countries on academic initiatives/activities of various sorts.

Outreach initiatives

Spanish classes in Roxbury (through Women’s Service Club). The potential for creative commitment with the community is substantial.

Facilities

Classroom facilities are seriously deficient; we lack the necessary technology, and the noise levels create obstacles to teaching/learning. Office facilities for full-time and part-time faculty and for TFs in 718 Comm. Ave. are woefully inadequate. Sharing of staff, student workers, office facilities (e.g., the Information Office), etc., with another department (MLCL) also hampers our mission.

C. Ten-year plan

Vision for our Future

We will continue to be nationally recognized as a vibrant center for study of the languages of the Romance world in all their richness, including literary art forms, cultural context, linguistic analysis, and translation. We will be known for study and teaching of: (1) The great works of the Romance literary tradition and related art forms such as film; (2) Cultural expressions of the developing world where Romance languages are spoken (e.g., Francophone Africa, the Caribbean, Lusophone Africa); (3) Romance languages themselves (through innovative pedagogical approaches and state-of-the-art technologies); and (4) Romance linguistics (with better integration of linguistic study of French, Spanish, and Italian into the curricula). We will be engaged in dynamic collaborations with other departments/programs (e.g., Core Curriculum, University Honors College), helping to integrate the study of Romance languages and cultures and Linguistics into their educational mission.

In the spirit of the goals for engagement in the community and in the world set forth in the University's strategic plan, we will also be known for our creative outreach to the Greater Boston community, supporting local schools and neighborhood organizations through activities related to the fields we cover, as well as: (1) Our integrated approach to international programs in the Romance world, whereby we are able to guarantee the high intellectual/educational quality of those programs; (2) The way in which the curricula of our international programs enhance our mission here on campus; and (3) Our role in the "internationalization" of our campus through our creative support of specialty houses (French, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Linguistics) and undergraduate clubs dedicated to the Romance languages and cultures as well as Linguistics. Our MA and PhD programs will continue to be nationally recognized for the high quality preparation they provide for teaching at the college or secondary-school level or related careers. We hope to have a first-rate graduate program in Linguistics, as well, extending our current undergraduate curriculum to graduate-level offerings.

Goals

Faculty. Within 10 years many faculty members will be either retired or on the verge of retirement. We need to ensure that faculty are consistently replaced as they retire, to guarantee the Department's current level of excellence in teaching and scholarship. We also need to fill significant lacunae in our current faculty. French has been affected by the participation of professorial-rank faculty in administrative capacities and by the failure to replace faculty who have left. There is a need to hire additional faculty members with expertise in: (1) Renaissance/Early Modern Literature; and (2) Media/Cultural Studies/Popular Literature. Italian needs a faculty member in the field of 18th- and 19th-century literature and intellectual history to position itself better vis-à-vis its peer group. Spanish needs increased coverage especially in: (1) Hispanic linguistics (which would also strengthen the Linguistics program and the MAT program in SED); and (2) US Hispanic/Latino literature and culture. The Portuguese/Brazilian section is only beginning to emerge; when justified by enrollments, we hope to hire: (1) A faculty member in the literature/culture of Portugal and Lusophone Africa or Brazil; and (2) A second full-time lecturer in Portuguese. As discussed in the separate Linguistics report, expansion of the faculty in Linguistics to cover critical subfields is badly needed.

Priorities: Enrollment trends in the department and the country at large would suggest that the needs in Spanish and Linguistics should be high priorities. The current staffing levels in French are also a particular problem in light of faculty commitments elsewhere in the University.

We hope to continue conversion of part-time language teaching positions into full-time positions in Spanish, French, and eventually Portuguese. The FY 2010 figures (see Figure 22) justify increasing the number of lecturers in French by 1 and in Spanish by 3, while also adding 3 TF positions in Spanish (thereby also enhancing the graduate program). Enrollments in French and Spanish are increasing; this would still leave some courses in each section to be taught by part-time lecturers.

Undergraduate Education. Plans: (1) Working with other language teaching departments (and the new

Assistant Dean of Language Instruction) to integrate the study of foreign languages/cultures more fully across BU, including, in the case of certain majors, language study beyond the current College requirements; (2) Developing courses geared to the professions (“Spanish for the Medical Professions,” “French for Business”); and (3) Improving language instruction by reducing class size.

Based on enrollment figures in multi-section language courses from Fall 2008, we believe that with the addition of ca. 12 language sections (i.e., the equivalent of 2 full-time lecturers) in French, Spanish, and Italian (combined), we could achieve class size of ≤ 19 students in 95-98% of our multi-sectioned courses. This not only would be of pedagogical benefit, but would also contribute to a higher standing for BU in the US News Rankings (where the percentage of courses of various sizes is a significant component).

We will also continue to look at curricular development, with a view to broadening the existing majors and developing different “tracks” to satisfy a wider range of student interests.

We are engaging in serious curriculum review curriculum, involving development of new courses, revision of existing courses (and titles and descriptions), and standardization of numbering, intended also to extend to courses offered through International Programs to facilitate integration of courses taken in Boston and abroad. We will also develop courses to serve students upon their return from study abroad.

We will also be proposing new joint majors with Linguistics (and possibly other fields) following the model of the new major in Linguistics and Philosophy.

The French, Spanish, and Italian sections have expressed support for joint majors with linguistics. Eventually, a joint major with Portuguese would also be an option. Ultimately, we hope also to extend these to MA (and BA/MA) programs and to cultivate specific study abroad opportunities for students with interests in these particular fields (on the model of the new Paris 8 program).

We are currently discussing a new major in “Romance Studies,” which would allow for study of more than one language/literature, and additional majors/minors in Romance that would cut across the sections: e.g., film, medieval studies, Renaissance studies. We also plan eventually to develop a minor, and then major, in Portuguese/Brazilian studies. We will also look to increase cooperation/ interaction with the Comparative Literature program in MLCL (a committee has been created already to fulfill this mission) and to develop freshman seminars and other courses for UHC.

We will aim for 100% participation by majors/minors in relevant study abroad programs, and seek to develop exchanges with foreign universities to allow our students to study abroad (and to enable foreign students to come here, to further “internationalize” the Charles River campus).

Master’s Education. Plans for the future include: (1) Developing new models for the MA in French and Spanish that would be attractive to those going into secondary education, to include an obligatory study abroad component; (2) Developing a Master’s program in Italian studies, which would then offer the possibility of a BA/MA program in Italian for undergraduates—contingent on expansion of the faculty; (3) Developing new MA and BA/MA program in Linguistics and Philosophy and new MA and BA/MA programs in Linguistics (as well as other joint degree programs including Linguistics)—see separate Linguistics document; (4) Enhancing the study abroad opportunities at the graduate level, pedagogical training for our graduate students, and mentoring and preparation for the job market; increasing the number of teaching assistantships for MA students; and (5) Working in collaboration with SED to strengthen its MAT program in second language teaching, possibly also including an obligatory study abroad component.

Doctoral Education. Plans for the future include: (1) Increasing the number of TFs in Spanish (already mentioned), as justified by recent trends in the job market (which would also indicate that the French doctoral program should retain its current size); (2) Taking steps to ensure that French and Spanish programs attract the highest quality applicants, that students have the best possible educational experience, resulting in high quality dissertations, and receive appropriate preparation for teaching, by: (a) Considering program redesign; (b) Increasing the speed with which our students can finish the degree; and (c) Freeing doctoral students from teaching responsibilities in their initial semester of enrollment and the semester during which they plan to defend their dissertation.

This would allow for training before students enter the classroom and provide them with time to focus on their dissertations. Our TFs have sole responsibility for the classes they teach—unlike most TFs in other departments, who serve as discussion leaders, graders, etc. Our PhD students have a 3 course per annum

teaching load after finishing coursework (75% of the teaching load of professorial rank faculty!).

For plans to develop a new PhD program in Linguistics, see the separate Linguistics document.

Interdisciplinary Interactions. We hope to: (1) Strengthen participation in currently existing interdisciplinary collaborations, such as Latin American Studies, European Studies, Medieval Studies, African Studies; (2) Develop more joint majors with other departments, following the model of Linguistics and Philosophy (e.g., Romance Literatures and Art History; Romance Literatures and Religion), as well as a Brazilian Studies major/minor, either independently or as a specific track within LASP, and a program in Film Studies in collaboration with other CAS departments and COM.

Facilities. High priorities for improvements include: (1) Dignified office facilities for all of our faculty; (2) Redesign of the Geddes Language Center to fulfill the needs of language instruction in the 21st century (with video and audio capabilities and IT support for language-related applications); (3) Enhanced facilities for film-viewing, either in Geddes or elsewhere; and (4) Improved technological capacities of classrooms for all language/literature/culture/linguistics courses.

Other Infrastructure. Aspirations include: (1) Enhanced role of specialty houses related to our majors/minors; and (2) Improvement of library facilities by redefining the library's mission, refining acquisitions strategy, and increasing electronic resources and printed journals.

Collaborations. We will strive for: (1) Greater integration with International Programs via strong oversight of the content of the curricula and the quality of instruction, better dovetailing of what is offered abroad and on campus, an enhanced environment on campus for "returnees" (e.g., reserving space for them in our language houses) so that the language/culture experience continues here in Boston; (2) Increased cooperative efforts with other colleges/schools to attract students to the study of language/culture in connection with their career interests (journalism, business, music, etc.); (3) Enhanced collaboration with other programs in CAS—e.g., African Studies (via French and Portuguese), African-American Studies; and (4) Wider range of offerings in Summer Term, including more intermediate and advanced literature and culture courses, as well as linguistics.

Other Academic Programs. Future possibilities include: (1) Professional enhancement/refresher seminars for teachers in New England (along the lines of the "Teachers as Scholars" program at Harvard); (2) Continued outreach efforts to community groups like the Spanish classes offered through the Women's Service Club (Roxbury); (3) Outreach programs in the Boston/Chelsea public schools, including student plays in Spanish in schools with high concentrations of Hispanic students (potentially coordinated with theater in Spanish on the BU campus); and (4) Distance-learning opportunities for alumni and the general community through the recently inaugurated "Aula Virtual" ("Virtual Classroom") in collaboration with the Instituto Cervantes.

Resources Needed

Pressing needs for infrastructure and staff include: (1) Improved office space, classroom facilities, and technology support; (2) Increased levels of departmental staffing; and (3) Departmental autonomy in assignments of staff and space (both partially shared now with another department).

Academic needs also include: (1) Increase in number of TFs (Spanish) and full-time Lecturers (French, Spanish), in part through conversion of part-time positions; (2) Continuing improvement of career opportunities for full-time Lecturers through the new "ladder system"; (3) Continuing improvement of faculty compensation, to recruit and retain faculty (especially given the salary lag characterizing foreign language/linguistics faculty at BU); (4) Enhanced professional development through substantial increase in research and travel funds; (5) Enhanced training/mentoring of our TFs, particularly for those at the beginning of their teaching activity; (6) Ensuring continued excellence in scholarship and teaching by filling current faculty lacunae in coverage and by replacing faculty as they retire or approach retirement.

Five-year Measurable/Verifiable Goals

(1) Establishment of an expanded, coherent, revitalized curriculum, well integrated with international programs; new tracks for existing degrees; new degree programs, as outlined above.

(2) Redesign and increase in the flexibility of existing degree programs, including modularity to facilitate interdisciplinary combinations.

Success will be reflected, in part, by an expected increase in overall enrollments and in the number of majors,

minors, and graduate students.

Department of Sociology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission

The Department of Sociology fosters teaching and research that expand knowledge of human social behavior. By introducing students to the art and science of sociology, including its theories and methods, the department contributes to the education of active, critically informed and globally-aware citizens, as well as to the training of the next generation of teachers, policy makers, and scholars. This department has special strengths in Theory, in Global Sociology, in the study of Culture, in analysis of Organizations, Networks, and Markets, in attention to Gender, in the study of Cities, Ethnicity and Migration, and in the understanding of Health, Illness, And Healing.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Peers

Four schools, three local and one non-local, provide our most immediate close comparisons. Northeastern's strengths are in gender and urban sociology, but its overall rank is lower than ours. Boston College is slightly larger, slightly ahead of us in overall rankings, and competes with us in the areas of cultural and global sociology. Brandeis is slightly smaller, also slightly ahead of us in rankings, and competes with us in gender and in health. Pittsburgh (at #54) (www.pitt.edu/~socdept), like us, is seen as a school on the way up, like us has strengths in culture and comparative sociology, and is slightly smaller.

Two national schools (both private, urban R-1 universities to which BU compares itself) provide comparisons to which we might reasonably aspire. Emory has strengths in culture and religion, as well as comparative sociology, but we compete well intellectually with them on these grounds. It is a larger department, ranked 20 places above us. USC is a school with fewer full-time faculty (although many affiliates) and more students, also ranked about 20 places ahead of us, and with strengths in migration and especially gender (a top 10 department in that area).

Two departments are places with specific strengths toward which we aspire, even if their overall strength and prestige may be beyond what we can expect to match in the next decade. Duke has strengths in markets and organizations, as well as in medicine and religion. NYU has strengths in culture, race & ethnicity, and global/comparative sociology. These are each departments toward which we look as leaders. They are tied at #14 in the national rankings (well above us), NYU is double our size, while Duke augments its faculty with substantial affiliates. Each has a graduate program roughly twice our size.

2. Faculty Quality

a. Scholarly/research quality (Aggregate):

1) *Publications*. From 2006 through the present, this group has produced a substantial body of scholarship (see Table 2a-1), and no persons are substantially below the department average. While a 3-year snapshot tells a great deal, it is also important to put this in the context of both several long and prominent careers that lend cumulative visibility to the department and the fact that book production (our dominant mode of writing) is better measured at a longer interval. In comparison to two of our aspirational peers (USC and NYU, each of which has substantially greater structural incentives available, especially through course reductions), we find that our per capita productivity is comparable – slightly lower numbers of books, but equal or greater numbers of articles. Our primary point of unequal comparison is in the placement of articles in major general-interest journals in the field.

2) *Grant Activity*. Since 2006, members of this faculty have been PI or co-PI on 14 grant-funded projects, with budgets totaling over \$600,000 (See Table 2a-2), a reasonable overall level, but not enough to provide

extensive support of graduate students. Since 2008, most faculty have also received small grants from the department's Morris Fund, assisting in start-up and project development.

3) *Awards*. Our work has gained high national visibility. Since 2005, 3 faculty books have received national awards, and the dissertation of Prof. Olafsdottir won both university-wide and ASA recognition.

4) *Citations*. We have not assembled citation counts for this report.

c. Educational/pedagogical contributions (aggregate).

1) *Course evaluations*. Course evaluations reflect a good overall teaching report card. What the overall averages mask is that evaluations are inversely related to class size (and that is true for almost every instructor), with our largest classes averaging only 3.35 on summary evaluations.

2) *Teaching awards*. Prof. Go won the Wisneski Award for Excellence in 2007, and Prof. Yeager was featured as one of the University's 'Most Outstanding Professors' in the 2006-7 University Viewbook.

3) *Academic enhancement activities*. Since 2006, eight faculty members have published (or are preparing for publication) articles with a total of 16 students. Ammerman's Templeton grant provided 1.5-year research assistantships for two graduate students. Five undergraduate research projects have been sponsored; one NSF dissertation improvement grant has been applied for and one received; and about half the faculty members have recently supported a Work for Distinction.

4) *Curricular and pedagogical innovation*. During this period, five new undergraduate courses have been introduced, and four of our faculty report the introduction of new labs, practical exercises, fieldwork, field trips, small group discussion techniques, and poster projects (including one exercise featured at BU's 2009 Instructional Innovation Conference).

f. Major professional and public service contributions. During 2006-09, 13 of 15 faculty served national and international associations and journals. Especially noteworthy are Prof. Go's appointment as editor of *Political Power and Social Theory*; Prof. emeritus George Psathas' continuing service as editor of *Human Studies*; and Prof. Swartz as senior editor and book review editor for *Theory and Society*. In addition, Prof. Smith-Doerr served as an NSF Program Officer, 2007-09. Not counted are the extensive service we collectively provide as reviewers for major granting agencies, journals, and tenure & promotion cases in the U.S. and beyond.

Our public service included service on an arts board and a philanthropic board, consultations with German and Russian academic programs, and on medical policy issues in both the U.S. and Iceland. In addition, Prof. Yeager routinely writes opinion pieces for various news outlets, and Profs. Greenfeld, Ammerman and Eckstein, among others, are regularly interviewed for dozens of print and broadcast news reports.

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education.

(1) *Goals & Purposes*. Our undergraduate curriculum seeks to provide students with a solid foundation in classical and contemporary perspectives on social order and change, conflict and integration, as well as the methodological skills necessary to analyze the social world they will inhabit and lead. The undergraduate program thereby contributes to the education of active and critically informed citizens and members of professional communities.

(2) *Vitality and Quality*. The Undergraduate Programs Committee oversees routine annual curriculum oversight, but the last major review of the program as a whole was carried out in 1995. The current eleven-course concentration has largely served students well, but this planning exercise has made clear that a new, thorough review of the undergraduate curriculum, including a survey of current and former students, is in order (see goals below).

(3) *Enrollment history & Projections*. After a dip in mid-decade, the sociology "market share" of total CAS credit hours has risen; enrollments in our courses have grown progressively, as has the number of BU students graduating with a major or minor in sociology. Students from CAS form the bulk of our enrollees, with a significant presence of COM students, as well. The growing presence of SAR students is notable. Service

courses targeting them (and several other constituencies) have been notable areas of growth.

(4) *Outcomes*. We have no systematic data on post-graduation outcomes but hope to remedy that soon (see goals below). We know anecdotally that a few outstanding students have been presenting their work at professional conferences and entering excellent graduate programs. Course evaluations suggest that much of the learning experience in the department is strong, but with need for attention to the experience of students in our largest, especially introductory, classes.

(5) *Diversity*. Sociology majors include proportionately more women than the undergraduate student body as a whole and roughly the ethnic mix of the overall student population. Beyond the numbers, Sociology contributes critical curricular offerings that focus on class, race, ethnicity, gender, and other cultural differences, challenging students to think critically and comparatively about the growing diversity challenges faced in modern societies.

b/c. Graduate Education (including both MA and PhD degrees).

(1) *Mission: Goals and Purpose*. The mission of the Sociology graduate program at Boston University is to provide a challenging environment in which advanced sociological learning can occur. The program supports students preparing for a wide variety of professional roles in teaching and research in the private, public, and nonprofit sectors. The program is oriented around training in sociological theory and methods, the acquisition of teaching, publication, and other professional skills, and the development of the conceptual and methodological abilities necessary to produce original contributions to knowledge.

(2) *Vitality and Quality*. Sociology's MA/PhD program is an intellectually lively dimension of departmental life, important to our mission and for faculty recruitment and retention. Our distinctive areas of strength draw students from beyond the department (as well as from other area universities). The small size of the program is both a weakness and a strength. It allows close mentoring and requires interdisciplinarity and collaboration with other units in the university. Enhancing these connections will be essential as a remedy for the relative paucity of current seminar offerings beyond the required core (see goals below). The graduate curriculum was last reviewed in 2003-4. A new exam structure was put in place, but no other basic changes were made.

The greatest weakness of the graduate program, in comparison to our peers, is the absence of sufficient funding for student support. *US News and World Report* ranks the sociology program as 57 out of 113 programs in sociology across the nation. This ranking is similar to the rankings for BU's Psychology (50) and History (48) departments which are much larger.

(3) *Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment*. The competitiveness of the department's graduate student recruitment is quite strong. Specifically, our acceptance rate of 19.8% for the PhD program puts us on par with other graduate sociology programs across the nation (ASA 2009) and with other doctoral programs in GRS. Admitted students have had increasingly strong GRE scores, falling above the median among GRS doctoral programs. Our program has declined from 33 students in 2000 to a near constant of 24-25 students per year from 2003 to the present. We have sufficient faculty to support a total enrollment of about 30, but that will only be possible with additional student financial support (see goals below).

(4) *Outcomes*. An annual reviewing process has been put in place and will be expanded in 2010. Time to completion for Sociology PhD students has been near the mean (6.7 years, compared to 6.6 GRS overall). Over the last decade, however, our average has been declining significantly, and we believe that our students are now making very timely progress through the program. This is especially noteworthy given the financial pressures that often slow our students' progress. Since 2006, sixteen students have received the PhD. Five currently hold faculty positions in U.S. schools and 4 in international schools; five others hold research positions (including 2 prestigious post-doctoral appointments).

(5) *Student diversity*. The graduate student population in the department is similar to the racial/ethnic composition of the total population of PhD students in sociology at the national level, according to the American Sociological Association. Current students include: White (non-Hispanic), 72%; Hispanic, 4%; African-American, 16%; Asian-American, 4%; Other, 4%; Men, 30%; Women, 70%. The admissions committee works toward a diverse incoming cohort, including annually submitting a suitable candidate for the Martin Luther King scholarship.

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives. See discussion of collaborations below.

f. International/global initiatives. Prof. Kibria is active in the South Asia Global Initiative, and Prof. Go is participating in conversations with the University of Warwick (UK). This is a major potential area for growth (see goals below).

g. Outreach initiatives. We have had relatively little activity of this sort. Our interest in developing internship and service learning initiatives aims at filling this void (see goals below).

4. Facilities

a) Offices. The department has 19 offices suitable for faculty occupancy (2 are now shared grad student offices, 1 houses visiting scholars, 1 is shared by two emeritus faculty, and 2 are vacant, but will be filled by this year's new hires). There are also 5 very small graduate student offices. Furnishings in all but 3 offices range from 20-50 years old and in some cases pose hazards to occupants.

b) Classrooms. We have 3 proprietary classrooms (2 small, 1 mid-sized), each recently refurbished. We otherwise depend on the University's classrooms.

c) Gathering. One large open area is heavily used both for informal student studying and gathering and for department receptions and meals. Furnishings are minimally sufficient, although 20+ years old and worn. A separate graduate student lounge was created recently and furnished with comfortable cast-offs. A well-equipped kitchen is one of the pluses of the department.

d) Administration. The administrative office suite includes sufficient space and equipment to support the work of the department.

5. Other Infrastructure

a) Basic systems. The visiting scholar office, one classroom and the lounge are plagued by major leaks that routinely stain ceiling, walls, and carpet and damage furniture. About half the offices are uncontrollably cold (avg. temp = 61) in both summer and winter, and most have no external ventilation.

b) Accessibility. The lift that navigates the half-flight of stairs between the two halves of the department is far from efficient and often not functional.

c) Connectivity. Almost all computers seem to operate at glacial speeds, suggesting both the need for equipment updates and for an assessment of overall broadband capacity in the building. We also have little Wi-Fi coverage. Our one portable laptop/projector and one installed IT/projection center suffice so long as we can anticipate classrooms in other buildings achieving full connectivity.

6. Collaborations.

a) Inside BU. We are intensely interconnected, with significant programmatic involvement in 6 other schools, 4 centers, 8 programs, and 4 departments (see Table 6a), plus participation in 9 interdisciplinary and inter-unit projects. These involve all but two of our faculty.

b) Beyond BU. Almost all of our faculty members participate in research collaborations, co-authoring, and national and international working groups beyond BU (see Table 6b). Especially noteworthy is the Boston area "Politics and Culture Workshop," organized by department faculty.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

Summary: In ten years, the BU Sociology Department will be recognized as a significant national and international contributor in its primary focus areas, with a steady flow of mid- and large-sized funded research projects and with publications, professional involvement, and scholarly collaboration at or above current levels in number and visibility. Taking advantage of BU collaborations to strengthen social science training, and targeting admissions and curriculum to focused areas of strength, the department's graduate programs will fund, train, and place a small but outstanding group of students. Both graduate and undergraduate education

will be characterized by a broad global engagement and focus, with increased international collaboration, as well as by increased attention to the computational and methodological skills essential to the field.

Undergraduate education in the department will remain strong in the disciplinary basics, with greater attention to opportunities for research experience and mentoring of promising future sociologists. The program will also be more expansively connected to the range of colleges and departments in which BU students are pursuing their educations and to the places beyond the classroom – in Boston and beyond - where they might be engaged in learning. And when students and faculty come to the department, they will find a well-equipped, comfortable, and pleasant environment, equipped with technology that helps us do our work.

Specific Goals, Needed Resources, Measures for Evaluating Progress

(1) Faculty.

- Continue to build a faculty that can sustain intellectual strengths in a set of identified areas of focus.
 - Resources: a) at least one new person to bring our Health cluster up to full strength; b) at least one new person to add strength around Cities, Ethnicity, and Migration; c) at least one additional person in an area to be named; d) replacements for up-coming retirements (one likely early in the decade, three mid-decade, and three at the end); and e) collaborations in hiring with other departments and units, such as Anthropology, IR, COM, SMG, SPH, and Geography & Environment.
 - Assessing Progress: Annual review of identified areas for teaching and research needs; adjustment of area definitions as needed.
- Provide a strong culture of and support for research activity, including publication in a variety of venues.
 - Resources: a) a strong and competent OSP staff and an IRB process that facilitates faculty and student research; b) routine paid pre-tenure leave; c) an expanded seed grant program; and d) exploration of course reduction incentives.
 - Assessing Progress: a) number of grants received; b) quantity and quality of publications c) increasing number of high visibility publications.
- Continue to develop a culture of life-long professional development, including teaching excellence; assure clear expectations for and support toward tenure and promotion.
 - Resources: a) departmental recognition of achievements and innovations; b) career assessment and skill-building opportunities in the University; c) continued support for mentoring programs; d) peer teaching assessment, along with external support for teaching enhancement.
 - Assessing Progress: a) successful tenure and promotion cases; b) awards for scholarly and teaching achievement.
- Increase public visibility and policy impact
 - Assessing Progress: Number of publicly oriented publications and engagements.
- Establish an appropriate balance of administrative support.
 - Resources: a) College staff trained to assist with tasks such as advising; b) expanded job responsibility and training (with commensurate pay increases) for department-level staff.
 - Assessing Progress: More faculty time for what faculty do best.

(2) Undergraduate education. Pursuing our goals will begin with a thorough program review and assessment of student outcomes beyond what has been possible in this planning process.

- Introduce sociological ideas and methods to a broader number and range of BU undergraduates
 - Resources: a) data from program review and survey; b) creative faculty.
 - Assessing Progress: Overall market share of CAS credit hours; increased enrollment from a broader range of schools and departments; increased numbers in introductory-level courses; higher course evaluations, especially for large classes.
- Enhance the curriculum with field- and/or service-based learning as one way to nurture a sociological imagination that encourages creative and constructive action in the world
 - Resources: a) department-level administrative support; b) collaboration with other units, such as the Pardee Center and International Programs; c) sufficient faculty resources to allow “diversion” from other teaching needs.

- Assessing Progress: a) At least one internship-based course offered by 2011-12; modest program in place by 2013-14; b) within-course field experiences added to 1-2 courses per year over the first 5 years of the period; c) at least one international curricular collaboration by 2013.
- Enhance the curriculum with strong methodological and computational teaching.
 - Resources: a) net new faculty strength in CAS in social science methods; b) adequately equipped and staffed computer labs
 - Assessing Progress: a) 3-5 new statistics and methods courses available in the social sciences by 2014; b) demonstrated student competence as consumers of research; c) increased interest in undertaking research.
- Nurture global and comparative thinking throughout the curriculum
 - Assessing Progress: a) evaluate new syllabi for inclusion of comparative themes; b) add five new internationally-focused courses by 2015
- Enrich the undergraduate experience of our best students, encouraging professional aspirations
 - Resources: a) participation in University Honors College; b) consider departmental honors program; c) continued expansion of UROP and other sources of research support; d) faculty-initiated research funding that includes research positions.
 - Assessing Progress: a) Number of works for distinction; b) number of other student research projects; c) admissions to graduate school; d) student participation in professional conferences.

(3&4) Graduate Education.

- Development of a distinctive, focused Masters program that takes advantage of our particular strengths.
 - Resources: a) assistance in market assessment and marketing; b) faculty time and creativity; c) key partnerships in the University; d) department-level administrative support.
 - Assessing Progress: a) an agreed-upon process and faculty investment; b) good data from which to work; c) a curriculum design that is feasible and exciting; d) program approved and launched by mid-decade; e) graduates successfully placed by the end of the decade.
- A modest-sized and adequately funded PhD program, specifically an average of six new PhD students per year, with a minimum of three years of guaranteed funding.
 - Resources: Graduate fellowships.
 - Assessing progress: a) increasing admissions yield; b) strong academic preparation of admittees.
- Enhance curriculum through increasing graduate-only seminars in targeted curricular focus areas.
 - Resources: a) overall expansion of faculty so as to be able to staff more seminars; b) targeted admissions so as to fill seminars; c) active collaboration with other schools and BU units.
 - Assessing Progress: one new seminar per semester beginning in 2011, expanding to 2 per semester no later than 2013.
- Enhanced teaching of social science methods, including collaborative work with other departments to offer a wider range of statistics and methods courses. (See discussion above)
- Improved monitoring and assessment of students throughout the program.
 - Assessing Progress: a) annual student review process regularized in 2010-11, with student issues routinely addressed early; b) 2010-11, begin assessment of current examination requirements with an eye toward a more conventional comprehensive exam, including more structured core reading lists; revisions in place for students entering fall 2012
- Support for professional development and enhanced placement.
 - Resources: a) funds for professional travel; b) expanded teacher training programs; c) faculty external research grants with assistantships.
 - Assessing Progress: a) joint faculty/student research and publishing; b) funded grant and fellowship applications; c) level of student professional travel; d) quality of job placement.

(4&5) Facilities and Infrastructure

- Space that is structurally sound, accessible, and routinely within standard limits for office temperature (68-76 degrees)

- Resources: a) HVAC overhaul; b) lift replacement; c) structural attention to leakage issues.
- Assessing Progress: a) declining number of days with office temperature below 68; b) access by mobility impaired persons; b) absence of water damage.
- Furnishings that are safe, comfortable, attractive, and conducive to productivity.
 - Resources: a) office furniture and carpet replacement in existing faculty offices b) replacement of all common area furnishings; c) fifteen work-station set-ups for graduate students; d) regular painting and carpet replacement.
 - Assessing progress: a) at least one faculty office makeover per year, in addition to overhauls for incoming faculty; b) common areas completed by fall 2012; c) graduate student work stations in place by fall 2014.
- Technology and training to support our work.
 - Resources: a) computer upgrade and replacement program in place; b) IT support staff with social science instructional and research competence; c) departmental-level knowledge sharing.
 - Assessing progress: a) near absence of crashed computers; b) levels of confidence and willingness to innovate.

Final notes about Resources and Assessment.

Most of the needed data for assessment are now being routinely collected by the department and the college. The primary missing piece, however, is student outcomes. This will require increasing alumni outreach initiatives, with which the department is eager to cooperate. Establishing a more complete database of alumni/ae contact information will facilitate both data gathering for program assessment and fund-raising efforts. It is reasonable to hope that major gifts to the department in the next decade might match the total from the previous decade.

CAS Strategic Plan

Part IIB: Academic Programs Strategic Plans

Table of Contents

African American Studies
American and New England Studies
Biochemistry & Molecular Biology
Core Curriculum
Creative Writing
East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies
Linguistic Sciences
Marine Program
Neuroscience
Women's Studies
Writing Program

Department of African American Studies
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Founded in 1969, African American Studies (AAS) at Boston University (BU) is a cross-departmental and interdisciplinary program that provides resources for the study of African American experiences from a global perspective. The Program offers undergraduate- and graduate-level courses to the larger BU community, and provides programmatic support for faculty who teach these courses. It confers degrees for undergraduate minor concentrators and Master of Arts graduate students. It also arranges forums for intellectual exchange and facilitates extracurricular activities between and among BU students, faculty, administrators, alumni, as well as non-BU affiliates.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

The Program features 12 total core faculty members: 7 Professors, 3 Associate Professors, 1 Assistant Professor (a 2010 new hire), and 2 Visiting Assistant Professors. It also features 6 affiliated faculty: 2 Professors, 2 Associate Professors, 1 Assistant Professor, and 1 Visiting Associate Professor. The departmental identities of the core tenure/tenure-track AAS faculty include: 4 in History, 2 in English, 1 in Political Science, 2 in Sociology (including a new hire), and 2 in Art History. The departmental identities of the visiting and affiliated faculty include: 2 in English, 2 in History, 2 in Political Science, 1 in Anthropology, and 1 in Music.

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

According to AAS research and to official rankings of the best graduate schools in the social sciences and the humanities (such as the 2009 edition of U.S. News and World Report: <http://grad-schools.usnews.rankingsandreviews.com/best-graduate-schools/top-humanities-schools>), AAS identifies as its academic peer group degree-granting centers, institutes, programs, and departments in Africana or African American studies at non-Ivy League, but still elite, private research universities. AAS at BU compares with the following “stronger” peer group, which features departments that grant degrees to both undergraduate and graduate students, and that comprise large core and affiliated faculty: *Northwestern University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in the Department of African American Studies, with an option for Honors designation; offers graduate degrees through the Ph.D. in African American Studies; 15 Faculty. *New York University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in Program in Africana Studies, as part of the Department of Social and Cultural Analysis; offers MA degree in Africana Studies; 8 Core Faculty, 24 Affiliated Faculty. *Duke University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in the Department of African and African American Studies; offers graduate certificate in African and African American Studies; 7 Primary Faculty, 3 Joint Faculty. *Vanderbilt University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in Program in African American and Diaspora Studies; offers graduate certificate in Diaspora Studies; 10 Core Faculty, 20 Affiliated Faculty, 13 Secondary Faculty. The following “weaker” peer group features programs or sub-programs that grant degrees to undergraduates, but at best only certificates to graduate students: *Stanford University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in Program in African and African American studies at the Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity; 66 Affiliated Faculty and Colleagues. *Emory University*: Offers undergraduate minor and major in Department of African American Studies; 12 Core Faculty, 19 Associate Faculty. *University of Southern California*: Offers undergraduate major in African American Studies, within the Department of American Studies and Ethnicity; 33 Core Faculty, 41 Affiliated Faculty. *George Washington University*: Offers undergraduate minor in Program in Africana Studies; Core and Affiliated Faculty N/A.

2. Assessment of Core Faculty Quality

Scholarly/Research Quality (aggregate) (numbers in parentheses represent more than one publication in a particular venue among the faculty): The 12 core faculty members published a total of 13 books over the past three years, or about 1 book per faculty member. The publishers include University of Texas Press, Peepal Tree Press, Cambridge University Press, University of California Press, Blackwell (3), Ohio University Press, University of Pennsylvania Press, Princeton University Press, Rutgers University Press, New York University Press, Editora contexto. The 12 core faculty members published a total of 30 essays in books, or about 2.5 essays per faculty member. The publishers include University of Illinois Press, MAT Éditions, Africa World Press, National Geographic Society, UCL Press, Oxford University Press (4), Palgrave Macmillan, Routledge, Georgetown University Press, Blackwell (4), State University Press of New York, Harvard University Press, University of North Carolina Press, Georgetown University Press, University of Massachusetts Press (2), Penn State University Press, University of California Press, Cambridge University Press (2), Cornell University Press, Sage, Edinburgh University Press, University of New Mexico Press. The 12 core faculty members published a total of 17 “high quality” journal publications, or about 1.4 publications per faculty member. The publishers include *Critical Interventions: Journal of African Art History and Visual Culture*, *Contemporary Islam: Dynamics of Muslim Life*, *African Arts*, *Journal of West Indian Literature*, *International Relations*, *Perspectives on Politics*, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, *Journal of African History*, *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, *African American Review*, *Legacy: Journal of the Society for the Study of American Women Writers*, *Southern Literary Journal*, *PMLA: Publication of the Modern Language Association*, *Theory and Society* (2), *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Migration and Ethnic Studies Review*.

3. Research Grant Activity

Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad Fellowship (\$63, 000); Radcliffe Institute Fellowship, Harvard University (\$75,000); Fulbright Senior Scholar Grant (\$50,000, declined); BU Humanities Foundation Support (\$5,000); Council of American Overseas Research Centers Multi-Country Fellowship (\$9,000); BU Grant for Undergraduate Teaching and Scholarship; BU African Studies Program Course Development Grant (\$2,000); BU Humanities Foundation Junior Fellowship; BU Humanities Foundation Library Acquisition Grant; BU Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (\$2,000); BU Humanities Foundation Translation Grant (\$3,000); W.E.B. Du Bois Institute for African and African American Research Grant (\$25,000); BU Jeffrey Henderson Senior Fellowship (\$50,000).

4. Awards

Election to President of the Phi Beta Kappa Society; Melville J. Herskovits Book Prize (African Studies Association); Community and Justice Award, to the Brown University Steering Committee on Slavery and Justice from Rhode Island for Community and Justice; Choice Award, 2007 Outstanding Academic Title; Fellowship at W.E.B Du Bois Institute of African and African American Research, Harvard University.

5. Scholarly/Research Quality of Core Faculty

- a. *History*: Europe and the African Diaspora (Allison Blakely); Africa, African Diaspora, and the Atlantic World (Linda Heywood, John Thornton); African American History (Julia Rabig); Western History of Racial Thought (Ronald Richardson); *English*: African American Literature (Mary Anne Boelcskev, Gene Jarrett) and West Indian Literature (Laurence Breiner)
- b. *Political Science*: International Relations (Neta Crawford)
- c. *Sociology*: Race and Ethnic Relations (John Stone and Ruha Benjamin)
- d. *Art History*: African Art (Cynthia Becker) and African American Art (Patricia Hills).

6. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions

Course evaluations use a numerical scale of 1 to 5, where 1 represents poor and 5 represents excellent. The average course rating in African American Studies is 4.362, and the average faculty/instructor rating is 4.496. In terms of teaching awards and enhancement activities, Boelsckevy received a 2009 grant to develop a summer school course on Toni Morrison that will be offered in Summer 2010. Thornton has been nominated for the 2010 Feld Family Professorship of Teaching Excellence in the College of Arts and Sciences. Becker (2006) and Jarrett (2009) participated in BU Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program; Thornton conducted special research with an undergraduate highlighted in BU Today (<http://www.bu.edu/today/node/9078>). Curricular and pedagogical innovation: In AY 2008-2009, Heywood designed a new course, AA395/ IR/ HI396: "Power, Leadership, and Governance in the Caribbean and Africa," which was approved by the Humanities Curriculum Committee. Heywood has also worked to create a new interdisciplinary course with Jarrett, "The History and Literature of the African Diaspora," while Thornton has been developing a new course on African religion. Since most of the courses offered by the Program are geared toward junior and senior undergraduates as well as graduate students, they have been unable not only to attract students at an earlier educational stage, but also to cultivate their interest in the Program through coursework. Since undergraduate education is a core mission of CAS, AAS realizes that greater undergraduate enrollment is needed at the earliest stages to make its minor degree more viable. Thus, the program has begun designing undergraduate introductory courses that will be cross-listed with equivalent courses in our fellow departments and programs. Boelsckevy, Jarrett, and Breiner are collaborating to design such courses on African American literature.

7. Academic Programs

Faculty meetings on the undergraduate curriculum, vis-à-vis the Strategic Plan, were held by AAS on October 26 and November 23, 2009, and, with the Advisory Board, on January 11, 2010. AAS is continuing to work to expand and diversify its undergraduate offerings. Since the first annual report in September 2007, enrollment in AAS at both the undergraduate and graduate levels has admittedly been uneven (with enrollment alternating between high and low numbers). The program has seen improvement, though, scheduling courses according to the university matrix. Enrollments for the spring 2010 semester are very strong for most of the program's course offerings. The program is also working on graduate and undergraduate recruitment. Currently, the program has four students in the undergraduate minor and four students in the MA program. Since the arrival (in AY 2008-2009) of Heywood as the Program's new director, and during the tenure (in AY 2009-2010) of Jarrett as acting director (while Heywood takes her sabbatical leave), the core faculty has actively begun implementing a self-assessment to redress the uneven enrollment figures. Proposed solutions include: the development of more attractive courses; the inauguration of introductory courses, since most of the courses offered by AAS are geared toward junior and senior undergraduates as well as graduate students; and expanding the pool of cross-listed courses, overcoming the undercount of courses that refer to the themes we find important and, therefore, should be cross-listed. Over the next academic year, AAS will begin to reach out to departments and programs featuring this coursework, seeking to cross-list their courses. This will represent the ongoing effort to formalize and expand curricular relationships between AAS and the rest of BU. Finally, AAS has considered the establishment of a joint major possibly with African Studies or other BU programs to form an Atlantic Studies major. The joint major has been seen as a possible way of enhancing AAS course offerings and multiplying student enrollment. It also would be emblematic of the kind of cross-program collaboration that has become the hallmark of curriculum development in CAS. The joint major promises to remain a topic of great interest to AAS faculty, and it will be examined closely for its implications for BU.

8. Assessment of Master of Arts Program

The MA program in AAS builds the conceptual, theoretical, and research skills that will allow students to examine African American experiences from national and international perspectives. However, the MA program has recently suffered from small application pools—even though the applicants are quite

qualified and accredited, as recent Fulbright awards show—because it is based on a one-year model that is inconsistent with the structures of some peer programs or departments (such as Northwestern University) and other aspirational departments (such as Harvard University, Yale University, and most recently Brown University) in which the MA is an instant gateway to a doctoral degree in African American Studies. In our case, the MA is inconvenient. As soon as students matriculate, they must begin as early as the fall semester to begin applying to doctoral programs (at BU or another university), even though their coursework is still incomplete and their relationship to professors, who must write letters of recommendations, is still embryonic. The early application process is not only disruptive, but it puts them at a disadvantage. While AAS may not yet be fully prepared to establish a doctoral program, more direct pipelines must be established to fellow departments in CAS that would recognize the MA in African American Studies as credit toward a doctorate. Preliminary discussions with the Program in American and New England Studies occurred in AY 2007-2008 about this possibility.

9. Other Academic Programs

AAS also runs a Visiting Scholars program, designed to give scholars from across the world access to BU's global African American Studies resources. Past visiting scholars have come from England, Brazil, Germany, and elsewhere. Scholars are given space in Mugar Library and faculty mentorship as they work on their respective research projects. This year, AAS has been working with Dr. Harcourt Fuller, who is conducting research on slavery and abolition in the Pacific Littoral of Latin America (Ecuador, Columbia, and Peru).

10. Interdisciplinary Initiatives

From the standpoint of programming, AAS has made a concerted effort to reach out to units across Boston University. Last year, the program co-sponsored a course on “The (Mis)Education of Black Boys” in the School of Education, and hopes to continue this collaboration next year with a similar offering. In addition, this year the program participated in the College of Communication's conference on narrative non-fiction that took place in October. From the standpoint of course offerings, the program is beginning to reach out to units across the university in an effort to consolidate all AAS courses under the program. We have been working with the School of Theater to cross-list Richardson's course CAS AA 510: “African American Drama,” and hope to continue this relationship in other ways.

11. International/Global Initiatives

In addition to the global outreach of the Visiting Scholars Program, AAS is also working on several other long-term global initiatives. Professors Heywood and Thornton have begun conversations with representatives in Angola and Brazil about establishing an exchange program between AAS at BU and universities in those countries. In addition, AAS is working with the Division of International Programs to incorporate a summer school program on Black Immigration in Europe, held every year in Amsterdam, into the graduate and undergraduate curriculum.

12. Outreach Initiatives

In AY 2008-2009, AAS applied for an NEH grant to host a summer school for K-12 teachers on the topic of African Americans in New England. The program was designed to bring together teachers from across the United States to explore the many and varied ways in which African American culture has made an impact on the New England landscape. Unfortunately, the workshop was declined, but the committee expressed great interest in the concept of the workshop, and the program plans to resubmit a proposal by March 2010. The workshop designed for summer 2011 will focus on how slavery and abolition, citizenship, education, and politics in the greater New England region affected the lives of African Americans. The approach is cross-

disciplinary, and will involve experts from a variety of perspectives, including history, art, museum studies, and literature.

13. Facilities

AAS hopes to pursue some renovations to 138 Mountfort Street. Over the past two years, there have been complications with both the heating and air-conditioning units in the building. These conditions have sometimes made the building uninhabitable.

14. Collaborating with other academic units and institutions

From a curricular standpoint, undergraduate majors offered by fellow BU departments and programs depend on coursework offered in AAS. Undergraduate majors in the Departments of History, English, Sociology, Art History, Political Science, and Economics, as well as in the Program in American and New England Studies, have opportunities to take courses that are cross-listed with those in African American Studies. Currently, in terms of course offerings, the program shows particular strengths in the fields of History and English. The recent hire of Ruha Benjamin, to replace retired faculty members James Teele and Daniel Monti, will further strengthen our offerings in Sociology. Moving forward, the program is particularly interested in collaborating with the Departments of Political Science, Economics, and Art History to ensure that our students continue to receive truly interdisciplinary training in African American studies. Collaborations across colleges—particularly with the School of Education, the College of Communication, and the School of Fine Arts—also promise to enhance the program.

Undergraduate majors and degrees outside of CAS also depend on our coursework. AAS has indeed collaborated with the School of Education in the creation of a course, which began in spring 2009, titled “The (Mis)Education of Black Boys.” Currently, we are working to cross-list one of our courses, taught by Richardson, “African American Drama,” with a course title and number in the Department of Theatre. The undergraduate minors in CAS and elsewhere whose requirements can be fulfilled by coursework in our Program include those in African Studies, American and New England Studies, Art History, Economics, English, Political Science, Sociology, and Women’s Studies. Similarly, graduate programs offered by fellow GRS departments depend on coursework in African American Studies. They include both the master’s and doctoral programs in American and New England Studies, Art History, Economics, English, Political Science, and Sociology. Finally, AAS serves CAS curricula beyond major degrees, such as contributing to the College Honors Program, which depends on the courses taught by Heywood, and to the College Writing Requirement, on those taught by Blakely.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

In 10 years, AAS aims to be one of the nation’s leading programs in African American studies. The program aims to continue to enhance the intellectual and research life of students, faculty, and non-BU affiliates as they examine African American and African Diasporic experiences in international terms. By the end of the upcoming decade, AAS will have the justification to argue for official status as a department in CAS upon succeeding in: regularizing and expanding faculty membership in AAS; maintaining or strengthening current faculty interests in African American experiences from a global perspective; being sensitive to and accommodative of new disciplinary directions in this field; establishing an undergraduate major; improving the masters-to-doctorate pipeline; and having resources in connecting graduates with nonacademic professional opportunities.

Regarding the faculty, AAS plans to have a more streamlined and stable core structure of the AAS faculty. It would include only regular full-time members, such as tenure-track and tenured faculty members as well as lecturers, while slowly dissolving the dependence on irregular members, such as “visiting” faculty. This approach would not just conform to the broader direction of BU, but also add long-term security to our staffing, curriculum development, and programmatic initiatives. Moreover, since the majority of the core

faculty will enter retirement age within ten years, AAS will have to consider hiring new faculty, at either the junior or senior level, to bolster its strengths in History, English, Political Science, Sociology, and Art History. Likewise, AAS will have to hire new faculty in departments represented within the affiliated group but not within the core group, including Anthropology and Music, and to hire new faculty in departments where AAS has suffered departures, such as Economics. And AAS will continue to conduct research to determine the newest approaches in the field of African American studies that warrant authorization for new hiring. That said, a greater effort will have been made by the 10 year-period to solicit greater participation among available BU faculty who already have interests in African American studies (according to their coursework, scholarship, and service) but are not formally recognized as part of the AAS community. This potential group would include faculty from CAS as well as the Schools of Education and Communication.

Regarding its undergraduate education, AAS will have an undergraduate major in African American studies. Many of the peer institutions, including Northwestern, NYU, Duke, Vanderbilt, Stanford, Emory, and USC, have such a major to accommodate the students interested in specializing in African American studies for the baccalaureate degree, not merely appending this field of inquiry to another departmental concentration. Having an undergraduate major would strengthen its argument that it, too, can be a core mission of BU undergraduate education. The major, however, will also be buttressed by the development of lower-level, interdisciplinary courses that would introduce freshman and sophomores to the fundamental issues of African American studies.

Regarding the masters education, AAS will strengthen and sharpen the mission of the MA program. We will continue to argue that the MA program provides a valuable service to the graduate community. The program is a successful stepping stone for students from nontraditional backgrounds interested in pursuing future academic work, and applications from the 2010 cycle, for example, suggest that a degree in African American Studies continues to be relevant to a wide range of other fields, including law, education, and ministry. The MA program continues to have significant support from faculty, current students, and alumni, and this continued involvement strengthens not only the program but also the university as a whole. The MA program will also have an improved, if more established, logical, and direct, pipeline from a graduate student's completion of the program's requirements to his or her application to a fellow department in CAS that would recognize the MA in African American Studies as potential credit toward a doctoral degree. AAS will also have greater financial support of admitted graduate students, so that they will have opportunities to complete their course of study undistracted by financial constraints or challenges. In this respect, they can be more prepared to apply for doctoral programs or, if they so choose, for opportunities in the nonacademic professional sector, such as primary and secondary education, which was a previous interest of the Program shortly after its founding in 1969 and which, in ten years, might be revitalized. When there are such institutional commitments and infrastructural developments, AAS can strongly consider the inauguration of its own Ph.D. program.

1. The Measures for Evaluating Progress

A primary indicator of the success of AAS is the degree that BU students, faculty, administrators, alumni, along with non-BU affiliates, regard the constitutive elements of AAS as crucial to their positive educational or intellectual experiences. The following units of measurement for progress in the areas mentioned in the Strategic Plan are monitorable and applicable at *both 5- and 10-* year intervals: the ongoing number of AAS-related courses; the ongoing number of students enrolling in them; the ongoing number of faculty whose research and scholarship fulfill the interests of AAS and are willing to commit themselves to its programmatic initiatives and intellectual life; the ongoing number of faculty willing to teach AAS-related courses; the annual number of conferred minor, major, and masters degrees; the annual number and range of AAS-related forums and activities held at BU and elsewhere; and the ongoing number of meaningful local, national, and international relationships established with institutions of primary, secondary, and higher education, and with those in non-academic intellectual and professional sectors devoted to the fundamental interests and constituencies of AAS. In each case, any increase in number and/or range would likely indicate the growing strength of AAS at BU.

American and New England Studies Program (AMNESP)
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The American and New England Studies Program (AMNESP) is a nationally recognized leader in American Studies, dedicated to rigorous interdisciplinary study of American society: its arts, culture, literature, history, institutions, and diverse intellectual traditions. Our areas of strength include Art History/Fine Arts, Historic Preservation, History, Literature, Material Culture, Religion, and New England/Boston Studies. We also specialize in transnational studies. Our large, prestigious Ph.D. program has produced professors, public historians, museum curators, and directors at major cultural and historical institutions. Our professional Preservation Studies M.A. and joint Law/Preservation J.D./M.A. provide training to effectively manage cultural resources. Our individualized B.A. program benefits majors and non-majors seeking a rigorous interdisciplinary experience. We actively collaborate with many of Boston's cultural institutions.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

There is not yet an NRC or national ranking of American Studies programs at research universities. Among our peers, BU is among the 3 or 4 top programs (reflected in our Ph.D. admissions selectivity rate of 18%). Each peer program parallels certain BU strengths (material culture, regional studies, preservation, history, ethnicity). We rank BU behind Yale, about equal to Brown, above the others.

- a. Yale University* is the top program in the US for virtually all faculty and graduate students polled. Closest to BU. Comparable strengths: material culture, art history, history, photography.
- b. Brown University* is notable for its public history MA, with strengths in history, gender, African American. Less strong than BU in material culture and art history.
- c. Harvard University* has the oldest American Civilization Ph.D. program, comparably strong in history, religion, and literature, but much weaker than BU in art history and film.
- d. The University of Delaware* has comparable preservation programs and material culture programs (Winterthur Program in decorative arts/ material culture; undergraduate material culture minor, and American Civilization Ph.D. in the History department).
- e. University of Southern California* is widely regarded as an excellent program, especially for ethnic studies.
- f. The University of Minnesota* is one of the biggest, oldest, and strongest U.S. programs, with strengths in history. Less strong than BU in art history, material culture, preservation.
- g. New York University* is strong in international studies, literature, urbanism, and architecture but less competitive than BU.
- h. University of Texas, Austin* is less strong than BU, but has a similar regional focus (southwest vs. BU's New England). Strengths: literature, art history, film, and preservation.

2. Faculty

56 faculty in 14 departments. 48 tenured/tenure-track, 4 non tenure-track; 4 part-time. We direct dissertations, administer Ph.D. exams, offer graduate courses, lecture, advise graduate students, and serve on admissions committees. One Preservation and 1/2 of a Material Culture position are in AMNESP; all others are affiliated. Our most active faculty: Art History (6), History (11), and English (12). Others: African-American Studies (3), Anthropology (3), Archaeology (3), Film (2), Humanities (2), Musicology(1), International Relations (1), Philosophy (1), Political Science (2), Religion (2), Sociology (7).

3. Scholarly/research quality (Aggregate)

- a. *Refereed scholarly books 2006-2009*: 56 faculty: 56 books 2006 to 2009 (average-one book per professor). Presses include: Oxford, Columbia, Yale, Cornell, California, Duke, Cambridge, Washington, Penn State, Pennsylvania, Stanford, Virginia, Harvard, Princeton, Routledge, Wiley-Blackwell.
- b. *Refereed articles and "High quality" journal publications*: 56 faculty published 102 articles from 2006 to 2009, in major scholarly journals, and an additional 106 chapters in peer-reviewed university press books. (Average 3.6 articles per professor).
- c. *Research grant activity*: 56 faculty members received 27 grants; total \$1,026,362.
- d. *Rankings*: BU's AMNESP ranked 4th in the *Chronicle of Higher Education's* Productivity Index for 2006, behind Harvard, U Texas/Austin, and Maryland. The National Research Council has not yet ranked American Studies programs. Informally, BU is consistently listed among the top 3 or 4 programs.
- e. *Awards*: Our 56 faculty won 58 awards from 2006-2009.
- f. *Citations*: Data are available through individual departments.

4. Scholarly/research quality

The American Studies Association lists 16 subfields. BU has particular strengths in 7 subfields: Art History/Fine Arts (painting, architecture, urbanism, photography), Historic Preservation, History (gender, multiculturalism, ethnicity, pop culture), Literature (African American, gender, international/cross-cultural studies), Material Culture, Religion, Regional Studies (New England/Boston Studies). For biggest areas, we list faculty, Ph.D. students, Ph.D.s 2006-2009 by 1st reader.

- a. *Art History/Fine Arts*: Affiliated faculty in photography (Kim Sichel, Director of AMNESP), painting (Patricia Hills), architecture (Keith Morgan, Claire Dempsey, Paolo Scrivano), decorative arts (Melanie Hall), material culture (Sewell, joint AH/AMNESP position). The largest percentage of AMNESP Ph.D. dissertations are in art history/visual culture, supervised by Professors Hills, Morgan, Sichel, and Sewell. We have internships at museums, archives, and cultural institutions. (6 faculty, 21 students, 6 recent Ph.D.s)
- b. *Historic Preservation Faculty*: Claire Dempsey (Preservation Program Director) works on vernacular architecture, research methods, history, and theory. 3 lecturers: Eric Dray (preservation planning), Elaine Finbury (financing preservation), and David Bitterman (building conservation). Ricardo Elia and Rafique Mughal (Archaeology) teach heritage management. Melanie Hall and Keith Morgan (Art History) teach 18th-20th century design, and historic site development. (1 full; 3 part-time faculty, 11 MA students)
- c. *History*: Affiliated History and African American Studies faculty cover all periods from early modern Atlantic exploration to the contemporary U.S., with strengths in the early American Atlantic world (Brendan McConville, Linda Heywood), intellectual/cultural history (Charles Capper, Jon Roberts, Brooke Blower, Nina Silber), and 20th century America (Marilyn Halter, Sarah Phillips, Bruce Schulman, Lou Ferleger). Strengths: multiculturalism, ethnicity, pop culture, gender. (11 faculty, 16 students, 6 recent Ph.D.s)
- d. *Literature*: Affiliated faculty cover colonial (Hunt Howell) to contemporary periods (Robert Chodat, Matthew Smith, Susan Mizruchi), and from the American Renaissance (Maurice Lee, Laura Korobkin, Mizruchi) to modernism, in poetry (Bonnie Costello, Anita Patterson), fiction (Chodat, Mizruchi, Lee, Korobkin, Charles Rzepka), nonfiction prose, film (Leland Monk) and drama (Smith). Special emphases include transnational and hemispheric comparativism (Gene Jarrett, Patterson), African American studies (Jarrett, Laurence Breiner), the Global South (Jack Matthews), feminism (Korobkin, Mizruchi). (12 faculty, 11 students, 4 recent Ph.D.s)

e. Material Culture: Material Culture is an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the relationship between the material world of things and the cultures that make and use them. It has been an important specialty of BU's curriculum for three decades. Material Culture has a dedicated specialist (Jessica Sewell, AMNESP/Art History), and affiliated faculty in Archaeology (Mary Beaudry), Art History (Hills, Sichel, Morgan, Hall), AMNESP (Dempsey), English (Howell). (Material Culture Ph.Ds are counted in Art History)

f. Religion: Affiliated Religion faculty include Stephen Prothero (Religion), Jon Roberts (History), Nancy Ammerman (Sociology, Religion), Rob Weller (Anthropology, Institute on Culture, Religion and World Affairs--CURA), Dana Robert (Religion), and Adam Seligman (Religion, CURA). CURA has supported AMNESP with Marilyn Halter's 1990 appointment (History, CURA) and with Ph.D. fellowships. (1 Ph.D.)

g. Regional Studies: The study of New England from colonial times to the present has been central to our mission since 1971, and BU is the national center for Boston/New England studies.

5. Educational/pedagogical contributions (Aggregate)

a. Course evaluations: Excellent instructors have cumulative ratings of 4+; improvement needed below 3.5. B.A. faculty averaged ratings of 4.37, M.A. faculty 3.97, and Ph.D. faculty 4.72.

b. Academic enhancement undergraduate/graduate: Conferences (American Studies in Global Perspective 2008, Genderfest 2009, Michael Haneke 2007), guest lectures (American Conversations), student professional training (Learning the Ropes), study groups, internships, practica.

c. Curricular and pedagogical innovations: AMNESP has been a developmental center for material culture and vernacular architecture since 1971.

d. Major professional and public service contributions: 54 contributions include editorial boards of national scholarly journal (*College Art Association Reviews, Reviews in American History, The Faulkner Journal, Twentieth Century Literature, Religion and American Culture, Modern Drama*), university press series editors (Cambridge, Wisconsin, South Carolina), boards of field-specific associations (ICOMOS, Society for Historical Archaeology, Society of Architectural Historians, American Sociological Association); trustees or committee members of national organizations (ACLS; Nominating Committee, MacArthur Foundation; Organization of American Historians; National Endowment for the Humanities).

6. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education

Excellent, small program. (20 majors)

1. Mission--Goals and purposes: The interdisciplinary concentration in American Studies gives students the chance to study the society and culture of the U.S. in its national and global contexts. Students have freedom in their course selection within a framework of required courses and a declared subfield specialization. Many majors choose international study and internships. Non-majors gain experience in interdisciplinary culture unavailable in departmental courses.

2. Vitality and quality: Our interdisciplinary major is intentionally small and individual. We actively value opportunities for students who wish an interdisciplinary experience. The intimate

scale and intensive faculty mentoring give our students a rigorous but personal experience in BU's large urban environment.

3. *Analysis of enrollment history and projections, student quality:* The number of majors grown steadily, from 5 majors in 2000 to 9 majors in 2009. Enrollments have dropped from a 2000 base figure of 632 students, to 388 in 2007 and back up to 514 in 2009 (total 18.67% drop). We must recruit more students to the major; this has begun by lifting restrictions on the introductory classes. Earlier larger enrollments reflect that several classes were cross-listed; we may reinstate that policy for interdisciplinary classes.

4. *Student outcomes:* Of 27 graduates 2006-2009, only four job placements are available (KBW Financial Staffing and Recruiting, Edelman Communications, Bristol Press, Girl Scouts of Central Texas). For such a small program, AMNESP majors have won a disproportionate number of highly competitive prizes, including three Humanities Foundation fellowships and two Grieg prizes in the last three years; one AMNESP student gave the Student Speech at the CAS Day Ceremony in 2006.

5. *Student diversity:* No data; 2/3 women, some Hispanic and Asian students.

b. Doctoral Programs

Extremely strong, among top 3-4 programs (51 students)

1. *Mission--goals and purposes:* Established in 1971, the doctoral program in AMNESP is dedicated to the cross-disciplinary study of American society in all its aspects: arts, culture, history, institutions, literature, religion, and diverse intellectual traditions. We maintain a strong commitment not only to History and Literature, but to Art History, Religion, Material Culture, Historic Preservation, and New England and Boston Studies. The Ph.D. program trains interdisciplinary scholars to work in American Studies, Communications, Media Studies, research on race, class, and gender, and blended disciplines, as opposed to distinct fields. These scholars teach in new interdisciplinary as well as traditional field-specific departments in universities, as well becoming museum curators, directors, and public historians.

2. *Vitality and quality:* The program was last reviewed in 2004, and the current curriculum deemed to be effective and flexible. Two required courses (AM 736 and AM 735) offer methodological backgrounds and research preparation; students design their own programs in consultation with advisors. Like most other prestigious national programs, we depend heavily on affiliated faculty. Faculty and graduates alike derive benefits from our scholarly synergies and collaborations, but we could do a better job of regularizing faculty involvement. A major roadblock to further improvement is our entering student package: one 4-year PUGF, a 1-year GA, and a 1-year TF; most peer schools have several 4 or 5-year packages.

3. *Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment:* Enrollment: 39 students in 2000, 44 in 2006, 54 in 2009 (we grew by 72%). Recruitment Selectivity/Attractiveness: AMNESP's Ph.D. program is one of BU's top 3 selective programs. 2009--18% post-MA admission rate (BU average 23%), 56% registration rate (BU 28%); 17% post-BA admission rate (BU 22%), 40% registration rate (college 23%). Quality/Scores: 2009 average post-MA GRE: 653 verbal, 513 analytical, writing 5. Post BA GRE: V530, A537, W7.

4. *Student outcomes:*

a. *Time to degree measures, BU completion rates:* 7.3 years average (GRS 6.8 average), attrition rate .36 (GRS average .37).

b. Number of PhDs completed: 2 in 2009, 4 in 2008, 7 in 2007, 4 in 2006. Comparable completion numbers: Yale --9 Ph.D.s in 2007, 10 in 2006, 6 in 2005 (only years available). Minnesota--7 Ph.D.s in 2008, 6 in 2007, 6 in 2005.

c. Placement over the past 3 years: We excel at placing our students in jobs (curators and public historians are as well respected as professors).

17 Ph.D.s from 2006 to 2009: 3 tenure-track jobs (Ursinus College, Armstrong Atlantic State University, U Mass Boston), 5 other teaching jobs (Babson College, BU, Roger Williams University), 6 public historians and curators (Whitney Museum of American Art, National Park Service, Plimouth Plantation, Preservation Company, American Academy of Arts and Sciences),

d. Rankings relative to peers: No ranking available.

5. *Student diversity:* No data. Currently, 4 African-Americans, 1 Asian of 51 students.

c. Masters Programs

Small, flexible. (11 students)

1. *Mission:* The professional Preservation Studies MA Program provides interdisciplinary training to effectively manage cultural resources. Students learn both traditional and innovative forms of preservation practice. This broad training emphasizes the variety of historic resources and diverse approaches to their preservation. The degree allows them to obtain both public and private sector jobs in architectural history; preservation planning, law, and finance; building conservation and adaptive use.

2. *Vitality and quality:* Our excellent program places students well but suffers from the isolation of having only one main faculty member and a few scattered adjuncts. We need a 2nd full time faculty to take full advantage of the rich New England resources and to create stability and continuity. Adjusted requirements reflect our 2004 curriculum review. We suffer from low funding compared to competitors.

3. *Competitiveness of graduate student recruitment:* Enrollment fluctuated between 2000 and 2009. BU has 5 new students in 2009. Two top programs (Penn and Columbia) have 20 to 25 new students a year, and a regional competitor (U Vermont) has 12 new students. Total BU enrollment: 21 students in 2000, 11 in 2009, compared to Columbia (45) and Penn 50).

4. *Recruitment:*

a. Selectivity and Attractiveness: Preservation programs are expanding nationwide. Our applicant pool and enrollments are down; applicants 40+ in 1999, now down 20+. Our 62% acceptance rate is higher than Vermont's 35%.

b. Quality-Scores: 2009 avg. GREs: 520 verbal, 525 anal., wr. 5.

5. *Student Outcomes:*

a. Time to degree measures: average time to completion: 2.5 years (BU average 2.1 years); attrition rate 1.7% (BU MA average 2.8%). Preservation Studies requires 12 courses; many other Preservation MAs require as many as 16. With low financial aid, many students attend part-time. We carefully plan individual programs.

b. Placement over the past 3 years: 15 graduates 2006-09: 13 preservation (Macroscopic Historic Advisors, New York Landmarks Foundation, Boston Preservation Alliance, Historic Boston, Inc., South End Historical Society, Massachusetts Historical Commission, Mt. Auburn Cemetery, Neighborhood Development Center, St. Paul, Public Archaeology Lab, RI; MA Dept of Housing, Winchester Town Planner, Matison

Preservation Consulting, Alston Village Main Streets). 2 other jobs (Reed Smith LLP, Museum of Fine Arts).

6. *Rankings Relative to Peers:* No formal ranking of programs exists. The best preservation programs are at Columbia and Pennsylvania; University of Vermont is our strongest regional competitor. Other strong regional programs are at Oregon, Texas, Kentucky, Georgia, and Maryland, with strong certificate programs at Virginia and George Washington University. Some other programs have a higher public profile from synergies with architecture and planning programs, more faculty and students, and better financial aid. BU would benefit from new higher profile faculty.

7. *Student Diversity:* No BU statistics available. Most students are white women.

8. *Interdisciplinary initiatives:* AMNESP is interdisciplinary by definition. See Mission Statement.

9. *International/global initiatives:* Many AMNESP faculty specialize in comparative relations between the US and the world (Kim Sichel, Anita Patterson, Roy Grundmann, Rob Weller, Allison Blakeley, Brooke Blower, Linda Heywood, Paolo Scrivano). Through Anita Patterson's efforts, 12 BU faculty held four panels at the International American Studies Association (IASA) meetings (Leiden, Holland, 2003). A Global Initiatives conference (2008) included many faculty and Ph.D students. We host DAAD students.

10. *Outreach initiatives:* Community outreach is not a central part of our mission at present.

7. Facilities

a. *Adequacy of facilities for the mission of the unit:* Necessary improvements:

Mold and ventilation: Air systems were incorrectly installed; we have ongoing leaks. Basement classrooms and offices are often moldy and damp; they need proper ventilation and dehumidifiers. We lost much furniture to mold, and must repair and repaint basement and first floor walls and ceilings.

Technology: The building cannot access wireless hubs. Our 2 main seminar rooms lack overhead stationary projectors. We also need computers for student to use as is common elsewhere on campus.

Common room: Students need a healthy common space.

b. *Plans for addressing issues, including financial:* We are in dialogue with the Dean's Office and GRS Business Office, and we may split expenses for a wireless system with History. Our operating budget will cover stationary projector, furnishings and technology.

c. *Collaborations:* Within Boston University we regularly collaborate with English, African-American Studies, Women's Studies, History, Art History, English, Archaeology, and Anthropology. Outside Boston University we have close relationships with the Mt. Auburn Cemetery, Wakefield Charitable Trust, and hope to return to more formalized programs with the Museum of Fine Arts, Historic New England, the Peabody-Essex Museum, Massachusetts Historical Commission, National Trust for Historic Preservation. We are renewing affiliations with the Addison Gallery of American Art, Andover.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten-Year Plan

a. Summary: As we move forward for the next decade, we plan to build on our strengths. As one of the 3-4 most selective Ph.D. programs at BU, we plan to actively fundraise to attract the best students, and to incorporate into our program several new faculty from other departments and through joint hires. We will reinvestigate the MA Preservation Studies program with a second full-time hire. We will expand undergraduate programs to double their size while maintaining their intimate culture. Finally, we will work together with COM, English and Art History to launch the new CAS film studies programs. AMNESP's interdisciplinary model and focus on visual culture and transnationalism as unique aspects of history can be a model within the university and nation-wide.

b. Faculty: Because AMNESP offers a close-knit and creative interdisciplinary community, a first goal – but an easy one – is to more actively involve affiliated faculty from core departments and from new areas; we have extraordinary colleagues but need to better engage them in our programs and teaching. For the doctoral and undergraduate program, we are welcoming new junior faculty from English, Sociology and Architectural Studies into our program, and are expanding our links with Archaeology and Anthropology professors. We also need the resources of new faculty from across CAS. As a high priority, we wish to hire a second full-time Preservation Studies faculty member to replace adjuncts and raise the national profile of the program. We also hope to build upon our historic strengths of visual culture, literature, and historical inquiry. We are collaborating with Art History as they seek to hire a Latin Americanist (a high priority for both programs) and with COM, Art History and English in film studies—the appointment of Professor Roy Grundmann (COM) as a full CAS faculty member is an important first step. We hope to add to BU's strengths in African American culture by working with Art History and African American Studies for an African American art historian, and with History for a colonial Atlantic historian. Finally, to build on our powerful role in New England/Boston studies, we are working with History on a hire of a Boston historian.

c. Undergraduate education: AMNESP should be very attractive to undergraduates seeking interdisciplinary study; our current staffing and course structure has kept it small. But we have plans to double or even triple the major in the next years by removing artificial barriers. We will list the most relevant departmental classes on our undergraduate course website, will cross-list some classes (AH, EN, HI, SO) to lure students (a return to past practices), and will open more enrollments for the introductory course AM 200, and will work to involve affiliated faculty more deeply with undergraduates. A new, senior faculty DUS will come on board in fall 2010 (Bonnie Costello, English). We will also regularize faculty teaching contributions from our three core affiliated departments (AH, HI, EN) asking each department to commit one faculty course each year for one of our four required classes. AMNESP would like to house the new CAS film program.

d. Doctoral education: AMNESP has made a mark as a world-class program with particular strengths; we will continue to promote the nationally recognized focus on material culture, visual culture, and New England studies that has made us stand out from our peers, as well as our strengths in historical, literary and religious studies. We have already begun expanding our anthropology and archaeology connections. Our biggest handicap is lack of funding, and we need better recruitment packages, but, perhaps more importantly, two or more new teaching fellowships are needed.

e. Masters education: Our ten year plan for the professional Preservation Studies MA is to improve its position among the premier programs in the US, with special strengths in Boston and New England Studies. We will work towards a full time second faculty member to better serve our core courses and provide continuity and stability. We will create synergies with other BU programs (heritage management, archaeology, preservation law, architectural history, technology, historic sites and museums, and urban planning). We will strengthen our already wide networks with New England's preservation, museum, and research institutions.

f. Collaborations: We will continue our successful collaborations with History, Art History, English, Film Studies, African-American Studies, and Women's Studies, and strengthen our Boston area and film curricula, as well as Anthropology, Religion, and Archaeology. We will forge alliances with Historic New England, Museum of Fine Arts, Peabody-Essex Museum, and Addison Gallery of American Art.

g. Resources that will be needed: We will work hard to secure external donor funding for our Ph.D. students, but we will need 4 or 5 multi-year tuition and stipend packages for each year's entering class, as well as two to three additional TFs for their later years. Expansion into film will require continued collaboration with COM, English, and Art History for new faculty. A Boston historian with History would further our work with New England and Boston Studies; collaboration with African American and Art History towards an African American art historian benefits all 3 programs. We need a 2nd Preservation Studies faculty line. We will measure progress by monitoring faculty productivity, Ph.D. graduate recruitment, time to degree, job placement, Preservation enrollment and staffing, numbers of majors, and grad job placement.

Five-Year Goals

In five years, we will double our number of majors and regularize course staffing. We hope to formalize Roy Grundmann (COM, Film) as CAS faculty in AMNESP and Art History. We hope to have a second full-time Preservation Studies faculty member on board to reinvigorate that program. We will work with Art History towards a Latin American art historian and with History towards a Boston historian. English is hoping for a film/media studies hire to also benefit AMNESP.

a. Steps the unit, CAS, and BU have to take: AMNESP and CAS will jointly work to better fund graduate aid. We expect better synergies with English, History, and Art History to place full-time faculty in all four core courses, and will welcome more BU faculty into AMNESP. We hope to fill the 2nd Preservation line. We will indicate progress by measuring enrollments, job placements, faculty output, and recruitments.

Program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the undergraduate program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB) is to provide a roadmap for students to navigate through the great many discoveries and breakthrough technologies occurring on an almost daily basis in the biomedical sciences. BMB strives to give its undergraduates a strong foundation in biology and chemistry, followed by the opportunity take more focused advanced courses and perform research within these disciplines. BMB aims to graduate students who compete successfully for admission to top advanced degree programs in the biomedical sciences (research and medicine) as well as obtain positions in the workforce in the area of biotechnology.

B. The Present

1. Academic Peer Group (ranked roughly stronger to weaker with BMB being in the middle)

- Brown University offers an interdisciplinary program in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. This program appears stronger than BMB as it requires independent research from all majors.
- University of Southern California offers both a BA and a BS in biology, with the BS being most similar BMB.
- University of Pennsylvania offers an undergraduate degree in biology with a concentration in molecular biology. This program appears stronger than us in genetics but weaker in biochemistry.
- NYU Department of Biology offers a biology degree with strengths in genomics and systems biology but a weakness in biochemistry.
- Tufts University offers an interdisciplinary biochemistry degree program that appears similar to BMB. However, based on the contributing departments it appears weaker.
- Boston College offers a BS option in biology, with the BS being most similar to BMB. The courses appear to be mostly cellular and molecular in nature and lack the strong chemistry component that BMB has.

2. Faculty

BMB is made up of faculty whose primary appointments are in Biology (25), Chemistry (10), and Physics (1). In addition, all teaching is assigned, administered and evaluated through home departments. Please see these departments for assessments of research and teaching contributions.

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education

1. Goals

Over the past two decades the exponential growth of technologies for analyzing biological and chemical processes have combined with the availability of whole genome sequences to rapidly advance our understanding of cellular processes at the molecular level. BMB offers a BA or combined BA/MA degree built upon a curriculum that bridges the Biology and Chemistry departments providing a course program not available through either department. The BMB curriculum combines Cell and Molecular offerings from Biology with the Biochemistry expertise from the Chemistry Department. In addition all students must participate in research whether done as independent research with a BMB faculty member or in “project labs” courses (BI 513 and BB 522) currently offered through the Biology Department.

2. *Vitality and quality*

BMB has remained a popular major as judged by a consistent enrollment, successful student outcomes, and strong interest at the annual open house. Students rightly view the program as excellent preparation for graduate research in the biomedical sciences. In addition BMB provides a rigorous premedical track that strengthens medical school applications. BMB majors and graduates speak enthusiastically about the major and participating faculty enjoy teaching BMB majors and having them conduct research in their laboratories. More than half of our undergraduates participate in independent research at some point in their BMB career and ~10% graduate with Distinction.

BMB students can add an MA in Biotechnology by applying to this “closed” program in their junior year and taking six additional courses including two independent research courses culminating in a thesis. This program remains popular with students who wish to enhance their competitiveness for finding technician positions in biotechnology and/or who have not decided whether to apply to a PhD program.

3. *Numbers of majors and degree*

For any given year, BMB has 200-250 students enrolled. The following are the numbers of degrees awarded for the past five years:

2009 69 BA; 2 BA/MA
 2008 57 BA; 4 BA/MA
 2007 60 BA; 9 BA/MA
 2006 54 BA; 3 BA/MA
 2005 52 BA; 6 BA/MA

4. *Student outcomes*

Exit survey data for graduating seniors (% of those responding)

Post-graduation plans	2008	2009
Medical School	19%	24%
Graduate School or other advanced training	34%	23%
Employment in Biological Field	45%	45%
Employment in Non-biological field	0%	2%
Other	2	6%

b. Graduate Education

Because the MA program is an extension of the undergraduate program it is discussed above.

1. *Facilities*
2. *Other infrastructure*
3. *Collaborations*

These components are not applicable to BMB as our faculty and courses are based in other departments (primarily Biology and Chemistry).

C. Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year plan

The challenge for the BMB program is to maintain its high level of achievement for its graduates while adjusting the curriculum to incorporate new technologies and areas of study. We feel that we are currently in a strong position relative to other science programs within BU as well as around the country, thus we have to maintain our high standards while staying “fresh”. To accomplish this seemingly simple goal, BMB needs to continue to offer a curriculum that provides strong foundations in biology and chemistry for Freshman and Sophomores and continue to offer higher-level courses that reflect the latest advances in the biomedical sciences. To accomplish this goal, BMB will leverage off of the growth of the Biology and Chemistry Departments as new hires are made in these departments. For example, current faculty searches in Systems Biology (Biology) and Chemical Biology (Chemistry) likely will provide new courses and research opportunities for BMB majors. At the same time, BMB expects to be consulted in future job hires (especially as current faculty retire) so that Biology and Chemistry course offerings will continue meet the requirements of the BMB major.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

Our primary metrics for evaluating the success of BMB will be based on our numbers of majors (and graduates) and the outcomes of our graduates. We do not anticipate drastic changes in our enrollment and we do expect that the vast majority of BMB graduates will go on pursue careers related to their major. This is in part because students who enroll in the BMB major arrive at BU with focused career goals in the biomedical sciences; thus they desire the more focused curriculum BMB offers compared to Biology or Chemistry.

3. Five-year goals

As noted, the BMB curriculum is dependent on offerings from other departments (primarily Biology and Chemistry). As both of these departments have strong research and teaching interests in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, it is likely that each department will maintain courses suitable for BMB. In addition, Biology and Chemistry have recently added (or are considering adding) courses that will be suitable for BMB. For example, in Spring 2010, Biology began offering an Intensive Genetics course (BI 216) in addition to Genetics (BI 206). BI 216, with its emphasis on molecular biology, is now the recommended genetics course for BMB majors while BI 206 is recommended for Biology majors concentrating in the more organismal aspects of biology. Chemistry is considering offering a grad level structural analysis techniques lab course that will be appropriate for BMB majors. Furthermore, BMB will benefit from the University’s push to become an established player in Systems Biology, as the BMB curriculum covers much of the science foundation required for this emerging field. To assist with this goal, BMB will strengthen mathematical training especially in the areas of statistics and quantitative methods. This modification will prepare students for analyzing and interpreting the large amounts of data expected to be generated using these “systems” approaches to biology. For example, the newly created course MA 196 (Introductory Quantitative Biology) will be added as one option to fulfill BMB’s math requirements.

While most of BMB's goals center around the BA and BA/MA programs, BMB will develop an undergraduate minor. We expect that this minor will be of particular interest to Biomedical Engineering, Chemistry, and other non-biology majors, particularly pre-medical students.

The Core Curriculum of the College of Arts and Sciences
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

1. The Mission of the Core Curriculum

The Core Curriculum offers an integrated liberal arts education to freshmen and sophomores in a series of eight courses spread over a period of two years. Its small classes, numerous co-curricular activities, and overall sense of community provide the feeling of a “college within the College” for students as well as faculty.

General Education is often described as “breadth” compared to the “depth” that students acquire in their majors. We prefer to use the metaphor of a “foundation.” The Core Curriculum is meant to provide a deep, thoughtful, sophisticated, and challenging foundation for future studies in the liberal arts. Our goal is to give students the knowledge and skills—along with the qualities of mind and heart—to succeed in their programs at Boston University and in their future careers as citizens and scholars.

2. What We Do

Students are taught mainly in small seminars. These classes give the Core Curriculum the intensity and intimacy of a series of freshman seminars, but with the structure and clarity of a large program. The shared syllabus for first- and second-year students fosters a sense of shared intellectual discourse—what one recent graduate called “a community of books”—that ties students and graduates together outside the classroom and beyond the university. Seminars are supplemented by lectures offered by outside experts and by specialists from our own faculty.

Core courses are integrated intellectually and programmatically, so that students can explore common problems across the different areas of the curriculum. Core courses also integrate study of the visual arts and music, along with works of enduring value in literature, philosophy, religion, and social thought.

The classroom experience is enhanced by an unusually wide variety of co-curricular activities, including an active student drama society, an annual festival of works by student filmmakers, a *Core Journal*, a film society, and a variety of events and activities that draw students together across the different levels of the program.

The Core is connected to two different residential communities: two Core Floors in Warren Towers and the Core House on Carlton Street. These residential opportunities allow students to build “living-learning” communities that carry their studies outside the classroom.

The Core stresses the importance of writing. Students who successfully complete both semesters of the first-year Core Humanities receive credit for WR 100. Students who successfully complete both semesters of the second-year Core Humanities (CC 201 and 202) or Core Social Sciences (CC 203 and 204) receive credit for WR 150. Core writing is based on careful reading and discussion of foundational works.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Group

We number among our peers the well-known and successful “Great Books” programs in American higher education. Today, the leading program in this group is the Columbia University Core Curriculum. The list also includes the University of Chicago program in General Education and the “Great Books” curriculum at St. John’s College in Annapolis. Yale’s small, selective program in “Directed Studies” shares some features with our Core Curriculum. For contrast, it is helpful to consider the new General Education program at Harvard (designed to replace the Core Curriculum that was established in the late 1970s).

- <http://www.college.columbia.edu/core>
- <http://squishee.uchicago.edu/newstudents/liberal-education-chicago>
- <http://www.stjohnscollege.edu/academic/ANreadlist>
- <http://www.yale.edu/directedstudies/>
- <http://www.generaleducation.fas.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do>

Our peer programs can be located on a spectrum ranging from programs in which the content is rigidly specified to programs that allow a wide range of choice within a few designated curricular areas.

The most rigidly defined program is found at St. John's. In some ways, this program is the gold standard of a "Great Books" curriculum. All students take the same curriculum; the courses focus entirely on "great books"; instruction is carried out in small seminars, with two instructors per seminar; and all instructors are trained to teach the entire curriculum. The program at St. John's engenders an unusual sense of pride, seriousness, and intellectual identity. Several of our own instructors were trained in this program and bring many of its strongest features to bear in their teaching.

The next point on the spectrum is occupied by Columbia. The Columbia Core Curriculum is one of the most venerable and respected "Great Books" programs in the country. Its central components, "Literature Humanities" (Lit Hum) and "Contemporary Civilization in the West" (CC), are required for all Columbia undergraduates. These two, two-semester courses are supplemented by one semester in a common Natural Sciences course called "Frontiers of Sciences," plus two additional science courses to be chosen from a list of options. The program also includes required courses in Writing, Social Sciences, Arts Humanities, and Music Humanities, along with a series of options in a "Global Core." The reputation and rigor of this program make it a source of great pride and elicit a high degree of loyalty among alumni.

The Yale program in "Directed Studies" has many of the same components as the Columbia Core, but it is not required. One of its most distinctive features is that it is selective: only one hundred twenty-five students are selected each year.

The Chicago "core curriculum" used to have the tight intellectual organization of the Columbia Core, but it has recently evolved into a series of choices, like the cafeteria approach in Divisional Studies at Boston University. Some of the courses reflect the ethos of the old Chicago core; some do not.

Finally, it is useful to compare the new "General Education" program in Harvard College. Here students are allowed to choose from a wide range of courses in several designated areas. According to the mission statement of the program, the distinguishing feature of these courses is that they "aim not to draw students into a discipline, but to bring the disciplines into students' lives." Otherwise, the courses reflect the curricular choices in the College at large.

The CAS Core Curriculum shares the strengths of other "Great Books" programs: it deals with foundational texts in small seminars and helps students form a distinctive sense of intellectual identity. Unlike Columbia and St. John's, the Core is not required for all undergraduates. We consider this a strength of our program, since it forces us to compete in a competitive intellectual marketplace. Compared to many programs (with the exception of St. John's), we are more intentional about integrating Natural Sciences and Social Sciences. Our program also includes Asian classics, along with music and the arts, in the regular Humanities curriculum. The drawback in this approach, compared especially to Columbia, is that these components can seem awkwardly integrated. They also can give the impression of tokenism compared to the attention we give to other disciplines and traditions.

2. Faculty

Core faculty are known for their commitment to undergraduate teaching. Four of the tenured faculty who teach Core seminars are winners of the Metcalf Award for Teaching Excellence. Several Metcalf winners are numbered among our regular lecturers, including Elie Wiesel, who is, as the French say, *hors catégorie*. The faculty in our courses meet regularly to reflect on the quality of their teaching. About half of our faculty

are lecturers who are recruited specifically because of their promise as teachers. Often they are our most effective teachers.

The principal statistical measure of faculty effectiveness is Course Evaluations. The most recent available statistics (on a scale of 1 to 5) from fall 2008 and spring 2009 show the following averages. (Detailed statistics are included as appendices to this report.)

	course rating	instructor rating
CC 101 (first-year Humanities)	4.26	4.46
CC 102 (first-year Humanities)	4.15	4.40
CC 105 (first-year Natural Science)	3.37	3.95
CC 106 (first-year Natural Science)	3.51	4.07
CC 201 (second-year Humanities)	4.15	4.28
CC 202 (second-year Humanities)	4.24	4.42
CC 203 (second-year Social Science)	3.99	4.11
CC 204 (second-year Social Science)	4.26	4.59

We consider an average of 4.0 to be acceptable and 4.5 to be quite exceptional. These figures show that students are extremely appreciative of their seminar instructors, across the board, with averages in all courses except the Natural Sciences close to 4.5. The Natural Science courses bear a special burden that will be discussed under the category of “Academic Programs” below.

Because of our focus as a teaching program, the achievements of our faculty in scholarly research are not directly relevant, although they often are quite impressive. “Participation in successful academic enhancement” takes place in the context of our rich program in co-curricular activities. “Curricular and pedagogical innovation” focuses on the development of existing courses. This will be discussed under the category of “Academic Programs” below.

A major priority in the Core is recruitment of new tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty in the College often express interest in the Core, but constraints on departmental staffing make it difficult for many departments to release their faculty to teach in Core.

We need to work with the deans and individual departments to schedule searches in which the teaching responsibilities of the new faculty will be shared between the departments and Core. In this way, we hope to reverse the worrying long-term trend of smaller percentages of Core students taught by regular CAS faculty (see appendices). Staffing the Core with full-time tenured or tenure-track BU faculty is essential to maintain the quality and intellectual rigor of the program, and also to provide future curricular and programmatic leadership.

3. Academic Programs

Core academic programs are focused entirely on the eight-course sequence in Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences. Faculty meet regularly throughout each semester to review the courses and plan changes, both major and minor.

a. Core Humanities

In first-year Core Humanities, we have streamlined CC 101 by dropping Thucydides’ *History of the Peloponnesian War* and changing the lineup of Greek tragedies. In CC 102, we added (and then dropped) an Islamic text, Farid ud-Din Attar’s *Conference of the Birds*, and we are studying the addition of a new translation of Ashvaghosha’s *Life of the Buddha*. The non-Western component in CC 102 presents a great challenge and also a great opportunity. Peer programs, such as the Columbia Core Curriculum, deal with non-Western cultures by isolating them in separate courses. We think that it adds an important comparative dimension to our courses if we study Asian texts side-by-side with Western texts such as Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*. But tensions remain. The same is true with the

components of Core Humanities that deal with art history and music. We have dealt with the tensions by treating art and music as a combination of curricular and co-curricular opportunities. They are part of regular class discussions and are supplemented by tours to museums and excursions to performances and concerts.

b. Core Natural Science

Our two courses in Core Natural Science (“Evolution of the Universe and the Earth” and “Biodiversity and the Evolution of Life”) are governed by the principle that scientific literacy comes best from “general science” courses that span different disciplines, rather than from specialized courses in individual departments. This principle is articulated by Robert M. Hazen and James Trefil, *Science Matters: Achieving Scientific Literacy* (Doubleday, 1991). These courses are intended to be interdisciplinary and student-friendly, and to emphasize hands-on laboratory experience. Both courses were reviewed and substantially upgraded when Prof. James Jackson (Astronomy) and Prof. John Finnerty (Biology) took over as coordinators in CC 105 and 106 about six years ago.

It is clear to everyone who is involved in these courses that they bear a special burden. Students often come to Core Natural Science with a distaste for the subject, inherited from their science courses in high school. Student antipathy to science shows up in Course Evaluations, where the average course rating is in the middle of the 3’s. We have attempted to remove student fears and instill, if not a love of science, at least a respect for it, by revising the labs and providing more extensive one-on-one tutoring by both faculty and student peers. The results of these efforts show up in the most recent round of Course Evaluations. But this would be a good time to look at the best models of science pedagogy elsewhere in the country and, once again, revise our Natural Science sequence.

c. Core Social Science

The second half of Core Social Science has benefited from such a revision. This semester we are introducing a new CC 204 on the theme of “Inequality.” This course is the product of intensive discussion with representatives of all major Social Science departments. We think it is challenging, fresh, and thoroughly contemporary, especially in its use of quantitative methodologies. In this respect, we believe that it compares favorably with similar courses in peer programs.

d. Enrollments

Since 2001 (when the Core went through a major reorganization), the numbers of students who start the Core Curriculum have trended downward, from 485 in 2001 to 388 in 2009 in CC 101 and from 328 to 203 in CC 105. We were pleased that our enrollments increased by 10% in fall 2009, but they continued to drop in CC 105. There are several possible explanations for declining numbers. Some of the decrease may be attributable to the size of first-year classes and increases in the number of foreign students (who often shy away from courses that they perceive are reading-intensive). We also believe, based on discussions at Summer Advising and with our present students, that students’ decisions about General Education are increasingly influenced by a rise in the number of Advanced Placement credits and by pressures from their Majors (especially when they are planning to major in more than one department or field). In the case of CC 105, students who plan to major in the Natural Sciences or anticipate a career in health sciences are advised NOT to take CC 105. Judging from the lines at the pre-med table in summer 2009, this significantly limited CC 105 enrollments. We are eager to gather concrete statistics about these trends so that we can adapt the Core Curriculum to the changing demographics of the CAS student body.

Retention

The same trends also affect retention of students from first to second year. Our retention rate of 41% from CC 101 to 201 in 2008-2009 was a major improvement over the previous four years, and it returns us to the retention rates we saw in 2001-2003. We are pleased by this increase, but the rise in

AP credits, pressures from Majors, and increased interest in Natural Sciences put continuing pressure on even our most committed students. We know, from speaking to students, that we also are affected by overall attrition in the student body. When students leave the University for whatever the reason (such as illness, a sick parent, economic pressures, etc.), we do not have a mechanism to replace them.

When all these factors are taken into account, we are persuaded that our enrollment and retention figures are quite respectable. Nevertheless, we are constantly working to improve.

Numerical Literacy in the Core Curriculum

When students complete the full Core Curriculum, they get credit for all Divisional Studies requirements, including Math and Computer Science. To reflect this equivalency, we include significant computational components in CC 105, CC 106, and the revised CC 204. But the numerical component is not systematically integrated. One of our most significant challenges for the future is to integrate numerical literacy in all Core courses (including the Humanities) and develop a systematic concept of numerical literacy that can serve as a foundation for all of a student's liberal studies.

Student Outcomes

Student outcomes are difficult to measure in a humanistic program such as the Core Curriculum. We use Course Evaluations and retention rates, both of which have been discussed. Dean Sapiro has provided us with an analysis of high school GPA's and SAT's of students entering Fall 2002 to Fall 2006. This analysis shows that Core students mirror the general student population in GPA and SAT, but differ in graduation rates. Students who completed the whole Core Curriculum during this period were significantly more likely to graduate within four years. Whether this is due to the merits of the Core Curriculum or to other factors is unclear. We do not make a point of gathering statistics about racial, ethnic, or gender diversity.

4. Facilities

Our facilities are generally adequate to the needs of our program. We would like to have a small kitchen facility to accommodate our many social functions. This is a limited expenditure and may be fundable from our regular budget. One of our faculty members pointed out that we would benefit from more seminar rooms, where we could conduct discussions without having to drag rows of chairs into a circle. Perhaps that can be included in the dream list for future CAS renovations.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

In ten years, we would like to be described as one of the leading General Education programs in the country. We would like to be perceived by the University and the wider public as one of the reasons a bright and ambitious student would choose Boston University.

This aspiration involves the following components:

- Expand the involvement of tenured and tenure-track faculty in all Core programs.
- Expand opportunities for career enrichment for all our faculty.
- Revise and enrich Core courses, especially the Natural Sciences, so that they are perceived as fresh, sophisticated, intellectually challenging, and responsive to the needs of future undergraduates.
- Integrate numerical and quantitative literacy across the curriculum.
- Develop a clear statement about the goals of writing in the Core Curriculum and a plan about how to achieve those goals.
- Expand EnCore, the Core alumni association, so that it is a lively venue for continuing education and a major avenue of alumni outreach for the University as a whole.

- Develop a series of courses so that students can continue their studies in the style of the Core Curriculum after sophomore year. These courses would be based in departments but would be affiliated with the Core Curriculum. They would be focus on foundational issues, personalities or works; they would be interdisciplinary in style; and they would be taught in a seminar format, with a high priority on collective and interactive learning. If possible, we would like to allow students to group a series of these courses together into a “Minor in the Core Curriculum” that can be listed as a special accomplishment on students’ transcripts.

The Graduate Creative Writing Program
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

Noli restituere quod non est ruptum --- Tacitus

A. Mission Statement

We hope to help each of our students become the finest poets, playwrights and fiction writers they can, which is what all creative writing programs do. We also attempt to make them scholars of literature – that is, aware of those upon whose shoulders they stand; in that we are unique.

B. Present

1. Peer Groups

We believe there are no programs superior to ours, though most of the eight named below are better funded, and for that reason can attract students who cannot afford to come to us.

- *California-Irvine*: Extremely small and select.
- *Iowa*: Large in size and reputation, with excellent but often unhappy students.
- *Johns Hopkins*: Like us, a former M.A. program and our direct competitor. Very well funded. Faculty not particularly strong.
- *Columbia*: Perhaps the only program less well-funded than ours, but with an increasing budget; New York City and an interesting faculty allow them to compete with us.
- *NYU*: Excellent faculty and unusual hours of study have meant that we sometimes lose top applicants to them.
- *Texas*: Extremely well-heeled. Large duty-free grants to all students, plus tuition.
- *Virginia*: Strong faculty, reputation, and a good deal of money.
- *Michigan*: Strong financial aid and growing reputation.

Perhaps this is the time for me to add that according to “The Atlantic” of September, 2007, ours was listed among the top ten programs in the country. We were also listed among the top five both for distinguished alumni and faculty. However, we did not make the list at all for programs able to be generous with financial aid. That is a pity.

2. Faculty

In poetry and fiction our faculty has few or no peers, either as teachers, practitioners of their craft, or in reputation. Among them they have won just about every major prize in fiction and poetry that can be bestowed in this country. We have only three tenured faculty members plus one tenured member who is associated with our program. In the last three years these four professors have produced three novels, a book of poetry, three books of literary criticism, a biography (of King David, yet) and a memoir, along with two professional productions of a full-length play. In addition, we have two Visiting Associates, one in fiction, one in poetry. Since 2006 these two have published two books of poetry and three novels. This is an extraordinary record of accomplishment.

Our playwriting faculty has no tenured members, but those who teach the workshops have a growing reputation, both locally and nationally. Since 2006, the four people who have regularly taught playwriting (two semi-permanent, and two on three-year contracts) have had thirteen of their plays fully produced and have produced themselves a dozen others. Eight of their plays have been published.

a. Teaching Evaluations.

We teach exclusively in workshops, save for one course in migrant literature. All courses by tenured faculty in poetry and fiction are on the graduate level, except for one workshop in advanced fiction. All courses are evaluated. In making our own evaluations we rely largely on the subjective, qualitative, handwritten responses of our students. Roughly eighty percent of these are superb. With some, that sort of response is consistently at one-hundred percent over the last three years. The other twenty percent vary from excellent to the occasional remark about the need for grading each story (a matter of faculty choice) or bringing in more (or less) outside reading. One non-tenured faculty member does strike some students as *giving the impression* of being less than fully committed – an issue we are attempting to address. Without seeming to be cavalier in treating this important subject, we would maintain that there is very little room for improvement in the skills or effectiveness of our faculty, who are regularly characterized as, to quote two oft-repeated words, “beloved” and “legendary”.

b. Pedagogical activities and innovations.

Members are on the boards of professional organizations and serve there at the highest level. One tenured professor, in particular, travels the nation and the world on behalf of his discipline and its teaching. We give or host public readings with and without our students at the university and across the nation. We run the Poetry Institute for k-12 Teachers in the summer and the Favorite Poem Project. We host and contribute to the publication of an important literary review. Two tenured faculty have taught at the Boston Arts Academy, a public pilot high school in Boston. Four of our teaching fellows teach there each year. Other teaching fellows run sixteen basic (and as alumni advanced) creative writing workshops at the undergraduate level, with a half dozen more such courses in MET and the Summer School. Their evaluations, quantitative and qualitative, are excellent. In the last thirty years, only two of over 400 instructors have failed to the extent that they had to be replaced. A typical sentence from the handwritten evaluations: “I am a senior and this is the best course I have had at B.U.”

3. Undergraduate Education

First please see immediately above. Our goal is to create a pyramid: roughly two hundred undergraduates take the basic workshops each year. The cream of that crop take the advanced workshops in each of the three disciplines every semester. And the *crème de la crème* are on occasion invited into a graduate workshop and, rarely, asked to apply to the MFA program. This pyramid may be unique to this country; it is certainly unusual.

We have from time to time tried to work out a creative writing minor for the undergraduates. It has never quite happened. No matter: because undergraduates are allowed to take the advanced courses as often as their instructors admit them, the highly motivated ones end up with what amounts to a *de facto* minor anyway. We consider the undergraduate courses a vital part of our program – intrinsically of great worth to students enrolled in them, but no less valuable for those who teach them: not only for their possible careers in the profession but because helping others to write poems, plays, and stories is one of the best ways to learn how to do those things oneself.

a. The MFA

In this time period we switched from an M.A. to an MFA. The main reason is that we were losing students who demanded an MFA and because, increasingly, no M.A. was considered a terminal degree. We changed nothing about our workshops or our methods or our nature. Our mission (1) remains unchanged. We are still a scholarly program. We reviewed our curriculum (2) just before making the change and decided nothing needed to be altered – in part because our “vitality and

quality” have never been higher. Our application figures tend to rise in hard times. The “Atlantic” article helped. We anticipate about a twenty percent further rise once the Global Fellows program becomes more widely known. Our enrollment (3) figures have gone down slightly in fiction, solely because we determined that ten, rather than twelve, was the ideal number in the workshop. Poetry remains constant at 8-9. Playwriting takes about five. The quality of our students (4 & 5) is high when they enter and higher when they leave. The director now has two novels to read from recent students, one a bestseller and the other, according to the Huffington Post, the best novel of 2009 (both began in our workshops). Remember, the “Atlantic” ranked our program among the top five with “Notable Alumni.” Though students technically can remain for a second year, we are a cold bath not a hot tub program: we want them to graduate after two semesters, plus perhaps a summer session; almost all do. Many of our students get positions as teachers; at the moment two of our graduates actually run the fine programs at Washington University in St. Louis and Michigan. We are an international program (6) and regularly draw from four and even five continents. The current fiction class, for example, has a half-German/half-Indian, another Indian, a half-South Korean/half-Canadian, a Sri Lankan, and an Iranian-American. Plus one Jew. They all get along fine. By the way, that bestseller was written by an Afro-American.

b. Interdisciplinary activities

We like to think of the translation seminars as an integral part of our program, and of course our students spread not only through the English Department but through the university in search of literature courses. But we either discourage or forbid any courses not fundamentally literary in nature. If and when the L.E. Fellows begin arriving, we expect increased collaboration with Romance Languages and Modern Foreign Languages.

c. Global initiatives

We bring students, professors, and writers from abroad and now will be sending many of our students to foreign lands when their work is completed.

4. Facilities

Our facilities have been regularly upgraded. 236 Bay State Road should be made accessible to the handicapped.

5. Other academic units:

This seems the place to discuss relations with the English Department, an often fraught association in the field. Prior to 1978 there was no formal undergraduate component to CW. Because our budget was part of the English Department’s, we were, in spite of much good will, caught in a zero sum game. A TF for us meant a TF taken from the department. While we did not stagnate, it remains true that we only began to realize our potential when we achieved an independent budget. One strong current of feeling among us is that the more such autonomy we have the more we shall flourish. Many of our strongest competitors (Hopkins, Columbia, Iowa) have no ties with English or other departments. The fact that we are now an MFA might argue for loosening our allegiance. In addition, our faculty lacks the expertise to evaluate many English department appointments, a situation that derives in part from the longstanding national trend of literature departments to move toward cultural studies and other areas of research that entail a diminished commonality with programs in creative writing. On the other hand our program is uniquely scholarly (demanding as many courses in literature as workshops and a demonstrated ability in a foreign language), and our association with the English Department is seven decades old. Our students benefit by being in the same building with the department and breathing the same literary air. It may be that the relationship between us is about right. We have a fair amount of independence. We take part in their deliberations when we feel we have the expertise or our interests are at

stake. There is good will. There are friendships. The ties ought not to be any closer, that much is certain. Neither, with the possible exception of hiring decisions, is there any need for us to draw much further apart.

6. *Outside units:*

See Boston Arts Academy above. We have also sponsored, or contemplated sponsoring, readings, colloquia, P.E.N. New England, Boston Book Fair, and Agni.

C. Future

1. *Ten Year Plan*

The program in ten years ought to be thought of just as it is now: intensive, forbidding, challenging, and the finest in the nation.

2. *Faculty*

No one plans on retiring or going elsewhere, but over the next 5-10 years surely some will. First, what we have called here the Visiting Associates: we now have four people on three year contracts. This is an excellent arrangement, allowing us to get fine teacher/writers while at the same time providing us needed flexibility. All will be well if funding for these positions continues at present levels, adjusted for inflation. But will it? (See 1-c below). Tenured faculty: the director must be replaced at some point. One tenured member feels strongly the new director should be a “quite senior” figure, both to keep up the reputation of the program and to have the clout to deal with the English Department. He thinks of our graduate, Carl Phillips, currently director at Washington U at St. Louis. But another opinion is that younger people, perhaps from the pool of our own graduates, would be best. We are watching such people as Maggie Dietz in poetry and Daphne Kalotay in fiction – grand craftswomen who have taught brilliantly for us. We continue to keep lists of junior or senior writers and plan to invite them to teach for us. When the time comes, we shall be ready.

3. *Undergraduate education.*

The program described above is working well and should not be changed.

4. *The MFA*

To continue our mission we shall need the following: (A), Enough financial aid not to lose students to those programs we compete with. (B), The Robert Pinsky Global Fellowship program should be extended to at least twenty years or, ideally, made permanent. (C), Again, the current level of funding for the Visiting Associates must be sustained. (D), Somewhat more autonomy from the English Department. (E), Rethinking our relationship to Playwriting. About that, a bit of history: Playwriting came to our program as a lagniappe for Derek Walcott, even though, as far as we can determine, such relationships are extremely rare. Almost at once it became apparent that the new discipline must have its own budget and its own administrative structure. But playwriting, though enormously successful at what it does, has never been considered a full partner of the Creative Writing Program. It is budgetarily and administratively semi-independent. It constitutes not a third but a sixth of our students. For all its wonderful work, its professors do not have the reputation of the fiction and poetry faculty; none are tenured. Most important, it is a program in flux. Its artistic director wishes to move it, “in partnership with the College of Fine Arts,” toward goals inconsistent with those of our mission statement. She wishes her students to earn full credit for courses in costume, lighting, and design. These may be fine subjects for playwrights, but poor ones for those pursuing a mission statement that stresses literary scholarship and an intensive one-year experience (the “cold bath”). The unanimous feeling of the tenured

faculty is that this between-two-stools approach will not succeed and that for the sake of both programs we must consider severing our ties.

5. *Facilities*

No changes needed, contemplated, or desired, save for handicapped access to 236 Bay State Road.

6. *Financing*

a. Through the CAS tuition budget, which is now augmented by Deutsch, Starbuck, Trimble, Leonard, and Holodnak (L.E.) fellowships

b. Grants, gifts, awards. We must vigorously pursue both the continuation of current donations (making sure the Leonard and Trimble grants, for example, are renewed or even made permanent), while seeking new donors and the successful matching of pledged funds (the L.E. International Fellowship). We hope to involve alumni in fund raising, in part through a reinvigoration of “236,” our virtual magazine.

c. Re-allocation. A high administration official made an intriguing suggestion regarding the L.E. International Fellowship. The strong and unanimous opinion of the CW faculty is that the fellowship as currently constituted is likely to prove untenable. Could these large sums be used instead either to create a series of endowed Visiting Professorships, making the current arrangement self-sustaining; or could they be diverted to the Global Fellowships, so that they could become a permanent part of our program? Or both? We urge that this idea be given every consideration.

7. *Measuring progress*

There are no official rankings of CW programs, but we should look toward outside evaluations like the one printed in the “Atlantic.” We should continue to monitor both subjective and objective teaching evaluations on undergraduate and graduate levels. And we should register the books that are published, plays that are produced, and awards that are won by our faculty and alumni. We should also attempt to track, perhaps through “236,” where our alumni are placed in academic life and in other professions.

8. *Measuring tools*

Sharp eyes, a trained administrative staff, and, again, a more organized “236” magazine.

9. *Five Year Plan:*

Everything above about the ten year plan applies equally and without distinction to the five year plan. All named goals should be accomplished in five years.

CONCLUSION: No institution on this earth is exempt from scrutiny by others and by itself. None cannot be improved. But we are a strong, stable, and successful program, preeminent among our peers. We shall have to work hard to keep it that way. We must be careful in the choices we make, especially in the new faculty and personnel. We are grateful for the support we have had from our wonderful university. Working together we can continue to achieve great things.

East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program is to provide a broad interdisciplinary and comparative perspective on Asia in general and East Asia in particular to the undergraduates of Boston University. The program holds that regional knowledge, when appropriately combined with broader knowledge of the world and disciplinary approaches, is an essential component in thinking about the world, both past and present. The East Asian Interdisciplinary Program supports disciplines and programs across the university.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of an academic peer group

According to one website (asianamerican.net), 34 American universities have East Asian Studies programs, centers, or departments (some have more than one). Comparison of these (and other programs) is difficult because they all vary in terms of structure, funding, faculty lines, and so forth. Data on faculty and offerings in these programs is dispersed and beyond the administrative capabilities of the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program, which has no staff. Nevertheless, based on reputation, the following programs, most of which are Title VI programs, appear to constitute our peer group:

Cornell University (Title VI)
George Washington University
Michigan State University (Title VI)
New York University
University of Colorado, Boulder (Title VI)
University of Denver
University of Pittsburg (Title VI)
University of Washington (Title VI)

2. **Faculty**

Research Productivity

The East Asia Interdisciplinary Studies Program has no faculty of its own, but there are nearly 40 faculty members in nine departments of CAS and eight schools throughout the university whose primary research interests and teaching responsibilities revolve around Asia. As a program without staff, we do not keep data on faculty research, but it appears that those involved in the East Asia Interdisciplinary Studies Program are a highly productive group which maintains active research agendas. Asia faculty have received a variety of prestigious awards and other recognition within their disciplines, and have received grants from the Carnegie Corporation, Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, Andrew Mellon Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Smith-Richardson Foundation, Japan Foundation, Woodrow Wilson Center, and the U.S. Department of Education (Fulbright programs), among others.

Educational/Pedagogical Contributions

The popularity of Asia-related courses and several teaching awards that have recognized Asia faculty (e.g. Metcalf Award for David Eckel) support anecdotal evidence of pedagogical quality.

Major professional and public service contributions

We do not have full data on professional and public service contributions of Asia faculty. Highlights of recent years include: Husain Haqqani's appointments as Pakistani Ambassador to the US, Robert Hefner's election as President of the Association of Asian Studies (AAS), Adil Najam's appointment to the UN Committee for Development Policy, Robert Weller's and Joe Fewsmith's past presidencies of the Council on Inner Asia of the AAS, Frank Korom's service on the board of the American Institute of Indian Studies, Thomas Barfield's leadership of the American Institute of Afghanistan Studies, Merry White's work with Cambodian coffee farmers as a Japan board member of the Boston Children's Museum, Mariko Henstock's leadership of the Japanese language program of the Japan Society of Boston, John Berthrong's interfaith dialogue activities, Andre de Quadros work with the BU Global Health Initiative and the Darpana Academy of India, and Robert Weller's contribution to the Boston Children's Museum exhibition on the "Children of Hangzhou." The International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History under the leadership of Robert Murowachick has also been very active in community outreach.

3. Academic Programs

a. Assessment of undergraduate education

The East Asia Interdisciplinary Studies Program does not have its own faculty. We currently have 39 tenure-track or tenured faculty members who offer courses approved for credit in the EAS program. In addition, there are 8 teachers of Chinese (only two of which are full time), 8 teachers of Japanese (again, only two of who are full time), and two teachers of Korean only one of who is full time). Although some of these faculty are on leave or teaching non-Asia-related courses, our faculty will teach some 1100 students in disciplinary classes in the spring of 2010, as well as 284 in Japanese language classes, 267 in Chinese language classes, and 80 in Korean language classes, for a total of over 1,700 students. The number of majors and minors has been relatively constant in recent years, with about 25 of the former and about 15 of the latter. These figures underscore the fact that the East Asia Interdisciplinary Program's primary purpose has been to support other programs, but that it plays a major role in doing so.

The East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program has always taken the word "interdisciplinary" seriously. Although our strength has traditionally been in East Asia, we have always looked to Southeast Asia and South Asia as part of Asia. We have also required an equal number of humanity and social science courses for our majors, believing that those who try to understand Asia should have a solid grounding in both areas. In addition, we have always required a complementary major or minor so that those pursuing an East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies major will have a solid grounding in an academic discipline. This is not only good for their undergraduate education but also useful if they seek to go on to graduate school. The rigor of the program (two years of an Asian language, 10 courses in Asian Studies (including three at or above the 400 level, and the complementary major or minor) makes the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program one of the most demanding in the College of Arts and Sciences and, no doubt, accounts for our modest number of majors and minors.

The popularity of the courses in the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program and the high evaluations our faculty regularly receive testify to the quality of the program. As a non-department, we do not have access to student evaluations, so demonstrating this point scientifically is impossible. But there are strong anecdotal evidence and attendance records over many years to attest to the quality of the faculty.

b. Assessment of doctoral programs/masters programs

The East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program is an undergraduate program and so does not have either a masters or doctoral program (at least not yet). Faculty members affiliated with East Asian Studies work with both MA and PhD students throughout the university. As the BUSCA Strategic Plan notes, there have been some 80 PhD dissertations written on Asia-related topics at BU since 2000.

Interdisciplinary Initiatives

The East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program has been very active in setting up and advancing BU's global agenda. Four East Asian faculty members (Fewsmith, Najam, Vachani, and Yeh) sit on the President's Council for a Global University and have been instrumental in drafting the university's academic strategy for India and China. These initiatives laid the groundwork for the establishment of BU's Study Abroad Program in Shanghai and our exchange programs with Chinese People's University in Beijing and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, also in Beijing. These programs have been bringing Chinese scholars to BU and sending BU students and faculty to China (one of the Ph.D. students in Political Science is currently in Beijing under our program with People's University). Similar initiatives are likely to unfold vis-à-vis India in coming years.

There are also Study Abroad Programs in Sydney, Singapore, and Kyoto that support the development of Asian Studies at Boston University.

Outreach Activities

The East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program does not have any outreach activities of its own (these will be conducted through BUSCA), but individual faculty members have been quite active in this regard. For instance, Merry White does a lot with the Boston Children's Museum, Rob Weller's also worked with the Boston Children's Museum exhibition on the "Children of Hangzhou," and Joe Fewsmith has worked with Primary Source and talked to student groups.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten Year Plan

Boston University has significant capabilities in regional studies in Asia (and elsewhere) and we should build on those capabilities. Although there have been some disciplinary trends away from "area studies" in recent years, those trends are now being reversed, and BU stands in a very good position to tout its advantages in regional knowledge and globalization. Indeed, our strengths in regional studies fit in very well with the university's strategic plan, which stresses the importance of BU as a global university. As mentioned above, faculty affiliated with the East Asian Interdisciplinary Program have played a very active role in helping the university define its global strategy. Working closely with BUSCA and other parts of the university, we intend to continue to do so.

If over the next five years (see below) we create a graduate program in Asian Studies, then our ten-year goal would be to build this program, attracting more and better students, and filling out our faculty ranks. If we do move in this direction, then we should consider working toward departmental status, creating an "Asian Studies Department" or "Committee on Asian Studies" with interdisciplinary faculty lines that would better integrate our curriculum as well as a physical space for classes and offices. There would have to be administrative staff to support its operations.

In conjunction with this goal, we will continue to develop undergraduate education, offering more courses in the areas noted above. We will encourage more students to take advantage of Study Abroad opportunities and support efforts to create new Study Abroad and exchange opportunities. We would like to develop more courses in the Writing Program and offer freshmen seminars, if BU moves in that direction. Asian Studies has always been interdisciplinary, but we will work to strengthen that aspect by offering more courses that tie trends in different countries together.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

Most of the indicators of progress are not under the control of the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program. We will look to expanded course offerings, greater student participation in Study Abroad Programs, modest increases in the numbers of majors and minors (keeping in mind that our primary role is to support other programs and department), and greater involvement of students in activities organized by East Asian Studies and BUSCA as measures of our progress.

3. Five-year goals

As a program with no faculty lines, the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program needs to continue draw attention to the rapidly expanding importance of Asia, whether in economic, political, or cultural terms. Increasingly our students are looking to Asia for career opportunities after they graduate. One of the reasons the Study Abroad Program in Shanghai was designed with a track for students who had not previously studied Chinese is that many students who have fulfilled their language requirement another way discover an interest in Asia late in their college career. The Shanghai program gives them one option for satisfying that curiosity and perhaps launching a career.

Over the next five years, and certainly over the next ten years, the East Asian Interdisciplinary Studies Program will increasingly be defined as an “Asian Studies Program,” and we have already discussed this among ourselves. If, as we anticipate, university offerings in South Asia continue to expand, we will be able to divide the renewed “Asia Interdisciplinary Studies Program” into two tracks: “East Asia” and “South Asia” with a number of courses cutting across these two sub-regions. This plan depends both on faculty hires and on the offering of South Asian languages, particularly Hindu and Urdu. If our application to Title VI is successful, this will be much more feasible.

Over the next five years, we hope to build Asian studies in at least two areas – South Asia and the environment. Our interest in South Asia jibes with what we are trying to do in BUSCA, namely build a truly “Asian” program, as well as with the goals of the departments of International Relations and History. As China’s role in the recent Copenhagen summit suggests, we need to focus more academic interest on China’s energy needs and the consequences of those needs for Asia and the world. This interest fits very well into the very strong program BU has in environmental studies.

A critical question for our development over the next five years is building the capacity to offer graduate education in Asian Studies. Our faculty has had discussions on this topic over time, and it has generally been felt that we do not have the personnel at this time to offer a competitive MA degree in Asian Studies. But we are getting close. We would need greater support in areas like History (a second historian of China), Asian languages (moving away from part-time teachers, offering advanced language training, and offering languages such as Hindi and Urdu), the environment, and security studies (the field of cyberwarfare will simply explode over the next few years). If we have the faculty to build a competitive MA program, we should certainly do it. One can imagine, for instance, an Executive MA program, offered primarily at night, which would appeal to the Boston business community, as well as the normal academic approach. Doing so would enhance our ability to attract Foreign Area Officers to study at BU. Developing a graduate program in Asian Studies would raise BU’s profile in this area considerably, and it would complement our status as a National Resource Center if we should win a title VI.

As BU’s offerings in Asian Studies become fuller, we will be looking increasingly to the disciplines to fill their needs, but with faculty who have an interest in Asia. For instance, the Department of Sociology may look for someone in gender studies; gender studies are important in Asia, and we may be able to find faculty that will address issues of both Sociology and Asia (Merry White already does this from an Anthropological perspective). The same applies to other departments, such as Economics and Environmental Studies.

Linguistic Sciences
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. MISSION STATEMENT. The central questions in linguistics are: What are human languages like, and why? How does language develop in the individual? How does it evolve in the community? Our primary objective at BU is to provide students at all levels with firm grounding in the traditional core areas of linguistics, while also developing dynamic research and teaching clusters in targeted areas, including theoretical syntax-semantics, laboratory phonology-morphology, and language acquisition. More broadly, we aim to be a resource for those in the BU community whose work relies on or can be enhanced by understanding the structures and histories of the world's languages.

B. THE PRESENT: DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT.

1. *Academic peer group.* Given the heterogeneity of our current configuration in Linguistics, we have selected a peer group representing a realistic 5-year target, rather than current positioning. It includes, in approximate order of relative strength: NYU, UC Santa Cruz, Rutgers, McGill, Northwestern, and Harvard. See Section C for justification and cluster ranking.

2. *Faculty.* BU's core Linguistics faculty comprises the 7 members of the Linguistic Sciences Planning Committee. Of these, 4 (Alrenga, Barnes, Hagstrom, Neidle) hold appointments in CAS Romance Studies, while 3 (Allen, Fraser, O'Connor) are appointed in SED.¹

a. *Faculty research quality.* This is an extremely active and productive group, as evidenced, in part, by its tremendous success in securing external funding for research activity. Between 2006 and 2009, the 6 core linguists then at BU had a combined total of 11 active grants from the National Science Foundation (9 as PIs, 2 as Co-PIs), totaling \$4,187,326 in awards to BU, or \$697,888 *per capita*.² Two-thirds of our faculty had active NSF grants during this period. These numbers are extremely high for linguistics, as Table 1 and Figure 1 in the Appendix attest: Among the peer institutions listed above, our nearest competitor was NYU, whose 17 linguists had just 7 awards active during this period, totaling \$1,103,691, or \$64,923 *per capita*. Other peers' numbers were much lower. In fact, not only did the skeletal BU Linguistics faculty outpace each peer institution individually, but our total funding actually exceeded that of all five US peers combined: \$4,187,326 vs. \$3,148,262).³

The Linguistics faculty's productivity is also reflected by its scholarly output. Over the relevant period, the 7 core linguists published 3 books, 15 journal articles, 27 book chapters, and 14 papers in proceedings. They also gave 32 refereed conference papers and 50 invited presentations, and registered 1 trademark for software for linguistic research. BU linguists also have an impressive record of collaboration, both within and across traditional disciplinary boundaries. We are proud of this aspect of our institutional culture and will work hard in the coming years to maintain and enhance it.

b. *Subfields.* A program of our (current or realistic future) size cannot do everything. We believe strongly, though, that for a small Linguistics program (i.e., < 15 faculty members) to achieve distinction, that program needs two things: 1) solid coverage of the traditional core areas of linguistic analysis, preferably with overlapping interests of faculty members in "adjacent" areas, and 2) a small number of coherent, dynamic, research and teaching clusters in carefully targeted areas. Programs that achieve these two goals usually end up "punching above their weight" in

1 This group will be augmented, we hope, by the morphologist for whom we are now searching. We have just learned, however, that it will also soon be diminished by the loss of Shanley Allen, who leaves BU this spring.

2 NSF is the primary source of external funding opportunities for linguists in the United States.

3 And lest it be suspected that this pattern is a quirk of the sample set, at MIT, arguably the strongest program in the US during this period, there were 4 grants to linguists, for a total of \$3,072 *per capita*.

terms of prestige and reputation; other programs mostly don't.

The traditional core areas of linguistic analysis are phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. We currently have at least one faculty member with primary specialization in all but two of these, phonetics and morphology, and we are on track to make an appointment in morphology imminently. The target areas in which we have begun to develop "clusters" are:

- ***Theoretical syntax & semantics.*** Recently augmented by the addition of a semanticist, Peter Alrenga. Benefits tremendously from connections with the Philosophy Dept.
- ***Experimental phonology & morphology.*** Currently one faculty member, plus the soon-to-be-hired morphologist. Benefits from the recent grant-funded addition of a laboratory. Will benefit from the eventual planned addition of a phonetician. Brings serious potential for synergies with programs in SAR and CAS Psychology and Cognitive & Neural Systems.
- ***Language acquisition.*** The primary historical strength in linguistics at BU. Benefits from the high-profile BU Conference on Language Development, as well as from synergies with programs in SAR and CAS Psychology. Has suffered considerably as a result of retirements. Currently facing imminent loss of sole remaining primary specialist in language acquisition (S. Allen). If Allen is not appropriately replaced, this area of strength will disappear.

Additional areas of current or developing strength in linguistics at BU include:

- ***Sign language linguistics*** (BU is one of relatively few universities in the US with this specialization), including ties to BU Deaf Studies and collaborations with BU Computer Science and with other institutions, such as Gallaudet and Rutgers Universities.
- ***Prosody***, including collaboration with psycholinguists and computer scientists at the MIT Research Laboratory of Electronics and Simmons College.
- ***Romance linguistics.*** So far primarily French, although RS has also repeatedly requested a Hispanic Linguist, the addition of which greatly benefits both Spanish and Linguistics.
- ***Pragmatics & information status.*** (Also negatively affected by Allen's departure.) Projects include research on information status in language acquisition, and linguistically informed annotation schemes for large-scale corpus work. Provides synergy in teaching and research with work in ***Prosody***.

c. *Educational/pedagogical contributions.* Our record as teachers is also strong, as reflected in the steadily growing numbers of Linguistics majors/minors and class enrollments, particularly in our introductory course, CAS LX 250 Foundations of Language (see Section 3). Much of this can be attributed to word of mouth among students. In addition, two linguists (Barnes, Neidle) received prestigious teaching awards recently, and one (Neidle) received an award for student advising. Many of our faculty members have also contributed to our students' education beyond the usual domains of teaching and advising. For example, Profs. Barnes, Hagstrom, and Neidle have served as faculty advisors for the undergraduate Linguistics Association (BULA), an active student organization serving as a focal point for the community of undergraduate linguists. Profs. Hagstrom and Neidle have designed and maintained an extensive program website for the purpose in part of building community among both current students and alumni. Prof. O'Connor recently sponsored a UROP grant for a student conducting research begun in Linguistic Field Methods; she later submitted an NSF proposal to enable 3 students to conduct further fieldwork in Cameroon. Over the reporting period, we have also: published 20 scholarly articles and given 19 conference presentations with students; sponsored 3 other students with UROP grants; funded 8 undergraduates through REU supplements to NSF grants; advised 3 Senior Work for Distinction projects and 5 BU Academy Senior Theses.

d. *Major professional and public service contributions.* BU linguists have also been extremely active in the profession and within the university. Many have been involved in organization of important conferences and workshops (Allen, Barnes, Hagstrom, O'Connor) and have served on editorial boards, review panels (including NSF), committees of professional societies, and

advisory boards. Neidle has also been engaged in a variety of activities related to promoting diversity at BU.

3. *Academic Programs.*

a. *Undergraduate Education.* Linguistics courses provide valuable resources to BU undergraduates, not just to our own majors, but to anyone interested in the growth and substance of the western canon. The history of linguistic scholarship is rich with landmarks central to the development of western thought as a whole. Philosophy, anthropology, sociology, psychology, computer science, and literary theory are just a few of the disciplines that have drawn heavily on work in linguistics.

The CAS faculty members constituting the core faculty for the undergraduate Linguistics program are Alrenga, Barnes, Hagstrom, and Neidle (and very soon, a morphologist, we hope). O'Connor (with primary appointment in SED) also teaches electives for this program. We are committed to offering our students a first-rate undergraduate education in Linguistics. This has been a challenge, given severe limitations in staffing (for peer comparisons, see Tables 6-8) and corresponding limitations on the range of courses we can offer. As Figure 2 shows, the ratio of majors to professorial rank faculty with primary appointments in our discipline is among the highest in CAS. (The few programs with higher ratios are much larger and benefit from economies of scale in ways we do not.) This ratio is also substantially lower among our peers (Table 2).

Increase in enrollments and numbers of majors. Over the last decade or so, there has been an explosion of interest in Linguistics across the US. The numbers of Linguistics majors have increased dramatically at every institution we surveyed, but they have been growing even faster at BU; see Tables 3 and 4, and Figure 3. The number of declared majors increased from 20 in 1999 to 86 as of February 2010, representing an increase of 330%. (Compare with UCLA's increase of 116% over the same period.) Since 2001-2002, majors have increased by 124% at Northwestern, 131% at Santa Cruz, and 169% at BU. We currently have more Linguistics majors (86) than Rutgers (80), despite their larger student body (over twice as large as BU's) and their greater number of linguists. We also have substantially more majors than Northwestern (38) and Harvard (22), which, despite their smaller overall undergraduate populations, still have larger Linguistics faculties than BU. Figure 4 shows a similar sharp increase in Linguistics minors, while Figure 3 and Table 5 document significant rises in overall Linguistics enrollments, especially our introductory course, CAS LX 250.

Increasing numbers of prospective BU students have also been contacting us regarding our Linguistics program, many expressing interest in combining Linguistics with another discipline. (Interdisciplinary joint majors with linguistics have been of great interest to undergraduates at peer institutions—see Table 3). There is every reason to believe our numbers will continue to grow with the proposed expansion of our faculty and curriculum and the addition of the new joint degree programs we will be proposing (Section C).

Characteristics of our students. Our Linguistics undergraduates are generally a talented, enthusiastic group. Many participate in BULA or join us on Facebook. A recent survey showed very strong interest in a Linguistics House, which we hope to launch in the near future.

Graduates. During 2000-2003 a total of 25 undergraduate degrees were awarded in Linguistics, whereas in 2006-2009, there were 83. Many of these students have been outstanding: For 5 of the last 7 years, the College Prize for Excellence in MFL/Romance Studies went to a Linguistics major. Other distinctions are listed here: <http://ling.bu.edu/alumni/hall/of/fame>.

Outcomes. See <http://ling.bu.edu/alumni/notes>. Our alumni have gone on to graduate work at top programs in Linguistics (UCSC, Rutgers, NYU, Harvard, Northwestern, U. of Chicago, USC) and in other fields (e.g., Education, Law, Business, Language Processing, Communication Disorders, Media Arts, Public Policy, Marketing, and Religion). Former Linguistics undergraduates are now on the faculties of McGill, Rowan U., SCAD, Swarthmore, and Smith.

Other alumni have careers in the computer industry, publishing, translation, editing, or administration.

b. *Graduate Education.* The Applied Linguistics Program is interdepartmental, offering degrees within GRS, with current enrollment of 14 MA and 23 PhD students. Admissions are selective (acceptance rate of <25%) and yield is around 50%. The program houses no faculty positions and offers no courses of its own. Core faculty are those identified above. Affiliated faculty are in CAS, SED, and MED. Our primary mission has been to prepare graduate students in the core areas of linguistics, and to support their development as scholars, researchers, and professionals in linguistics and related areas, e.g., natural language engineering or language teaching. The MA program prepares students for doctoral study in linguistics and related areas, and for language-related professions.

Outcomes. Our time to degree averages 6.7 years for the PhD, 3.5 years for the MA. Our attrition rate for PhD students is .44. Our annual reports detail our graduate students' grants, publications, and presentations. One measure of success is the placement of our graduate students. Recent PhDs now work as assistant/associate professors in Linguistics and/or language studies at U. Colorado Boulder, Syracuse U., and Kalamazoo College, and as lecturers in the US (Northeastern, Tufts, BU (in Arabic)) and the UK (U. Southampton, U. Edinburgh). Though we take pride in our students' accomplishments, we note that many have had to take advantage of courses at other local institutions to fill curricular gaps here. This has lengthened their time to degree in some cases, and in other cases, limited their ability to move into scarce academic positions after graduation. The coverage problems described in the previous section have been more dire still for the graduate program. Moreover, shifts in faculty have rendered "Applied Linguistics" no longer a useful descriptor for our target market.

The new configurations described in Section C will address these weaknesses. At the same time, historical strengths of the existing program will carry forward. In particular, one of the most distinctive features of the AL Program is the BU Conference on Language Development, now in its 35th year. BUCLD is widely regarded as the most important annual meeting for researchers in the field of language acquisition; it is the only annual conference in linguistics to receive ongoing funding from the NSF Linguistics Program. Each year, the conference brings together over 500 researchers from around the world to attend externally refereed scholarly papers and poster presentations. The acceptance rate (around 30%) is the lowest in the field of language acquisition. Our students benefit in many ways from participation in this event. Our prominence in language acquisition is a vital resource for linguistics at Boston University, but as of now we are barely covering the bases by combining introductory courses in SED and SAR, with an occasional "topics" course in CAS. There are few advanced classes, and Shanley Allen's appointment as Department Chair in SED has further cut into our offerings. Her imminent departure makes matters far worse.

Contributions to undergraduate programs and other graduate programs. Our graduate students serve as language instructors in CAS and SED (for ASL), and as TFs for the introductory Linguistics course. The courses that make up the Applied Linguistics curriculum, offered through CAS (Linguistics, Anthropology, Philosophy, Psychology), SED, SAR (Speech, Language & Hearing Sciences), and other colleges, also serve a wide range of other programs throughout the university.

4. *Collaboration, interdisciplinarity, and international initiatives.* Linguistics sits at the crossroads of many very different disciplines, in the humanities, the social sciences, and even the "hard" sciences (e.g., acoustic physics). As such, the work of linguists both relies on, and potentially enhances, that of scholars in these related fields. Traditional partners in interdisciplinary collaboration for linguists include language and area studies programs, philosophy, anthropology, and psychology. To these, more recently we might add computer science, evolutionary biology, and cognitive neuroscience.

As reviewed above in connection with our areas of specialization, BU linguists are prolific collaborators, working with scholars in a range of fields including cognitive science, computer science, Deaf studies, philosophy, psychology, speech and hearing sciences, and various language/area studies specializations (e.g., Bantu, Romance, Slavic, Turkic). These collaborations have involved colleagues both at BU and at a long list of other institutions in the US and abroad. With respect to the Linguistics curriculum at BU, various interdisciplinary initiatives are already underway, and several others are currently in the planning stages. Our proposal for a joint BA in Linguistics and Philosophy was recently approved. Plans to propose additional joint degree programs, in particular with a number of language and culture programs, are discussed in Section C.

We are also currently working with International Programs and faculty at Paris 8 and the École Normale Supérieure to develop a Linguistics specialization as part of the new study abroad program in Paris. As also noted in Section C, this, too, is a collaborative model we hope to expand to other institutions and countries in the near-term future.

C. STRATEGIC PLAN FOR THE FUTURE.

1. Ten-Year Plan.

a. *Overview.* Our primary objective is the creation of new MA and PhD programs in Linguistics, replacing the current Applied Linguistics program, along with further integration of graduate and undergraduate education in linguistics. In 10 years, our unit will, we hope, be small, but of great distinction, offering solid training at all levels in the core areas of linguistics, with excellence, depth and dynamicity in a small number of targeted areas. We will also be known for the breadth and quality of our interdisciplinary initiatives, both within and outside BU.

Achieving our goals will obviously involve a commitment of significant new resources on the part of the university. Doing this, however, would give BU a realistic chance, over the next 5-10 years, of becoming one of the top 3 Linguistics programs in New England (behind MIT and UMass Amherst, but ahead of Harvard, Yale, Brown, Dartmouth, etc.) and of moving into the top 20 programs nationally. This is a rare opportunity in program development: As far as we know, few other programs at BU currently have the potential to move so far ahead on so (comparatively) little.

We now explain the basis for selection and ranking of the peer group identified above. The institutions we expect to remain "better than" BU at the end of this planning period—NYU, UC Santa Cruz, and Rutgers—are all somewhat larger than we will probably be, but have nonetheless achieved their current prominence by doing exactly what we propose here: achieving solid core coverage, augmented by specific target areas in which they are known to excel. The program we believe we could draw approximately even with over this time is McGill. McGill is small for a top program (11 faculty members), but of high quality. It too maintains this reputation by offering strong coverage of the core areas, together with unusual depth and vigor in targeted areas (chief among these, in fact, language acquisition). Programs of roughly the same size (7-9 faculty members) that we believe we can surpass over the next ten years include Harvard and Northwestern. Both are considered strong programs, and both boast a small number of extremely prominent researchers. As Tables 6-8 show, however, both have been less successful at achieving core coverage than have other peers. They both also lack a certain mission coherence, necessary to advance from being a group of arbitrarily selected famous individuals into a functioning unit with common goals, aspirations, and an identity that its students take with them into the world when they graduate. We plan to do better.

b. *Faculty and program development goals.* As noted, our primary goal is to open our planned MA and PhD programs in Linguistics. We will do this in stages, as resources permit, beginning with a stand-alone MA (and BA/MA as well), and then as circumstances allow, moving to add a

PhD program.⁴ In order to reach the point of opening new graduate programs, we must both fill gaps in coverage of critical core areas and strengthen the central target areas identified above. The most serious remaining core gaps are in the areas of morphology (soon to be remedied by a new hire this year) and phonetics. The target areas most in need of strengthening are language acquisition and experimental phonology/morphology. See below for details.

In addition to launching the new graduate programs, we intend to expand our existing interdisciplinary initiatives to include new joint degree programs, for which evidence suggests there will be particularly high demand. Most of these are implementable within the next five years, and include:

- A joint MA (and BA/MA) degree in *Linguistics & Philosophy*, to be added to the joint BA.
- Joint BA degrees with various language and culture or area studies programs. Discussions are currently underway for proposals of joint majors in *French/Spanish/Italian & Linguistics*.

In addition, we plan to extend the range of our linguistics "study abroad" offerings, taking the Paris 8 program currently under development as a template for expansion to include analogous connections in other countries (e.g., Spain or Italy).

c. *Resources*. Beyond morphology, we have two top hiring priorities:

- **Language acquisition** with secondary specialization in a core area of linguistic analysis. Originally a lower priority, Allen's departure moves this to the top of the list. There are other scholars focusing on language development at BU, but none from a linguistic perspective. Without this position, BU Linguistics will have no specialization in language acquisition. Additionally, our ability to maintain the Conference on Language Development—a crucial part of our accumulated equity in the field—is seriously jeopardized.
- **Phonetics**. This, too, serves the goals of both enhancing core coverage and developing one of our chosen target areas (experimental phonology-morphology).

In addition to filling these critical gaps—and clearly far into the hypothetical future—we would ultimately like to add a specialist in neurolinguistics or computational linguistics, with a secondary specialization in some core area of linguistic theory. This would add both breadth to our offerings in a growth area of the field and depth in the core areas, ideally also enhancing an existing target area. With either appointment, the synergies with other programs at BU are obvious. Either addition would put us in an excellent position to offer a serious PhD program in Linguistics.

In the shorter term, however, there are other potential developments that might hasten us equally along that path. The first of these is the line in Hispanic Linguistics requested by Romance Studies. A Hispanic linguist with a secondary specialization in some area of linguistic theory would both strengthen our core coverage, and bring critical mass to a specialization in Romance Linguistics within the program. Lastly, were Bruce Fraser to retire within the next 5-10 years, the loss we would incur in the area of pragmatics might be mitigated through the hire of a specialist in pragmatics with primary responsibility to CAS/GRS Linguistics. This would both sustain our coverage of this core area, and enhance our clusters in both syntax/semantics, and pragmatics/information status.

With any such new positions, however, there also arise issues regarding facilities, primarily office space. We believe it is important, to the extent possible, to locate new faculty members in space contiguous to that of the other CAS Linguistics faculty members (in 621 Comm. Ave.).

⁴ There is evidence of a substantial clientele for an MA in Linguistics, making even this initial stage sustainable for the longer term, if necessary. Though there are a small number of high-quality terminal MA programs in Linguistics in the US (e.g., Santa Cruz), there is no such program in the Boston area (or indeed, in New England). Demand for such a program is evidenced in part by the inquiries we routinely receive, both from our own undergraduates, and from others. Potential students typically seek the foundational training necessary either to continue to top PhD programs in Linguistics or related fields, or to take jobs in industry, of which there are many in the Boston area.

BU Marine Program
Strategic Plan, 2009-2010

A. Mission Statement

BUMP provides a rigorous, interdisciplinary education in marine science to undergraduates. Our curriculum encompasses biological, chemical, geological and physical oceanography as well as the spatial dynamics of marine systems. While the typical science curriculum teaches students *about science*, BUMP teaches undergraduates *how to be scientists*. We accomplish this by requiring all majors to complete the [Marine Semester](#), an intellectually and physically demanding sequence of four consecutive research-based courses. This often-transformative experience immerses students in faculty research and exposes them to pressing issues impacting marine ecosystems. We strive to prepare BUMP graduates for top jobs in marine science and for positions in elite graduate programs. More broadly, we aim to increase marine literacy and contribute to the worldwide effort to preserve and protect threatened marine ecosystems and sustainably manage critical marine resources.

B. The Present

BUMP is in the midst of a successful transition from being a specialization within the Biology major to a stand-alone interdisciplinary major. The new [Marine Science concentration](#) received official approval in 2008. The number of entering freshmen declaring the Marine Science major has increased dramatically over the last four years, as has the overall number of majors. Additionally, the number of students taking the Marine Semester has risen steadily since 2006, when the program first moved to the BU campus. Several ambitious new (or revised) marine semester courses have been launched since 2006, and these courses have been met with generally outstanding student reviews. However, we are also encountering growing pains. In the long run, the move from Woods Hole to Boston will benefit the program, but in the short term, it forces us to deal with a *substantial reduction in teaching laboratory space* and greater logistical difficulties in providing field opportunities for our students. In addition, the move coincided with *faculty departures* that created gaps in our curriculum—particularly within the marine semester—and left us with insufficient capacity to accommodate the growing needs of our students going forward. Particularly significant are the retirement of Ivan Valiela, because this eliminated any significant coverage of biogeochemistry and the departure of Paul Barber [BI] because this eliminated any significant coverage of molecular biology or genetics. If we fully capitalize on the existing strengths of our program and address key needs, we should emerge as the top undergraduate marine science program in the northeast (our most direct academic peer group) and be counted among the elite programs nationwide.

1. Academic Peer Group

- a. Marine science programs are offered primarily by universities located along the coasts, and because these programs are generally rooted in local marine habitats, our most immediate peer group consists of other universities along the eastern seaboard (especially the Northeast).
- *University of Connecticut, Department of Marine Science:*
<http://www.marinesciences.uconn.edu/about.html>. Like BUMP, UConn has a focus on interdisciplinary marine science. UConn offers an undergraduate major in “[Coastal Studies](#),” as well as minors in “Marine Biology” and “Oceanography.” UConn features a substantially larger marine faculty than BU (>30 faculty members in the department plus 2 affiliated faculty from other departments), and they have their own marine lab, the [Marine Sciences & Technology Center](#), located at Avery Point on Long Island Sound. The department serves 60-70 undergraduate majors. They do not offer a research experience approximating our Marine Semester, but involvement in directed

research is encouraged. The Marine Science department itself does not offer field courses in any tropical locations, but they trumpet “specific connections with programs in Mexico, Brazil, Chile, and Turks & Caicos.” Support facilities include a new, 76-foot research vessel, “a seawater facility with environmental controls, walk-in environmental chambers and clean rooms, an electronics shop, and a fully equipped dive program that offers SCUBA certification.”

- *Northeastern University: Marine Biology concentration in the Department of Biology:* (http://www.biology.neu.edu/undergradprograms/bsbio_1.html) The Biology Department offers a concentration in Marine Biology through their own marine lab, the [Marine Science Center](#) in Nahant. Northeastern has nine faculty in the area of “Marine Biotechnology and Ecology.” Their [Three Seas Program](#) provides advanced undergraduates and beginning graduate students with semester long research-based courses in three distinct marine ecosystems (Fall: Nahant; Winter: [Gump Marine Station](#), French Polynesia; Spring: [Wrigley Marine Science Center](#), Santa Catalina, CA). The Three Seas Program accommodates up to 20 students per year.
- *University of Maine, School of Marine Sciences:* (<http://www.umaine.edu/marine/>) Maine offers interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate degrees in “Marine Science.” Undergraduate Marine Science majors may concentrate in [Aquaculture](#), [Marine Biology](#), or [Physical Marine Science](#). Juniors and seniors in the program are encouraged but not required to participate in the [Semester-by-the-Sea](#) program at the [Darling Marine Center](#). Undergraduate majors are required to complete a “capstone” individual research project with one of [50 marine faculty](#) at Maine.
- *University of New Hampshire, Marine Science Program:* (<http://marine.unh.edu/>) UNH offers undergraduates two avenues towards a marine science degree: Biology majors may opt for “[Marine and Freshwater Biology](#),” and Earth Science majors may opt for “[Oceanography](#).” The Marine and Freshwater Biology specialization involves an optional six-credit summer course in “[Field Marine Science](#)” taught at the Isles of Shoals, a series of rocky islands off the NH/Maine coast. UNH boasts 73 [marine faculty](#) (including several research-tenure track faculty) divided among several departments.
- *University of Rhode Island, B.S. in Marine Biology:* (<http://www.uri.edu/cels/bio/marbio/>) While the URI undergraduate marine curriculum focuses on biology, it captures some of the interdisciplinarity of BUMP in that students in this major are required to take a graduate-level course in oceanography and may also take electives in the Graduate School of Oceanography. A research-semester is not integral to the major, but students may receive credit for field research courses offered through the [URI in Bermuda](#) program or the Sea Semester program offered by the Sea Education Association in Woods Hole. URI boasts 10 [marine biology faculty](#) in the department of Biology as well as 28 marine faculty in other departments.
- *University of South Carolina, Marine Science Program:* (<http://www.msoci.sc.edu/Programs/aboutMSCI.html>) USC offers an interdisciplinary marine science degree for undergraduates combining biological, chemical, geological, and physical oceanography. The program has existed since 1972, and they currently boast [40 marine faculty](#) (although only 12 “primary marine faculty”). They have 140 undergraduate marine science majors (in addition to 32 marine science graduate students). The Marine Science Program offers students “field-oriented, research-based learning courses” akin to BUMP’s marine semester at an off-campus marine lab in the Caribbean and at USC’s own [Baruch Marine Field Laboratory](#) (BMFL) in Georgetown, SC.

b. Summary

BUMP is as strong or stronger than all of our most direct academic peers with respect to 1) the interdisciplinary nature of our curriculum, 2) the integration of research experiences into the curriculum, and the diversity of 3) marine habitats and 4) research platforms to which we expose our students [A5]. BUMP is a mid-sized program, but given current enrollment trends [A1, A2] and our past existence as a specialization within Biology, we expect to emerge as the largest program in the

northeast. Our most significant competitive disadvantages include a relatively small marine faculty [A5] and the lack of our own waterfront marine lab.

2. Faculty

The [BUMP faculty](#) are not formally appointed to the program.

a. Scholarship/research quality

Because their primary appointments are in their respective departments, and BUMP's mission is principally educational, the research of the BUMP faculty is not described here.

b. Educational contributions

As an interdisciplinary program that provides cutting-edge theoretical and experimental training in key areas of modern marine science, our success depends upon research-active faculty teaching courses in their own area of expertise. This is particularly true of the Marine Semester, which consists solely of research-based courses. The faculty teaching BUMP courses hail from Biology (BI), Earth Sciences (ES), Geography and the Environment (GE), and the New England Aquarium. The breadth of the faculty's expertise is essential for if we are to supply BUMP students with interdisciplinary training in marine science.

3. Academic Programs

a. Goals and purposes

The development of an interdisciplinary Marine Science major at BU is important on many levels. Roughly 71% percent of Earth's surface is covered by ocean, and marine ecosystems directly impact the welfare of every human being on the planet. Anthropogenic forces are rapidly altering and degrading marine ecosystems worldwide, a situation particularly concerning to Boston as one of the world's great maritime cities. As part of BU's unique service to our city, our region, and the global community, we have long supported a world-class marine science faculty. However, previously, there was no mechanism for marine faculty from different departments to collaborate in an interdisciplinary educational enterprise. This was a significant handicap because the challenges confronting marine ecosystems are inherently interdisciplinary. Furthermore, BU has a long history of attracting large numbers of undergraduates with a passion for marine science and a desire to make a difference. There is a clear opportunity for BUMP to emerge as one of the elite programs in the field, and as such, BUMP would serve as one of the more visible beacons of BU's academic excellence.

b. BUMP's curriculum

BUMP's curriculum incorporates several pre-existing courses that are regular offerings of our affiliated departments. However, BUMP makes a special contribution to the University's course offerings through the Marine Semester.

a. The Marine Semester

The Marine Semester is the capstone of the major, and its importance to the success of BUMP cannot be overstated. It is a unique educational opportunity that distinguishes Boston University from any of our peer institutions. The Marine Semester provides BU juniors, seniors, and graduate students with the opportunity to take four consecutive research-based courses in diverse areas of marine science. During each month-long block, students choose one course from among the two-three courses that are offered. All of the courses involve field research (in Boston, other coastal New England sites, on research vessels in the Gulf of Maine or the Caribbean, and on a Belizean coral reef). In Fall 2009, the Marine Semester offerings included 9 courses (with BI, ES, and GE/BI designations; [A4]). The Marine Semester has been in existence for >30 years. Prior to 2006, it was run at Woods Hole as part of the Marine

Biology Specialization. The present-day Marine Semester inherited three superb courses that were offered in Woods Hole for >10 years before being transplanted to BU's Charles River Campus (BI531, BI532, and BI563). However, the move to Boston necessitated a major revision of the Marine Semester, including the phase out of some long-running Woods Hole based courses, and the development of others (BI546, BI547, ES543, ES545, ES546, and GE/BI578).

b. Most Recent Curriculum Review

BUMP faculty meet regularly (2-3 times per semester) to discuss curricular issues, particularly the composition and execution of the Marine Semester. At our last group meeting in October 2009, we were able to celebrate the final and successful transition of the Marine Semester to the Charles River campus, but we also recognized the following urgent curricular needs.

i. Curricular Gaps

To prepare BUMP graduates for the top jobs in marine science and to make them competitive for positions in elite graduate programs, we must cover the essential content areas [A7] and technical skills of modern marine science [A8] in addition to the major environment types [A9] and groups of marine organisms [A10]. The marine semester lacks coverage of: biogeochemistry/nutrient cycling; genetics/genomics; molecular biology; microbial biology; climate/global change; environmental contamination/marine pollution; remote sensing. We are addressing the first four deficits by launching new courses using existing faculty. We are formulating plans to address the remaining deficits.

ii. Insufficient Enrollment Capacity

Majors are required to take the Marine Semester, so the capacity of the Marine Semester limits the size of the major. In Fall 2009, the Marine Semester reached its carrying capacity in blocks 3 and 4. This might be acceptable if the enrollment was static or declining, but enrollment is trending up. The courses offered in the Marine Semester are essential for two student populations to whom we must give enrollment priority: undergraduate Marine Science majors and graduate students in Marine Biology. Currently, we barely meet the needs of these two student populations. In addition, there is significant demand from Biology majors and Earth Science majors who wish to minor in Marine Science. To broaden our service to BU and to more fully realize the interdisciplinary promise of BUMP, in the near future, we hope to begin actively advertising the marine semester to those students from other science majors who have an interest in the marine environment (e.g., Geography; Chemistry; Physics). Marine Semester courses could also serve Earth Science undergraduates to satisfy that major's requirement for field research (Guido Salvucci, personal communication). Furthermore, the marine semester should appeal to highly motivated students from the social sciences or humanities whose scholarly or professional interests extend into marine policy or marine industries (e.g., students majoring in History, International Relations, or Political Science). Finally, our past experience with the Marine Semester in Woods Hole reveals its appeal is sufficient to regularly attract students from other universities; this generates revenue for BU and fosters BU's reputation for educational excellence. In 2008, the Marine Semester enrolled a student from Simmons College, and in 2009, a student from Lawrence University (Appleton, WI).

iii. Accommodating Students With Physical Disabilities or Financial Hardships

It is essential to offer courses on the BU campus during all 4 blocks to accommodate students that are physically and/or financially limited in their ability to perform rigorous fieldwork or venture abroad for an extended period.

c. Teaching quality measures

i. Faculty teaching evaluations:

Current BUMP faculty are evaluated below based on their average course ratings for required Marine Science courses over the last three years.

Excellent (>4.25)	Needing improvement(<2.5)	
All Marine Science [n=10]:	9 faculty;	0 faculty;
Marine Science, Biology [n=4]:	3 faculty;	0 faculty;
Marine Science, Earth Sciences [n=4]:	4 faculty;	0 faculty;
Marine Science, Geography [n=2]:	2 faculty;	0 faculty;

d. Academic enhancement:

i. Academic Partnerships

With the move to Boston, BUMP established formal partnerships with leading marine institutions that provide our students with unique educational opportunities, direct access to local leaders in the marine science community, and an inside track to competitive internships.

The [New England Aquarium](#) is a leading [marine research institute](#), particularly in the area of marine conservation. BUMP partners with the aquarium to offer Marine Geographic Information Science, taught by Kerry Lagueux, a researcher from the aquarium (appointed as an instructor in GE to teach this course). This academic partnership promotes interaction between BUMP undergraduates and researchers from the aquarium, often leading to internship opportunities (see below).

The [Sea Education Association](#) (SEA) collaborates with BUMP to run a two-block course on the tropical oceanography of the Caribbean (ES545-546) led by Professor Rick Murray [ES]. SEA is a world leader in providing shipboard education in oceanography and seamanship to college undergraduates. Students in ES546 conduct near shore and open-ocean research in geological, chemical, physical, and biological oceanography on a 22-day research cruise from St. Croix to Key West.

[Stellwagen Bank Marine Sanctuary](#) is the only national marine sanctuary in the northeastern United States. In BI546, BUMP students collaborate with NOAA scientists at this unique facility, and they get extensive ship time on the sanctuary's superbly equipped, "wicked fast," 50-foot research vessel, the [Auk](#). Students perform biological collections and oceanographic measurements in the "marine equivalent of the Serengeti Plain," an unsurpassed aggregation of marine megafauna that includes Atlantic white-sided dolphins, humpback whales, minke whales, and north Atlantic right whales.

ii. Directed research at BU

Approximately 25-30% of Marine Science majors engage in research with Marine Science faculty annually, both during summers and the academic year. In 2008-2009,

2 students did research for distinction, 12 did research for credit, and 6 earned a grant from UROP.

iii. Internships with our academic partners

In 2008 and 2009, a number of BUMP students secured very competitive internships at the New England aquarium, some of which grew directly out of research conducted during the Marine Semester. In addition, in summer of 2008, one BUMP student performed research in residence at the Stellwagen Bank National Marine Sanctuary on a project that originated in BI 546. We are in discussion with SEA regarding summer internship opportunities for BUMP students.

e. Enrollment Data:

i. Marine Science majors and minors:	Majors	Minors
2008/2009:	54	15
2009/2010:	74	18
ii. Majors in Related Programs (2009/2010):	Majors	
Biology	566	
Specialization in Ecology & Conservation	37	
Earth Sciences	29	
Environmental Science	45	
vii. Course enrollment history: Marine Semester	Other Marine Science	
2008/2009:	133	211
2009/2010:	140	202 (as of 1/12/2010)
viii. Graduate enrollments in related subfields of affiliated departments (Fall 2009):		
Biology: Ecology, Behavior & Evolution + Marine Biology:		35 PhD, 4 MA
Earth Science: Oceanography/Biogeochemistry:		7 PhD, 1 MA

f. Student Quality Measures:

i. Student publications:

The following publications were co-authored by BUMP students (in bold) reporting research conducted during the Marine Semester since BUMP relocated to the main campus.

- [1] Reitzel AM, Sullivan JC, Brown BK, Chin DW, Cira EK, Edquist SK, Genco BM, Joseph OC, Kaufman CA, Kovitvongsa K, Muñoz MM, Negri TL, Taffel JR, Zuehlke RT, Finnerty JR (2007) Ecological and developmental dynamics of a host-parasite system involving a sea anemone and two ctenophores. *J. Parasitology* 93:**1392-1402**. [cited by 5]
- [2] Stetson P, Shank B, Lobel PS (2009) Mapping reef structure and bathymetry in Belize using Cobra-Tac. Proceedings of the 11th International Coral Reef Symposium, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida, pp. 510-515.

ii. Academic credentials of Marine Science majors:

Average SAT score [out of 2400] = 1950	Average ACT = 28.6
Average # AP credits at admission = 11.9	Average # of transfer credits = 3.4
Average overall BU GPA = 3.15	

4. Facilities

The Marine Teaching Laboratory (BRB B25) is a superb facility that has allowed us to overcome *many* of the limitations of not being located on the water. In this facility, and with the expertise and hard work of Justin Scace (BUMP’s aquarist), we have established living stocks of several marine animals, including reef fishes, crustaceans, sea anemones, corals, and giant clams. Students are able to collect living material from coastal New England and Belize and maintain these organisms in laboratory mesocosms, allowing the students to conduct studies that would otherwise be impossible. However, despite the quality of the facility, it is too small to support the current demands of the Marine Semester. When student research projects are underway, every square inch of lab benches and sea tables is utilized; aquaria, flumes, and other research instruments occupy most of the available floor space; passageways around the sea tables and aquaria shrink to the point where the conditions are unsafe. As a result, for the last three years, BUMP students have overflowed into empty lab space in BRB to conduct research. This overflow space is no longer available, and we now confront an urgent need for more space, which could be provided by renovation of adjacent rooms.

C. Strategic Plan

1. Ten-year projection.

In ten years, BUMP will serve about twice as many majors (~150 students), and it will be widely regarded as the pre-eminent marine science program in the northeast US. The Marine Semester will accommodate more students (>50 per year versus the current 39 [A11]), and it will serve a more diverse student population, including a few students from outside the natural sciences, and a few non-BU students. BUMP undergraduates will routinely publish in the peer-reviewed marine science literature. BUMP will help BU to recruit the most sought-after applicants, as top high school students with an interest in marine science rank BU as their first choice, and the Marine Semester contributes to BU’s overall reputation for providing unique real-world learning experiences. As BUMP’s reputation grows in lockstep with an increase in the quality of our students, BUMP graduates will compete more successfully for the top jobs in marine science and positions in elite graduate programs. Within the University, BUMP will serve as a nucleus for broader interdisciplinary educational initiatives, some of which will lead directly to broader interdisciplinary scholarship. In addition, BUMP will have strengthened its academic partnerships with local marine institutions, and BU will be more widely known as both an important player and a good citizen in the New England marine community.

2. Five year plan.

Our 10-year aspirations are achievable if BUMP capitalizes on existing strengths and addresses our deficits—particularly the existing gaps in the Marine Semester—within the next five years.

a. Enrollment capacity and curriculum of the Marine Semester

We’ll bolster the enrollment capacity and address curricular gaps by developing new courses. As some BUMP faculty (Fulweiler, Murray) are only able to teach in the Marine Semester on an every-other-year basis, we developed a two-year course rotation [A12]. Planned new courses (or re-launched existing courses) that will be taught by existing faculty [A13] include: “Coastal Nutrient Cycling and Biogeochemistry” (Fulweiler [ES]); “Marine Ecological Genomics” (Finnerty or possibly a new “systems biology” hire in the ongoing faculty search [BI]); “Marine Microbial Ecology” (Steve Golubic [BI]); “Coral Reef Dynamics,” (Kaufman and Golubic [BI]). At least three different courses will be offered in each block. This is essential if we are to reach the needed enrollment capacity while offering an interdisciplinary slate of courses in each block. *Simultaneously, we must address the space limitations in the Marine Teaching Lab by renovating adjacent space in BRB. We will work with Professor Cooper, chair of Biology, to help plan the necessary renovations in BRB.*

b. Diversity of research platforms

Modern marine science interrogates the marine realm from shore, small watercraft, open-ocean research cruises, submersibles, SCUBA and remote sensing as well as through the use of marine mesocosms (aquaria). With the exception of submersibles, BUMP does provide and should continue to provide real-world experience to our students on all of these major research platforms. A strength of our program is its coverage of shore-based marine research, small watercraft, open-ocean research cruises, and the use of mesocosms. Weaknesses of BUMP include SCUBA and remote sensing.

1. SCUBA

Prof. Lobel is proposing a scientific diving course that would allow students to attain certification as scientific divers according to the strict qualifications set forth by [NOAA](#).

2. Marine Remote Sensing

Satellite-based remote sensing technologies have become an indispensable tool in modern marine science. There is strong sentiment in our affiliated departments (BI, ES, GE) that BU needs to grow in this area. The BUMP faculty concur, particularly if we can recruit an individual using remote sensing in marine research that could enrich the Marine Science curriculum.

c. Diversity of marine habitats / BUMP's presence in the tropics

Sixteen years ago, BUMP initiated a robust program for undergraduate teaching in tropical marine biology coupled to graduate and faculty research in the most desirable field location in the Americas, the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef system in Belize. The first phase of our engagement in Belize began with the BUMP Marine Semester field course Ichthyology 2, which has been taught in block format every winter by Dr. Phil Lobel since 1994. This course is based on Wee Wee Caye (WWC), located in the most diverse region of the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef, and in close proximity to the Smithsonian Tropical Research Station at Carrie Bowe Caye and a host of other local resources. Dr. Lobel and Ichthyology 2 have been joined by Drs. Kaufman, Golubic, and Atema in various years, all of whom contributed to teaching the course. Field-based research courses in the tropics during November-December are a compelling complement to our New England offerings in September-October. Indeed, we have strengthened our tropical presence with the development of the Tropical Oceanography course led by Dr. Murray [ES].

1. BU Marine Lab in Belize

Going forward, we should maintain and bolster the New England/tropics model. An important mechanism for maintaining and bolstering our presence in the tropics would be to invest in a BU marine lab in Belize. Currently, BUMP rents the WWC facility. This subjects us to the vagaries of the rental market for the limited (and shrinking) number of suitable marine stations. Prices can spike suddenly and, as happened just this past year, BU can lose out to competing universities. Prof. Lobel's ichthyology course ordinarily travels to WWC in December, giving him ample time to prepare the students for the safety challenges and logistical difficulties of fieldwork. However, in 2009, another university booked the facility in December. Fortunately, we were able to secure a November rental, but this necessitated a major disruption in the curriculum, and it short-circuited the standard pre-expedition preparation. Particularly now that additional BUMP faculty from multiple departments are contemplating Marine Semester field courses in Belize (Buston, Fulweiler, Golubic, Kaufman), it makes sense to purchase our own facility [A14]. We can then leverage our significant local expertise and burgeoning relationship with the University of Belize to make the launching of new field courses cheaper, easier, and safer. Given the benefits that Boston University students have enjoyed from our long-term association with field teaching and research in Belize, we now propose consideration of a permanent presence there, a formalized partnership with the University of Belize, and an expansion of our field course offerings in Belize.

Undergraduate Program in Neuroscience
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

To produce scientifically literate, well informed graduates by providing broad exposure to the field of neuroscience through a range of lecture and lab-based experimental courses, and the nature and process of scientific discovery through hands-on faculty-mentored research experiences. Some of our initiatives are aimed at curricular innovation at the undergraduate level, that include expanding access to neuroscience related content to non-majors, improving outcomes and reducing attrition by getting students involved in research earlier, and outreach into the local community. Furthermore, our program's advising structure offers unique, individualized support for the academic, professional, and personal development of all majors.

B. The Present

We have not yet been evaluated or ranked, however, our program falls somewhere in the middle of the following programs in terms of number of affiliated research (>50) and teaching (23) faculty. It is noteworthy that among our peer institutions, our broad coverage and integration of computational, biological, and cognitive neuroscience is unique and innovative, as is the flexibility with which our curriculum allows students to focus their interests among and/or within each of these domains.

1. Academic Peer Groups

- *MIT*: Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences; 47 Faculty Members; curriculum owned by BCS; well integrated neuroscience community housed in one building
 - (<http://bcs.mit.edu/academics/undergrad.html>)
- *University of Pittsburgh*: Department of Neuroscience; 23 Faculty Members; curriculum largely owned by department; (<http://www.neuroscience.pitt.edu/programs/undergraduate/>)
- *Emory University*: Neuroscience and Behavioral Biology; 75 Faculty Members; extensive list of courses that extends to anthropology, philosophy, and environmental studies, (*Interdepartmental*; <http://www.nbb.emory.edu/>)
- *Brown University*: Undergraduate Concentration in Neuroscience; 20 Faculty Members; overall comparable to our program (*Interdisciplinary*; <http://neuroscience.brown.edu/undergraduate/>)
- *Brandeis University*: Neuroscience Program; 28 Faculty Members; comparable computational coverage, weaker in overall breadth (*Interdisciplinary*; <http://www.bio.brandeis.edu/undergrad/neuro/>)
- *NYU*: Program in Neural Science; 20 Faculty Members; weaker in cognitive neuroscience (*Interdisciplinary*; (<http://www.cns.nyu.edu/undergrad/>))
- *Tufts University*: *Specialization* in Cognitive and Brain Science through Psychology Department; 22 Faculty Members; weaker overall: breadth, integration, depth (<http://ase.tufts.edu/psychology/undergrad.htm>)
- *UPENN*: Neuroscience Concentration through Biology Department; 35 Faculty Members; weaker overall: breadth, integration, depth (<http://www.bio.upenn.edu/programs/undergraduate/concentrations/neuroscience.html>)

2. Faculty

a. Research Quality (aggregate, primary tenure and tenure-track faculty)

1. Refereed publications (2006-2008): 312 total, 43.1/faculty member

2. High quality pubs interdisciplinary and top specialty (*Science, Nature, PNAS, PLoS*

Biology,

Neuron, J Neurosci): 44 total, 5.5/faculty member

b. Research grants:

1. CY 2006 Total: \$27,449,716 Per faculty member: \$3,538,875
2. CY 2007 Total: \$5,502,556 Per faculty member: \$682,901
3. CY 2008 Total: \$14,274,296 Per faculty member: \$2,191,242

c. Research Quality (subfields, research active faculty)

1. *Computation: (Bullock, Eden, Guenther, Kopell, Kramer, Mingolla, Shinn-Cunningham)*

- a. Refereed publications (2006-2008): 132 total, 22/faculty member
- b. High quality pubs: 9 total, 1.5/faculty member
- c. Research grants:
 - i. CY 2006: \$7,240,490 total, \$1,206,748 per faculty member
 - ii. CY 2007: \$989,418 total, \$164,903 per faculty member
 - iii. CY 2008: \$7,237,219 total, \$1,206,203 per faculty member

2. *Cognition: (Cherry, Cronin-Golomb, Eichenbaum, Hasselmo, Kantak, Liederman, Rucci, Somers, Stern, Watanabe)*

- a. Refereed publications (2006-2008): 134 total, 13.4/faculty member
- b. High quality pubs: 27 total, 2.7/faculty member
- c. Research grants: CY 2006: \$18,649,389 total, \$2,072,154 per faculty member
 - i. CY 2007: \$3,729,418 total, \$414,378 per faculty member
 - ii. CY 2008: \$3,380,531 total, \$375,615 per faculty member

3. *Cells and Systems: (Baum, Dionne, Gardner, Lin, Wachowiak, Yamaguchi)*

- a. Refereed publications (2006-2008): 46 total, 7.7/faculty member
- b. High quality pubs : 8 total, 1.3/faculty member
- c. Research grants:
 - i. CY 2006: \$1,559,837 total, \$259,973 per faculty member
 - ii. CY 2007: \$783,720 total, \$103,620 per faculty member
 - iii. CY 2008: \$3,656,546 total, \$609,424 per faculty member

3. *Educational contributions (aggregate)*

a. Course evaluations

Faculty numbers are based on evaluations of at least 2 different courses during the last 3 years for undergraduate courses.

- Excellent >4.0, 17 faculty
- Needing improvement <2.5, 0 faculty

b. Awards

College Award for Excellence in Advising, 2009 (Lipton)

c. Academic enhancement

Approximately 35-40 neuroscience undergraduates have engaged in faculty mentored research during the summer or academic year. Faculty research mentors are housed in Sargent College, College of Engineering, Psychology Department, Mathematics and Statistics, Cognitive and Neural Systems, Pharmacology, Massachusetts General Hospital, and McLean Hospital. In AY 2009/10, four of 18 neuroscience seniors are completing work for distinction.

4. *Educational contributions (subfields)*

Course Evaluations

Faculty numbers in categories calculated as above

- *Computation*: excellent, 1 faculty; needing improvement, 0
- *Cognition*: excellent, 10 faculty; needing improvement, 0
- *Cells & Systems*: excellent, 6 faculty; needing improvement, 0

2) Undergraduate Majors:

Neuroscience 165 total (2009/10)

Undergraduate Majors in Related Programs:

- Biology w/Specialization in Neurobiology 80 (2009/10)
- Chemistry 97
- Computer Science 110
- BMB 224
- Mathematics and Statistics 176
- Physics 82

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education

1. Goals

Our program provides broad exposure to the field of neuroscience with a concomitant foundation in basic quantitative, biological, and experimental concepts and methodologies. Following a year of chemistry, calculus, a semester of biology and statistics, all neuroscience majors take our three core survey courses that introduce the breadth of the field partitioned into three broad domains (cognition, cells and systems, computation), each of which foreshadows a corresponding group of upper level electives that allow for greater depth of study, and participation in a faculty mentored research project.

On paper, our strengths include an extensive list of courses and potential for faculty mentored research. The reality, however, is less idyllic. How much overlap exists among “neuroscience” courses? Are students properly prepared for upper level electives? Do we deliver on our promise of flexibility and opportunity? All courses that count toward the neuroscience major are offered through other departments as integral components of their own programs of study, designed to accommodate their own unique set of requirements and prerequisites. Our dependence limits the range of content and course availability, impacts the growth of our program, and cohesion and flow of programmatic elements from the introductory courses to upper level electives. Many upper level electives are in extremely high demand, filling up remarkably fast and leaving many to scramble for courses that are tangential to their level of interest or expertise. Access to many upper level psychology courses is restricted to psychology majors only. Furthermore, given that psychology, biology, and neuroscience all have an upper level laboratory requirement, too few laboratory courses are offered.

b. Vitality and Quality

The curriculum committee and a larger assembly of affiliated faculty performed a thorough review of the program in March and June, 2009, respectively. Less than a year old, and following only the first and then second registration cycle (for spring '09: ~35 majors; for fall '09: ~65 majors), the number of neuroscience majors was a fifth to a third of its current enrollment. Recommendations at the time included the addition of an upper level laboratory course, and permitting students to receive credit for

participating in research outside Boston University. In response, Biology has graciously offered to add a second upper level lab course next year, and we now have students working in labs at MGH, Maclean, and the Brigham for credit toward the major.

In addition, at the latter faculty meeting the topic of faculty participation and ownership in the program came up briefly in discussion, though given that the majority of faculty who were present already teach the majority of neuroscience students, little insight emerged. Following the faculty meeting, two faculty leaders who do not teach undergraduates quietly raised the issue of creating a new neuroscience department with an undergraduate and graduate mission...

4. Enrollment History and Projections

- May 2009: 83
- January 2010: 165
- September 2010: >200
- September 2011: ~250

5. Student Outcomes

Our first cohort of seniors will graduate this spring. To assess how undergraduate research participation impacts attitudes on science, research, and our curriculum we have recently administered our first survey to all students who have completed or are currently engaged in research. The results will be available in March.

6. Diversity.

- 65% Female
- 1% African American
- 2% Native American/Alaska Native
- 7% Latino/Hispanic

7. Outreach Initiatives

As part of a Howard Hughes Undergraduate Science Education grant this fall we proposed a set of pre-college and transition programs aimed at introducing neuroscience content through after school classes and monthly half-day visits to BU for students from three local high schools: Fenway, Brighton, and English. A subset of these high school students would then have an opportunity for a paid summer internship in a BU lab. We are participating in a more recent initiative in collaboration with Paul Trunfio and Gene Stanley to develop neuroscience modules for high schools. The program would involve our undergraduates helping to create and deliver content similar to the Peer Health Exchange model (<http://www.peerhealthexchange.org/>), designed to expose high school students to neuroscience content through high profile topics that include drugs and aging.

8. Facilities

We have no facilities of our own. However, a future goal of the program is to develop a two-semester introductory lecture/lab course for first year students modeled after introductory physics/biology/chemistry courses. This sequence will require laboratory classroom space. Biology has graciously offered us a small but viable space in the Metcalf Center. Approximately \$80,000 in renovations and \$150,000 in equipment costs are necessary to develop and implement this course using this space, for which we have sought (HHMI), and will continue to seek (NSF-CCLI) external funding. Care to help?

5. Collaboration

a. Inside BU

- i. Were it not for oddities in enrollment numbers and timing, Jason Bohland (SAR) would be offering an undergraduate computational neuroscience course this spring;
- ii. Having been approached by Jean-Jacques Soghomonian and Jennifer Luebke (AN-BUSM), our students would have had access to their graduate methods course this spring; the course canceled due to poor graduate enrollment;
- iii. Additional clinical faculty at BUSM have offered to participate in a senior clinical seminar coordinated by Helen Tager-Flusberg (Psychology);
- iv. Together with faculty from Mathematics and Statistics, Sargent, Biology, Psychology, and CNS we are preparing to submit a proposal to NSF that would facilitate research collaborations at the intersection of the mathematical and biological sciences for undergraduate math and biological sciences majors (i.e. neuroscience).

b. Beyond BU

We have established undergraduate research opportunities with researchers at Massachusetts General Hospital, Maclean Hospital, and Brigham and Woman's Hospital.

C. Plan for the Future

1. Ten-Year Plan

a. Summary

It is premature to make a detailed plan of action given the unexpected growth and flux of our program. However, keeping in mind that the way forward is complicated by a number of factors, most immediately the fate of CNS, we recognize the opportunity to consider the positive impact on the undergraduate program, collaboration, and synergy among like minded cognitive and computationally oriented faculty. Additional factors that are critically important include the interests of the Departments of Psychology and Biology, and availability of resources. Since we are likely to grow beyond 200+ majors by next fall, and are not simply a specialization within Psychology or Biology, our program requires an allocation of resources that includes teaching laboratory space and courses designed specifically for neuroscience majors.

The following are our most pressing concerns:

- Dependence on affiliated departments
- Course overlap and repetition (students have begun to turn to the medical school or upper level graduate courses (700-800 level) for variation and challenge)
- Over enrollment in existing courses. Students lack the flexibility to enroll in whatever courses they wish within their major. One original goal of the program was for students to have the option of breadth, or depth. Currently, students take whatever classes they can get into, and too often are of secondary priority to departmental majors in enrolling for key courses.
- Too few upper level laboratory courses.

Possible solutions:

- Increase enrollment limits
- Restrict sections or whole courses to neuroscience majors
- Hire additional neuroscience affiliated faculty in participating departments.

- Just as Psychology utilizes part-time lecturers to staff many of their courses, this is an option to consider where we have critical demand, for instance, upper level laboratory courses (e.g. adding a second section of PS 322).

Indeed, to continue growing the program and to accurately represent the diverse interests of our neuroscience community, we must encourage greater participation and promote a sense of ownership among our neuroscience faculty. Faculty members must develop new courses, or refine existing courses to better reflect and capitalize on the evolving hierarchy that our new introductory courses promote. We must seek alternatives to and encourage more broad thinking about existing courses that at present offer only a modest value to our curriculum. With the status quo, the question is how do we achieve our goals with a faculty only secondarily affiliated with the program while primarily obligated to serve their departmental programs?

As noted above and in previous self-reflective evaluations of our program, a realistic solution is to create a departmental entity with which the undergraduate neuroscience program would be linked that would help alleviate many of the growing concerns articulated in this document, putting at high priority space and faculty resources to support this successful initiative. The new department must be organized to serve undergraduate education, and include primary faculty housed on the same floor(s) of a new or existing building, and an extended affiliated faculty throughout the university community.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

- Less content overlap among existing courses
 - Indicators: Fewer students complaining (rightfully) that slides and lectures are identical across courses
- Neuroscience-only courses, or less restrictive enrollment in existing courses
 - Indicators: Fewer students struggling to enroll in upper level electives
- Greater willingness among “neuroscience” faculty to engage in curricular innovation, including the development of new courses and revision of existing courses
- Expanded catalogue of electives in computational and biological neuroscience, and upper level laboratory courses

3. Five-Year Goals

The BU neuroscience community must reach consensus regarding what constitutes progress, and participation and ownership in our educational mission, without which our continued status as interdisciplinary will serve not as a strength, but as a significant impediment to our growth and success. New faculty and/or instructors, changes in enrollment restrictions, new sections or courses, the creation of a new department, space allocation, any or all of these will be a mark of progress five years from now.

Women's Studies Program
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Women's Studies Program strives to achieve excellence in undergraduate education through creating a dynamic academic environment and an intellectually enriching relationship between the faculty and students. The WSP maintains a collegial and scholarly atmosphere that not only has made the emerging WSP the hub of students' activities, but also a supportive and welcoming place for cross-university as well as national and international academic collaborations. The Program introduces students to scholarship centered on women's and gender issues in diverse fields, and it enhances their understanding of women's intellectual contributions worldwide throughout history. The WSP is a vital part of BU's academic community and with the impending convening of a Task Force, the WSP looks forward to fine-tuning its curriculum and expanding its faculty.

B. The Present

The Peer Group

For our peer group we looked at the universities and colleges that are affiliated with the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies (GCWS), a Boston-based educational consortium of eight universities and colleges established in 1993, which Boston University joined in 2006. We also reviewed the Department of Gender and Women's Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. We chose academic members of GCWS because we have had a close relationship with the women's and gender studies programs in these institutions. While BU's WSP is not a "major" granting program, a majority of the GCWS members as well as Wisconsin-Madison's programs do offer a major in WS. Some, such as Simmons College and Brandeis, offer a joint Master's degree in Women's and Gender Studies. The Department of Gender and Women's Studies at Wisconsin-Madison, by far the most extensive one, not only offers a major, but has a graduate program and a graduate certificate in WS. Northeastern University and Boston University are the only universities on this list that offer only a minor. The former offers a Graduate Certificate in Women's Studies, while the WSP at BU has a proposal to pending initiate a graduate certificate in Women's Studies.

Another major difference between these universities and colleges is the faculty composition. While the others all have tenured and tenure-track professors on their faculty, the core faculty at WSP are instructors, complemented by talented "professors of the practice" [Brandeis' term] with international field experience. A distinguishing strength of the WSP at BU is that faculty energy and creativity is solidly based in the Women's Studies Program.

The Faculty

The WSP includes a small and highly committed, diverse, and engaged faculty teaching interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary WS classes. The WSP, however, has no faculty lines of its own, and this can potentially weaken this otherwise dynamic small Program. Nine full-time and part-time professors teach a rich range of courses in gender and women's studies. The director, the only tenured faculty, is a member of the Anthropology Department and teaches one course per year that has its departmental designation (AN) and is "cross-listed" with WS. The WS core faculty includes two full-time instructors who each teach 6 courses a year. Both professors (Balser and Gottfried) have taught WS courses at BU even when there was no formally established WSP. Both are excellent teachers who have made innovative contributions through talks, and creation of new syllabi and courses in areas of women's studies (Balser in areas of women and politics, and Gottfried, regarding women, media and the arts, and gender studies) and have been active in extra-curricular activities, from the local to the global level. Because Professor Balser's and Gottfried's academic ranking is that of instructor, their salaries are lower than salaries of assistant professors, despite their

many years of teaching experience. They thus not only have full teaching loads, but have taken on challenging consultancies, and summer courses. As instructors they do not have sabbatical opportunities for research.

By 2005 and 2006 two assistant professors became affiliated with the WSP. Each teaches one course per year for the WSP and is active in research through their home departments. Preston, English Department, has been highly active in WS extracurricular activities and has initiated a “Genderfest” annual program. The WSP has three part-time lecturers, one of whom teaches a course during the summer, and the other two teach one course per year each. One graduate student from the American and New England Studies teaches one course per semester. Despite their part-time position with the WSP, these professors are fully engaged with the WSP curriculum and extra-curricular activities.

The WSP professors, whether full-time, part-time, or affiliated from other departments, are highly sought after and are involved in a variety of diverse pursuits within and outside of the BU academic community.

For the academic year 2005-2006, Diane Balser took a leave of absence to work as the Executive Director of Brit Tzedek v’ Shalom – Jewish Alliance for Justice and Peace. She was also the chair of the outside review committee to evaluate the Simmons College Graduate Program in Gender/Cultural Studies. Further, Professor Balser has been an international facilitator on women’s issues and leadership development for more than 25 years. Among others, she led a workshop in Ireland in 2003 in which Catholic and Protestant women met to discuss the peace process and the fight for female participation. Diane Balser persuades women who are in the Women’s Studies Program to become leaders within the University and the community. She has helped several of our students gain internships in the Massachusetts State House, or to work in Congress during the summer. She has also helped some to do semester internships in women's organizations outside of the United States.

Barbara Gottfried has been active as a consultant on faculty affairs for the American Association of University Professors, and in collaboration with Shahla Haeri, has received several annual grants from Boston University’s Humanities Foundation. She has twice been awarded Humanities Foundation grants (Fall 2006, Fall 2008) to bring a female film director to campus in conjunction with her WS 346 Women and Film Class; has twice won curriculum development grants from the BU Summer Session to design new courses for them, and is currently designing a course for the Summer London Study Abroad Program to be offered in Summer 2011.

Brenda Gael McSweeney draws upon her three decades of international leadership experience, and her field research in three zones of the UNESCO/UNDP Project for Equal Access of Women and Girls to Education in Burkina Faso, West Africa to create a truly dynamic and rigorous, yet pragmatic course for students interested in women internationally. UNESCO electronically published her field research in 2007 and 2009, as well as the book she edited entitled *Another Side of India: Gender, Culture, and Development*, to which Haeri contributed a chapter. The findings, which are based on real-life country-level challenges, form the basis for interactive Gender Case Study exercises with her students in her seminar WS 348 “Gender and International Development.” McSweeney also brings to her coursework and campus interactions insights gleaned from her role as adjunct Professor of the Practice with international graduate students at Brandeis University’s Heller School for Social Policy and Management, from running the UN Virtual Development Academy’s gender courses worldwide, and from her current role as advisor to UNDP’s Regional Bureau for Africa.

Shahla Haeri and Brenda McSweeney (a former representative of the UN Secretary General, and UN Development Program executive head in India and Jamaica, also Executive Coordinator of the UN Volunteers Program and a BU Visiting Scholar and lecturer), were awarded a much sought after UNESCO Chair/UNITWIN (“University Twinning”) on Gender, Culture, and People-Centered Development in 2007, which will continue for six years. UNITWIN forged an academic and institutional partnership, seated at Boston University, in collaboration with three prestigious universities, plus three renowned Non-Governmental Organizations in India. This academic exchange and ground-level research has led to numerous publications and social development outreach by both Haeri and McSweeney and their international partners (<http://unitwin.blogspot.com>). The German government in 2008 awarded Dr. McSweeney a top German honor

from the President of the Republic, the Order of Merit First Class, in recognition of her contribution to development and the international community.

With President Brown's Global Initiative and BU's commitment to establishing a scholarly and academic relationship with India and Indian universities, WSP's partnership with the UNITWIN Network is well-poised to advance the President's plans and programs.

The students' evaluations of the WS faculty are on the whole very positive, with comments frequently emphasizing the meaningfulness of the WS courses and changes in the students' perspectives regarding social, humanitarian, and literary issues, as well career priorities.

Academic Program

The WSP offers small classes (max. 30) primarily focused on discussion, which makes the WS classes perennially popular. Students get to know the teacher and each other on a more intimate level than a large lecture would afford. Real dialogues, discussions, and the exchange of creative analysis and personal experiences takes place within these classes. Students' feedback, ideas and issues are then raised and discussed during staff meetings, and incorporated into the evolution of our ongoing courses, and/or designing new and equally innovative ones.

The number of Women's Studies minors fluctuates between 40 and 30, currently standing at 30. In addition, a significant number of COM students choose Women's Studies as their CAS concentration. The total number of students taking WS courses during the fall and spring semesters 2008-09 plus summer enrollment was 438. The WSP offers diverse courses, including core courses in Humanities and Social Sciences which can be counted toward CAS distribution requirements, and flexible upper division offerings including the multiple course designation, WS 305. The Women's Studies Program already gives students credit for over 50 courses taken in departments outside the Women's Studies Program, and additional petitions to grant Women's Studies credit to such courses continue to arrive.

WSP courses are considered to be cutting-edge, thought provoking, and engaging. The WSP faculty, regardless of their affiliation, continuously update their courses or design new ones. Sometimes innovative courses are first offered through the WSP's WS 305 umbrella. If popular, they are then incorporated into the WSP's regular curriculum. Gottfried's courses WS 340: "Women, Gender and Race in Media" and WS 346: "Women and Film" were first offered as WS 305s. Immediately successful, they were each then submitted to the Curriculum Committee for approval and consequently became permanent numbered courses. Gottfried further designed and taught the WS 305: "Asian Women's Literature, Autobiographies, and Film." For Fall 2009, she designed a very successful course titled WS 305: "Women and Comedy," which given its impressive popularity we hope to offer it for several more years. She has also been creative in designing her summer courses. For summer 2010, she has designed a new course called WS 305: "American Masculinities." Swedberg course, "WS 305: Feminism: What is Left to Accomplish?" falls in the same category.

Likewise, Balsler responded to the students' demand and interest and reorganized her course WS 350, calling it "Hillary Clinton and Women and Politics." Brenda McSweeney brings to her very popular course, WS348: "Gender and International Development," a host of firsthand knowledge and experiences from her long service worldwide in the United Nations.

The WSP's proposal for the creation of a Graduate Gender Certificate is pending. If the proposal is approved, the WSP would add graduate level courses to its curriculum, along with the courses offered by the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies. Boston University became a member of the Graduate Consortium in Women's Studies (GCWS) in September of 2006. The GCWS offers access every semester to two or three interdisciplinary graduate level courses in Women's and Gender Studies to Boston University graduate students in any discipline. Courses are taught by teams of faculty from the nine participating universities. In addition, the Consortium offers BU faculty the opportunity for collaborative teaching across the disciplines with faculty members from the participating universities, which in turn enriches BU's own faculty development and course offerings. The WSP does not currently offer graduate level courses, though graduate students have occasionally enrolled in 300-level WS and done extra work to qualify for graduate credit.

Diane Balser and Barbara Gottfried, as co-directors of undergraduate studies, and Shahla Haeri as the Director, all act as student advisors and mentors. Gottfried and Balser frequently participate in Freshman Orientation, and Haeri regularly contributes to Work For Distinction and Faculty Friday programs. Brenda McSweeney frequently advises students from a spectrum of departments on the international arena, has organized student internships overseas, and mentors our WSP research assistants, who also maintain our UNITWIN network blog (<http://unitwin.blogspot.com>).

All of the WSP professors, whether full-time or part-time, have sponsored students' organizations, e.g. VOX, Sikh Association, Persian Club, Nari Pragati, the Boston University Women's Center, and inspired the creation of BU Students Against Human Trafficking. The WS faculty continues a long-standing process of working with students to further develop resources and programs for the recently established Women's Center. The WSP organizes an annual end-of-the-year function for women's studies minors and others. These meetings enable students and faculty to interact on a more personal level and to discuss issues of academic, personal, and social concern to the students. Students also get a chance to make suggestions about their experience within and vision for the WSP. Our students have frequently told us that they find these events a very important part of the program and of their overall education.

Interdisciplinary and Cross-College Collaborations

The WSP has consistently maintained its interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary focus, primarily through collaborative programs with departments from across the university campus, as well as with local universities. Quoting from the WSP's inaugural Newsletter (2002) the director, Haeri wrote, "Knowing the great academic talent and resources at Boston University, I have started an archive of BU Professors and advanced graduate students whose teaching and research is relevant to gender and women's studies. I have sent out over 75 letters to Boston University professors, of whom 25 have responded so far. Our intention is to request, on occasion, their participation and attendance in some of our ongoing events and programs." It is a sign of changing academic atmosphere at BU that last year our colleague and the interim director, Deborah Belle was able to finalize the impressive list into the Faculty Network. Concurrently, the WSP created the Graduate Network. We believe that it is essential to involve BU graduate students in the Women's Studies Program so that they can benefit from interactions with our faculty and students. The proposal to develop a Graduate Certificate in Women's Studies is one step in this direction.

We have also presented programs and events in conjunction with the African American Program, African Center, American and New England Studies, Anthropology, English, History, Psychology, Sociology, School of Fine Arts, Medical School, Law School, Institute for Human Sciences, Howard Thurman Center for Race, Culture and Ethnicity, International Programs and the Humphrey Fellows Program.

Events and Extra-Curricular Activities

An area of strength in the WSP is the determined attempt by the faculty to organize extra-curricular activities and to seek out not only faculty members from within the BU community, departments, and institutions but also from other entities and colleges outside of BU, as well as from the local community and around the globe.

Multi-cultural collaboration has been a point of strength at the WSP, where scholars, academics, and public personalities from *i.a.* India, Pakistan, Iran, Israel, England, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Russian, Kazakhstan, Niger, Iraq, Belgium, and Poland. Inter-University cooperation and international collaboration have been defining characteristics of the WSP. Such collaborations will surely continue as the Program is benefited by Task Force recommendations.

Facilities

The WSP currently meets its space needs, but should it expand as the result of the Task Forces recommendations, it would need more office space and a larger budget to fulfill its mandate.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

Looking ahead, we plan to rearrange the number of required courses to fulfill a minor in the WS. This involves taking four courses, instead of the current requirement of three, from within the designated WS course list, plus two additional courses chosen from the accepted “cross-listed” courses. We plan to petition for a Women’s Studies “capstone” course, preferably at a 500-level, that is open to qualified juniors and seniors, as well as graduate students.

We are also awaiting the decision regarding the WSP’s proposals for a name change to “Women’s and Gender Studies,” or “Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies,” and the creation of a Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies.

The WSP faculty, whether in the WSP or affiliated with it, are highly dedicated to teaching undergraduate courses and because the majority of the students who take WS are highly self-selective, the academic relationships between the WSP professors and their students are often warm and mutually supportive.

In five years, we envisage an even greater international component in our WSP offerings. Additionally, current linkages with entities such as BU’s International Programs would be further boosted. The Women’s Studies Program will strive to remain anchored in ground realities globally

In ten years, a major change we foresee would be in the composition of the faculty and a new crop that would include tenured, tenure-track, professors of practice, visiting faculty, full-time and part-time lecturers and instructors. We also hope that the WSP’s proposals for a name change and creation of a Graduate Certificate in Women’s Studies will come through. A major in WS may also be in order.

Extra Credit Question

The WSP involvement in the UNESCO Chair/UNITWIN (University Twinning) with our partner academic institutions and non-governmental organizations (notably in India) could contribute significantly to BU’s international/global studies.

Arts & Sciences Writing Program
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Writing Program's primary mission is to help Boston University undergraduate students acquire writing and communication skills and more general habits of mind essential both to their full participation in the intellectual life of the university and to their future personal, professional, and civic lives. The program pursues this mission directly, through its courses and tutorials, and indirectly, by supporting faculty, programs, departments, colleges, and schools across the university in their efforts to help their own students develop as writers. The Writing Program contributes to graduate education as well, by offering pedagogical training and teaching opportunities to graduate students from a range of departments and programs. It also aspires to leadership in the national conversation on writing pedagogy.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

The Writing Program was established in 2001 in accordance with the 1999 Proposal for a College Writing Program. This document delineates a new freshman-level writing curriculum, but it does not focus on the freshman year alone. On the contrary, it recognizes that “[i]deally, students’ development as writers keeps pace with the full four years of their progress through the undergraduate curriculum,” and it calls for the “eventual extension” of the writing requirement beyond the sophomore year. Since 2001, the Writing Program has developed into a robust program offering an array of rigorous writing seminars, but its efforts have remained focused mainly on the freshman year. We are now pursuing a range of initiatives intended to preserve the program’s best elements while also positioning it for future growth. Highlights include: (1) revising the WR 100/150 sequence, (2) developing a new portfolio-based assessment regimen, (3) revising the program’s training courses for graduate-student teachers, (4) producing new professional resources for Writing Program faculty, and (5) beginning to work with CAS departments to foster writing in the disciplines. Our ambition is to develop the Writing Program into the comprehensive, four-year program envisioned in its founding document.

1. Peer Group

The Writing Program may be compared to the following peers:

Programs at National Peer Institutions:

- Columbia, Undergraduate Writing Program, <http://uwp.columbia.edu/>
- George Washington (GW), University Writing Program, www.gwu.edu/~uwp/
- New York Univ. (NYU), Expository Writing Program, www.nyu.edu/cas/ewp/

Programs at Regional Peer Institutions:

- Brandeis, University Writing Program, www.brandeis.edu/writingprogram/
- Harvard, Harvard College Writing Program, www.fas.harvard.edu/~expos
- Northeastern, Writing Program, www.english.neu.edu/writingprogram/

Programs of National Prominence:

- Duke, The Thompson Writing Program, <http://uwp.duke.edu/>
- Stanford, Program in Writing and Rhetoric, www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/pwr/pwr/

The programs at Brandeis, Columbia, and Northeastern are embedded in these institutions’ English departments and so have structures that differ from that of the Writing Program. The programs at Duke, GW, Harvard, NYU, and Stanford are, like our program at BU, autonomous institutional entities. In structure, mission, and kind of institution it serves, the Writing Program is most similar to the programs at GW and NYU. The Writing Program is, however, significantly larger than the programs at any of the other schools in

this peer group, both because BU has a larger undergraduate population than these other schools and because these other schools require only a single freshman writing seminar. (Stanford, which is on the quarter system, requires one freshman writing seminar and one sophomore writing seminar.) The Writing Program lags behind the other autonomous programs in this peer group in operating budget, faculty salaries, teaching loads, section caps, and directorial staff. Consequently, it is less able than these other programs to support writing throughout the undergraduate curriculum. More positively, in its staffing structure (see B2 below), the Writing Program is well suited to its mission. In these respects, it most resembles the program at Stanford, perhaps the best program in this peer group. The Writing Program has none of the structural problems (low visibility within the institution, lack of tenure-line leadership, over-reliance on adjunct faculty, etc.) with which many other writing programs contend. In this context, the Writing Program's strong and mutually beneficial relationship with the English department deserves special recognition. The department benefits from the training its graduate students receive from the program (Ph.D. students in English ordinarily teach in the Writing Program in their second year); the program benefits from its affiliation with a major academic department. We consider this affiliation with English to be essential to the program's long-term success. To achieve its aspirations, the Writing Program does not require restructuring; it simply requires sufficient resources and support. Parity in this respect with the programs at GW and NYU would be a reasonable immediate target (see table 1 for detailed comparison).

2. Writing Program Staffing

The Writing Program's directorial staff consists of a director (associate professor, tenured in English), an associate director (non-tenure-eligible assistant professor), and a director of English as a second language (non-tenure-eligible assistant professor). The program's administrative staff consists of a program administrator, an academic administrator, and a senior staff assistant. The program's teaching staff consists of 42 full-time lecturers (3/3 load), 25-30 graduate-student teachers, and 35-40 part-time lecturers (fewer in the spring semester). A small number of faculty of professorial rank also teach occasionally in the program (tables 2-5).

a. Faculty Profile

Because its courses are topic-based writing seminars, the Writing Program requires faculty with training in a range of fields. Currently, 70% of our full-time faculty hold degrees in literature, up from 54% in the fall of 2005. We hope through recruitment to increase representation of non-literature fields on our faculty. Since 2005, the percentage of our faculty holding Ph.D.s has remained fairly constant, at approximately 50% (table 3). We hope through recruitment to raise this percentage in future years. In AY 2008-2009, 58% of our courses were taught by full-time lecturers, 24% by part-time lecturers, 12% by graduate writing fellows, 3% by teaching fellows, and 3% by departmental faculty (table 5). These percentages have remained fairly constant for the past several years. Our reliance on graduate-student teachers and on part-time lecturers leads to a high faculty turnover rate. Approximately 50% of our fall faculty will not have taught in the Writing Program the previous spring (table 6). To increase the stability of our faculty, we would like to reduce the percentage of courses taught by part-time lecturers and to increase the percentages taught by either advanced graduate students or full-time lecturers.

Course Evaluations:

Average course evaluations are well over 4.0 (5-point scale) for overall course rating and overall instructor rating. Part-time lecturers as a group tend to have lower ratings than either full-time lecturers or graduate-student teachers (table 7).

3. Academic Programs

The Writing Program contributes to general education and supports other schools, colleges, departments, and programs as described below.

a. Contributions to Undergraduate Education

The Writing Program offers over 350 sections of its writing courses and has over 6,000 student enrollments per year (tables 8a, 8b). Most BU undergraduates satisfy their writing requirement by taking the Writing Program's main two-semester sequence of freshman writing seminars, WR 100 and WR 150. These courses are central to the university's general-education curriculum and are a crucial part of students' first-year experience. In AY 2008-2009, we reviewed the WR 100/150 sequence and revised it so that it would better meet the expectations of CAS faculty and better reflect best practices in writing pedagogy. While retaining the program's topic-based seminars, we developed explicit course outcomes, increased the sequence's emphasis on academic argumentation, and shifted to portfolio-based instruction. We are also working to expand the range of topics on which we offer seminars (table 9). We believe that in their conception and design, our freshman writing seminars are as good as or better than similar courses at peer institutions. However, our high section caps limit the degree of attention our faculty—especially full-time lecturers teaching three sections—can give to their students. The Writing Program offers several other courses (WR 097, WR 098, WR 099) and group tutorials (WR 095, WR 096) for students deemed likely to benefit from additional preparation before entering the main sequence. We are beginning to review these ancillary courses now. Finally, we offer tutorials to students enrolled in our courses through our Writing Center (tables 12a-12c).

b. Assessment:

The Writing Program has historically assessed student learning through the Boston University Writing Assessment (BUWA), an extemporaneous writing test administered to incoming freshmen during orientation and again at the end of each WR course (table 13). We have retired this instrument and are now developing a new portfolio-based assessment regimen.

c. Enrollment History/Student Diversity

Since most BU undergraduates satisfy their writing requirements through our courses, our enrollments and the diversity characteristics of our students track those of the university as a whole. A trend that will greatly affect the program in future years is the increasing prominence of non-native speakers of English at the university. From 2005 to 2009, the number of international undergraduates at the university grew from 994 to 1,364, a 37% increase (table 14). We are considering ways of adjusting to this influx.

d. Contributions to Graduate Education:

The Writing Program trains and supervises numerous graduate-student teachers (an average of 27 per semester), predominantly but not exclusively from CAS departments. From the fall of 2001 to the spring of 2010, 175 individual graduate students have taught in the Writing Program (table 15). The program has also offered occasional writing instruction to graduate students who are non-native English speakers.

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives:

Writing is inherently interdisciplinary. Given proper support, the Writing Program could play an important role in enhancing and facilitating writing instruction not only within CAS but also across the university. Indeed, the Writing Program already has relationships with a number of other CAS units as well as with a number of other schools and colleges. Within CAS, WR-equivalent courses are regularly offered by (among others) English, History, American and New England Studies, and the Core. The Writing Program is also working closely with Chemistry to make CH 111/112 into a WR-150-equivalent sequence and to identify ways that department can better attend to writing in its major. Outside CAS, the Writing Program supports courses in the School of Education (SED), the School of Management (SMG), and Sargent College (SAR). Since 2006, the Writing Program has offered WR 202, a special two-credit seminar in children's literature for SED students majoring in Early Education. Since 2001, the Writing Program has supervised a group of writing associates who grade

and tutor in SMG's required sequence for incoming students, SM 121/122, and in its parallel course for transfer students, SM 299. For three years beginning in the fall of 2006, the Writing Program similarly supported HP 151, HP 252, and HP 353 in SAR. In the fall of 2009, SAR assumed direct leadership of its writing initiative by hiring a full-time lecturer to administer it. All of these initiatives are regarded as successful, but they have evolved in piecemeal fashion rather than in accordance with any overarching principles. In our view, the Writing Program's proper role is not to permanently manage writing initiatives for other units but rather to help these units better integrate writing into their own curricula by providing them with guidance, expertise, and start-up support. The Writing Program's work with SAR and Chemistry stand as potential models.

f. Outreach

The Writing Program supports English High School through the Step-Up program, offering in-service training to EHS faculty, enrolling small numbers of EHS students in Writing Program courses, and helping to staff the EHS tutoring center.

g. Facilities

The Writing Program's main location is 730 Commonwealth Avenue, Room 301. It also uses a number of offices in the English department at 236 Bay State Road. To teach effectively, writing faculty need relatively private offices in which to work and to consult with students. Our facilities are now taxed to the limit and are clearly inadequate for the future. At our main location, we have four administrative offices and nine small faculty offices arrayed around a central common area. Each faculty office is shared by up to four full-time lecturers. The common area is used for writing tutorials, by graduate-student instructors, and by full-time lecturers temporarily displaced from their personal offices by their office-mates. At 236 Bay State Road, we have thirteen offices, occupied by the director of ESL, 15 full-time lecturers, and 20 part-time lecturers. Graduate-student instructors receive no personal office space. Moreover, our facilities are minimally equipped with computers. Technology is playing an increasing role in our courses, and our technological needs will only increase. CAS is aware of our needs and has identified the Writing Program as a candidate for relocation to a new CAS building.

h. Budget

CAS has made important strides in improving the per-course rate offered to part-time lecturers and the salaries of full-time lecturers. Nevertheless, the compensation our lecturers receive remains low relative to peer institutions. The operating budget, currently \$45,895, has remained nearly constant since 2003 (tables 16-18).

C. Strategic Plan

1. Ten-Year Plan

Our goal for the next ten years is to develop into a comprehensive writing program capable of directly and indirectly supporting students' development as writers throughout all four years of the undergraduate curriculum, in ways that are in keeping with (1) evolving best practices in writing pedagogy and (2) the pedagogical missions of CAS and the broader university. In ten years we hope that the Writing Program will be known throughout the university and recognized nationally for its distinctive and effective curriculum, its informative assessment regimen and institutional research agenda, the resources and professional development opportunities it provides to its faculty, and its work with other university entities.

2. Faculty

We will continue to work to improve the terms and conditions under which full-time and part-time

lecturers work because these have a direct bearing on program quality.

a. Directorial Staff

We are now working to realign the responsibilities among the program's current directors. The director of ESL will be more fully integrated into the program's directorial team, and the associate director will assume greater responsibility for the WR 100/150 sequence. These changes will enable the director to give greater attention to curricular planning and professional development and to new initiatives directed toward supporting writing in the later years of the undergraduate curriculum. The program is understaffed at the directorial level relative to its peers and will require additional directorial staff if it is to become a comprehensive writing program. We propose that CAS fund three additional associate directors with responsibilities in the following areas: writing in the disciplines (emphasis on the sciences), writing assessment, and graduate-student writing. A reasonable salary range for these positions would be \$70,000-\$90,000. If incremental funding is not available to fund these positions fully, they could potentially be funded by combining current positions into additional directorial lines.

b. Undergraduate Education

To ensure that our curriculum remains current and that it continues to serve the needs of the university's students, we engage in regular, ongoing curricular review. We also plan to conduct more formal curricular reviews every five years. In keeping with CAS's First-Year Experience initiative, we are actively seeking to develop new writing seminars on topics related to Boston or Boston University. Over the next ten years, our curriculum will have to respond to the changing profile of BU's student population (BU is becoming increasingly selective and admitting increasing numbers of international students) and to the changing nature of writing itself (new media and information technologies are becoming increasingly pervasive). Such changes create potential for increased collaboration with other units concerned with the teaching of writing and communication, such as the Rhetoric Division in CGS and the COM Writing Program. We also hope that over the next ten years we will be able to reduce the section caps in WR 100 and WR 150 from 20 and 18 students/section, respectively, to 16 students/section. Students in writing seminars require frequent, detailed feedback from their instructors, and high section caps make such feedback difficult to provide, especially when instructors teach multiple sections. (The Writing Program's full-time lecturers teach a 3/3 load; part-time lecturers can teach up to a 2/2 load.) The Writing Program's section caps are higher than those of any of our peer programs, which average 15.25 students/section (table 1). We estimate that reducing caps in WR 100 and WR 150 to our target of 16 students/section will require adding 40 additional WR 100 sections and 21 additional WR 150 sections per year.

Increasing our capacity to support writing beyond the first year of the undergraduate curriculum is a top priority. The Writing Program should offer advanced, elective writing courses, and it should assist other instructional units in their own efforts to attend to student writing in ways that are in keeping with those units' pedagogical goals and values. To encourage such efforts, CAS might consider imposing an advanced writing requirement, per the recommendation of the 1999 Proposal for a College Writing Program. Whether or not CAS imposes such a requirement, it should offer positive incentives (e.g., reduced course sizes for writing-intensive courses, curriculum development grants administered by the Writing Board) to encourage departments and programs to give attention to student writing. We also recommend the appointment of an additional associate director with expertise in writing in the disciplines.

c. Doctoral and Masters Education

The program's graduate writing fellowships are highly competitive awards (approximately 15% acceptance rate) that allow doctoral students to teach in the Writing Program. Graduate writing fellows can ordinarily expect to receive two years of support. Because fellowships go to students from a range

of departments, increasing the number of these awards would both help the Writing Program diversify its course offerings and help departments recruit and support the best graduate students. The Writing Program is periodically asked to provide writing instruction to graduate students whose primary language is not English. The program has long helped such students on an ad hoc basis, but it does not have the resources or personnel to deliver regular support to graduate students. We are willing to expand the mission of the Writing Program to encompass supporting graduate-student writing should sufficient resources be forthcoming. We would recommend the appointment of an additional associate director who would have responsibility for graduate-level writing and an increase in the program's operating budget commensurate with this additional responsibility.

d. Assessment

We are now revising our assessment regimen. The program would benefit from the addition of an associate director with expertise in this increasingly technical area. Our long-term goal is to mount a sustained program of institutional research.

e. Facilities

The Writing Program is a candidate for relocation to a proposed new CAS building. We are prepared to participate in developing specifications for the new space.

3. Measures for Evaluating Progress

There is no recognized national ranking of writing programs. The Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC) and the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) have established guidelines for the review of writing programs. Similar programs at peer institutions may also be taken as benchmarks. We recommend as well that the program undergo a formal external review within five years.

4. Five-Year Goals

Within five years, we expect to have completed the program's internal renovation and to have made visible progress in supporting writing beyond the freshman and sophomore years. Our main internal five-year goals are (1) to have fully integrated e-portfolios into our courses, (2) to have fully implemented a portfolio-based regimen of curricular assessment, and (3) to have in place a robust array of professional resources and professional development opportunities for our faculty. Our main external five-year goal is (4) to have significant writing-in-the-disciplines initiatives underway in at least three CAS departments. We also hope (5) to have hired two of the three additional associate directors we are requesting, (6) to have achieved some reduction in section caps for WR 100 and WR 150, (7) to have seen some improvement in faculty salaries, and (8) to have established a firm plan for our program's physical relocation. We can complete our internal curricular renovation without significant additional resources. We will, however, require additional personnel and resources if we are to address longstanding concerns about compensation and section caps, and if we are to assume greater responsibility for supporting writing throughout the undergraduate curriculum. Any enhancement plan should allow for progress on both of these fronts simultaneously.

CAS Strategic Plan

Part IIC: Strategic Plans for Centers, Institutes, and Other Units

Table of Contents

African Studies
Center for the Study of Asia
East Asian Archaeology & Cultural History
Editorial Institute
Institute for the Classical Tradition
Institute for Philosophy & Religion
International History Institute
Judaic Studies
Muslim Societies & Civilizations
Remote Sensing
Division of Religious & Theological Studies
Humanities Foundation
Boston Playwright's Theatre

African Studies Center
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Boston University African Studies Center seeks to promote knowledge and understanding of the historical, social, economic, and ecological diversity of the continent of Africa by:

- Maintaining a multidisciplinary community of students, faculty, and researchers with an interest in Africa
- Supporting the inclusion of Africa-related content throughout the graduate and undergraduate BU curriculum
- Providing instruction in African languages
- Promoting multidisciplinary research and publication on Africa
- Sponsoring outreach programs in the Greater Boston community, particularly for primary and secondary schools
- Developing linkages with students, scholars, and universities within Africa

B. The Present

1. Academic Peers

Boston University's African Studies Center is among the oldest and most respected African studies programs in the country. Founded in 1953, the ASC has built a strong reputation for training academics and professionals with a specialization in Africa, producing pioneering and influential Africanist research, and engaging in innovative community outreach. As it has for more than five decades, the ASC remains a national and international leader in the field of African studies.

The ASC could potentially be compared to two different groups of peers – large private universities with African studies programs and universities with Title VI centers, most of which are large state schools. With 86 affiliated faculty, the ASC compares very favorably in size to other private universities with respected African studies programs such as Northwestern (51 faculty), Yale (40), Stanford (43), Harvard (59), and Penn (32 core faculty, 27 associated). Among private schools, only Columbia's Institute for African Studies, with 91 affiliated faculty, is larger. The breadth of our faculty, including a substantial number of faculty from schools outside CAS, particularly in public health, is matched only by Columbia.

In applying for Title VI funding from the US Department of Education, however, BU competes primarily with state universities. Of the 9 schools that are both National Resource Centers (NRC) and have Foreign Language Area Studies (FLAS) grants, Yale is the only other private university. Of the state schools, only Ohio University has a smaller program (60 faculty). Others range in size from 97 (Illinois) to 170 (Michigan State). Most have extensive programs in professional areas, such as agricultural development, land tenure, and public health and medicine. Nearly all of these schools, including private schools like Harvard, Penn, and Yale, have Title VI centers for other geographic regions, which facilitates administration. Penn (which is an NRC but not FLAS center) has strengthened its program through a consortium with Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore, and Haverford, and Berkeley and Stanford are in a consortium for FLAS.

Measuring BU's ASC against our main private university peers (Northwestern, Yale, Harvard, and Penn) and smaller state university programs (Ohio, Illinois, and Florida), our comparative advantage lies in our strong language program (with three fulltime faculty, the possibility of studying to advanced levels in six African languages, and innovative curriculum development), in the disciplines of History (with 4 faculty working primarily on Africa and 4 other affiliated faculty) and Anthropology/Archeology (with 5 Africa-

focused faculty), in the School of Theology (an area overlooked by all but Harvard and Yale), and in the School of Public Health (with 23 affiliates and numerous research programs in Africa).

We are comparatively weaker in the arts and humanities, with no Africa specialist in English (though two faculty affiliates have a secondary interest in Africa) and only two affiliates in the College of Fine Arts (both in Music, with no Africa specialists in Theatre or Visual Arts). The lack of any fulltime teaching faculty focused on Africa in International Relations is of particular concern, given the focus of Title VI funding on preparing students for international public service. The impending retirement of both long-time Africa specialists in the related discipline of Political Science adds to this concern. In comparison, Florida, Ohio, Northwestern, and Yale each have 4 Africa specialists in Political Science/IR, while Harvard has 6; as of next fall, BU will have no fulltime teaching professors in Political Science or International Relations with a primary focus on Africa. (The ASC director, whose appointment is in Poli Sci, is teaching only half time, while other ASC affiliates in Poli Sci or IR teach only part time). The BU ASC is also comparatively weak in the School of Management, with only two affiliates, none of whom focus specifically on Africa, compared to 4 at Penn and 5 at Harvard.

2. Faculty

African Studies Center affiliates include approximately 35 faculty whose research and/or teaching focus almost entirely on Africa, faculty for whom Africa is one of several areas of focus (about 30), and faculty with only a secondary research or teaching interest in Africa (about 20). Unlike some centers, however, we have no tiered system of membership. Faculty are free to engage with the ASC as much as they choose, and the degree to which faculty teach relevant courses, advise students, and attend lectures and other events varies widely and is not dependent on the percentage of their academic work focused on Africa. While the 9 faculty with offices at the ASC have the easiest time remaining involved in the ASC, a number of other faculty are also actively engaged in our program. As one affiliate outside CAS has stated, “We choose to participate in the Center because we want to.”

With the exception of African language courses and our introductory course ID116, no courses are taught formally under ASC auspices, and only language lecturers are appointed by the Center. The remainder of courses and faculty are officially taught in departments and are spread throughout BU curriculum. We do not, therefore, have access to teaching evaluations and other materials that could be used to assess our faculty in a systematic fashion. We do have a list of approved courses and can present course enrollment numbers, but these will duplicate the reporting in their home departments. As a result, much of our assessment is necessarily qualitative.

3. Scholarly/Research Quality.

The ASC faculty are among the most highly regarded in the field of African studies. Our faculty maintain a high level of productivity and are engaged in both individual and collaborative research that is published in the best academic journals both within specific disciplines and in the field of African studies. During the period 2006-2009, the 15 CAS faculty whose research focuses primarily on Africa published 13 books (.86 average) and at least 24 peer-reviewed articles (1.6 average) and 22 (1.5) book chapters.¹ The 12 faculty in Public Health whose research focuses entirely or primarily on Africa co-authored an average of 9.7 articles each during the same period.² As a measure of the quality of the work being produced, 4 of our faculty published articles in the premier journal in the field, *African Studies Review*, during this period, and books have been published by the very top academic presses in the field (Cambridge, Yale, Columbia, Carolina, Virginia, Ohio, Texas)

¹ Bard (AR), Becker (AH), Bustin (PO), Cazenave (LF), DeSilva (AN), Gendzier (PO), Harris (EC), Heywood (AA), Kaufman (BI), Longman (PO), McCann (HI), Ngom (AN), Shipton (AN), Thornton (AA), Wylie (HI). This list includes only fulltime tenured or tenure-track faculty whose publications focus primarily on Africa.

² Dearden, Feeley, Foster, Fox, Hamer, Larson, MacLeod, Miller, Onyango, Rosen, Tozan, Yeaboa-Antwi.

Not only are the ASC faculty prolific, but their work has also received considerable recognition. In the period 2006-2009, two of our faculty received Fulbright fellowships (Becker, Ngom), faculty have served as Radcliffe (Becker), WEB du Bois (Heywood), and Bogliasco (Wylie) fellows. In 2008, three ASC faculty (Shipton, Heywood, and Thornton) shared the African Studies Association's Herskovits Award "for the best scholarly work published on Africa in the previous year," the top honor in our field. Faculty have also received important outside research grants from the Rockefeller Foundation (McCann), USIP (Longman), and elsewhere. Finally, our Publications Program provides us a unique opportunity to shape the direction of the field, publishing two sets of working papers as well as the respected *International Journal of African Historical Studies*, which the ASC has published since 1968.

4. Educational/Pedagogical Contributions.

In assessing the contributions of our teaching, it is helpful to distinguish between the African language courses that are under our direct control and other courses taught by affiliated faculty in various departments. Our non-language courses are spread throughout the curriculum, with the majority in CAS but others are taught in CFA, COM, SED, LAW, MED, SPH, STH, SMG, and MET. In 2006-2007, total enrollments in non-language courses were 2,025 in 86 undergraduate course sections and 824 students in 35 graduate courses (level 700 and above); in 2008-2009, enrollments in 106 undergraduate courses was 3,187, while enrollments in 63 graduate courses was 807. The increase in courses and students does not reflect an explosion in courses but rather an administrative effort to include more comprehensively the existing BU courses with Africa content. 2008-2009 is thus a good starting point to measure future course section and enrollment data against. We do not have access to most teaching evaluation numbers, but many of our faculty have a good reputation for teaching. One professor (Wylie) has been recognized as a National Endowment for the Humanities Distinguished Teaching Professor.

Beginning last year, a new Director of African Languages implemented a reorganization of our language courses to offer fewer languages to a higher level, focusing on six core African languages. This year the language faculty began a major innovative project to develop multi-media curricular materials for language classes. We hope that these efforts will lead to growing enrollments in the future as well as better language acquisition. Enrollments in our language courses have increased from 56 in fall 2006 to 70 in fall 2009. Given the specialized nature of these language courses, many will continue to have small enrollments and should not be judged by numbers alone. Evaluation tools included in our next Title VI program will both assess language acquisition and track how graduates use their language skills in their future careers.

5. Academic Programs

The African Studies Center currently grants no degrees but rather coordinates teaching and research focused on Africa throughout the university. Our primary focus has been on graduate education, with a secondary focus on undergraduates. Instruction in African languages is a major emphasis at both levels. Currently, 18 CAS departments offer a total of 199 courses with Africa content, while 70 courses with significant Africa content (at least 25%) are also taught in CFA (16), COM (2), LAW (12), MED (1), SPH (16), STH (22), PDP (2), and MET (1).

6. Undergraduate Education.

Our primary goals for undergraduate education have been (1) to encourage the inclusion of Africa content throughout the curriculum so that students throughout the university have an opportunity to be exposed to information about Africa and (2) to allow students with a particular interest to include a more intensive focus on Africa in their education. Last year undergraduate courses with significant Africa content were taught in 16 CAS departments, COM, PDP, and CFA. Clearly, we have been successful at meeting our first goal, as students in almost every department are able to take courses with significant Africa content. We are

continually working to expand these offerings. For example, we are currently working with SHA and SAR to include courses with Africa content in those schools beginning next year.

We have been less successful at meeting our second goal for undergraduate education, providing only limited support to students who are interested in a more concentrated focus on Africa. We offer two minors, a general Minor in African Studies, which graduates a small number of students each year (about 10), and a Minor in African Languages and Literature, which has been dormant for a number of years. We do not currently offer a major in African studies. Until this academic year, we have offered very little programming targeted specifically at undergraduates. BU-sponsored opportunities for study abroad in Africa are also very limited. To better serve the interests of undergraduates in the future, we need to offer more educational opportunities and more activities specifically for undergraduates.

7. Graduate Education

The ASC allows students within any graduate program at BU to include a specialization in African studies in their education. We place a strong emphasis on multi-disciplinary education, language preparation, and active participation in the ASC community. We offer a certificate in African studies that graduate students from any college are eligible to earn. We offer a wide range of graduate courses entirely focused on Africa, particularly in Anthropology, Art History, History, Political Science, and Theology, and many others with significant Africa content. Our weekly scholarly lecture series, annual Graduate Student Conference, film series, and other events provide numerous opportunities for graduate students to deepen their knowledge of Africa outside the classroom. Although the bulk of our students come from CAS, we do regularly have graduate students participating in our programs from LAW, SPH, STH, SMG, SED, COM, and CFA. The FLAS language fellowships and GRS fellowships that we provide are distributed to students from throughout the university. The success of our graduate program is demonstrated by the placement of graduates in universities, government, NGOs, business, and development agencies. In general, our graduate program responds adequately to student demand. One area of concern, however, is in International Relations – the discipline with the fastest growing number of students, but where no fulltime faculty are focused on Africa.

8. Interdisciplinary Initiatives

The ASC's programming is inherently interdisciplinary. We involve students and faculty from nearly all BU colleges. The physical divide between the Charles River and Medical campuses presents challenges for university-wide outreach, but the ASC intentionally seeks to be inclusive. We regularly schedule lectures of interest to Public Health students and faculty, and we purposely provide fellowships to SPH graduate students. Collaborative research projects among ASC faculty represent important interdisciplinary initiatives. The Maize-Malaria project, which involves faculty from History, Public Health, Remote Sensing, Geography, and Archeology, is emblematic. Future collaborative projects include an exhibit of a South African artist involving Art History and History, a human rights initiative involving Political Science, Public Health, Theology, and Law, and a collaboration with the School of Education to use technology to link high schools in South Africa and the US. We also work closely on programming and research initiatives with other BU Centers such as the African Presidential Archives and Research Center, the Pardee Center, the Center for Remote Sensing, and the Center for International Health and Development.

9. International/Global Initiatives

The ASC is committed to expanding its linkages with African universities and developing more opportunities for study abroad. We have developed cooperative agreements with the University Gaston Berger in Senegal and Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia and are working on agreements with Iringa University in Tanzania and Fort Hare University in South Africa to allow students to study language. We hope to expand these linkages further in the future. We are concerned that, despite BU's emphasis on study abroad programs, BU has only one academic-year program in sub-Saharan Africa (Niger, cancelled for the coming semester),

one in North Africa (Rabat), and one summer program (Senegal). We anticipate the development of additional opportunities for students to study in Africa. In addition to linkages in Africa, the ASC participates in BU initiatives with the University of Warwick and the Chinese Academy for Social Sciences.

10. Outreach Initiatives

Outreach is a vital part of the ASC's mission. Our Outreach Program has been an innovator in promoting Africa content in K-12 education, working regularly with schools, museums, and media outlets. In the past three years, we have trained 1,260 teachers in workshops and sold 3,100 teaching material items. Our programs also seek to include African heritage communities in the Boston area. Finally, the ASC works with Africanist scholars from other area universities. Our Fellows program allows both independent scholars and scholars from other universities such as Tufts and Northeastern to maintain a formal affiliation. Our lecture series regularly includes both speakers and audience members from various area universities.

11. Facilities

In August 2009, the ASC moved into a newly refurbished space at 232 Bay State Road. Although the overall size of the new space is somewhat smaller, including a reduction in the number of offices and a reduction from three to two classroom spaces, the new facilities are well adapted to most of our needs, creating a warm, inviting location that is already receiving heavy usage for lectures, meetings, and student gathering. The warm colors and distinctive art work help to create a space that serves as a home for our African studies community.

12. Other Infrastructure

The African Studies Library is an important partner of the ASC. BU's excellent Africa-focused library collection and dedicated space and library are an essential component of our research and teaching efforts.

13. Collaboration with other academic units and institutions

See Outreach and Interdisciplinary Initiatives above.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Maintaining the Strength of Our Faculty.

The composition of our current faculty allows the ASC to preserve BU's status as one of the pre-eminent centers for African studies in the United States. There are only a few disciplines where additional faculty are needed. The clearest needs are in International Relations and the fine arts. It is important to note, however, that – particularly in CAS – the ASC faculty is quite senior. Of the 15 CAS faculty whose work focuses primarily on Africa, only one is untenured. (An additional untenured member will join the faculty next year). As retirements take place in areas such as Economics and Political Science, BU must intentionally keep the ASC part of recruitment efforts. In many disciplines nationally, the study of Africa is merely an afterthought, and failing explicitly to include Africa specialization in job searches will usually produce candidates without Africa expertise. To have no Africa specialist in a discipline such as Economics, for example, would seriously compromise our standing as a leading African studies program. BU must also remain committed to maintaining a complete language faculty with the realization that demand for African languages may grow but will remain restricted.

2. Developing Undergraduate Education

While the ASC has a long tradition of first-rate graduate education, growing interest in Africa among undergrads means that the time has come for greater emphasis on the undergraduate study of Africa. Increasing undergrad participation will allow us to enhance our educational impact, increase enrollments in language courses, and foster future Africa-focused graduate students. We can enhance our undergraduate program in various ways. We are exploring creating a joint major with African-American Studies, which will increase the options available to individuals interested in a detailed focus in African studies. Expanding events targeted at undergrads is essential. Offerings such as the conversations we held in the fall on “Working for the UN” and “China in Africa” should become a regular part of our schedule. Expanding the number of study abroad opportunities in Africa would benefit primarily undergraduates, while helping to build interest in our courses and, specifically, our language program.

3. Increasing Linkages and Study Opportunities in Africa

Opportunities for study and travel in Africa as well as exchanges with institutions of higher education in Africa are important for the education of our students. The fact that BU currently has only three study abroad programs in Africa (Morocco, Niger, and Senegal) is of grave concern. Over the next decade, we hope that BU is able to develop new programs in Africa. The ASC is already cultivating linkages with universities in South Africa, Tanzania, and Ethiopia that will allow our students to continue their language studies in countries where languages such as isiXhosa, Kiswahili, and Amharic are spoken. Building on these linkages and developing programs in countries whose languages are taught at BU would be a natural way of expanding opportunities in Africa.

4. Expanding Community Outreach.

BU already has an impressive Outreach Program focused on children and youth. In the next decade, we should enhance these activities with outreach to the Boston community more broadly. As the only Title VI Africa center within 100 miles, BU could play a larger role in coordinating African studies students and scholars in the area. We have begun by introducing a community calendar for Africa events and developing a directory of African studies scholars in area schools. Since Boston is a major media outlet, the ASC should play a more visible role in the local media. We should also increase our outreach to local African immigrant populations, who can enrich our programs while also benefiting from our activities.

5. Developing an Alumni Network

Despite having graduated scholars for more than 50 years who have gone on to successful careers in academia, government, and non-governmental work, the ASC currently has no formal system of maintaining contact with alumni. For development purposes, to provide networking for current students, and to strengthen our overall programs, we need to become much more systematic about developing an alumni network. We need an alumni newsletter that appears annually at the very least, and we need to be much better about tracking our alums – including undergraduates – and keeping them informed about our program.

**Center for the Study of Asia
Strategic Planning, 2010-2020**

A. Mission Statement

The mission of Boston University's Center for the Study of Asia (BUCSA) is to promote comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and cross-national understanding of Asia at Boston University. Operationally, it provides a focal point and institutional support for the study of Asia across Boston University through coordination of teaching missions, support of research, community-building among faculty and students, and outreach beyond the university.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

It is not clear how best to identify BUCSA's academic peer group or how to specify useful comparative data. For the purposes of this strategic planning exercise, we are focusing primarily on those functions over which BUCSA has direct control—i.e., programming, research support, community-building, and outreach. In this respect, the most relevant comparisons would be with centers that do not offer their own courses or degrees or have their own faculty lines. Even within that group of Asia centers, there is great diversity based on resources, missions, and staffing, and much of the relevant data (including budgets, endowments, facilities, and grants) is unobtainable.

That said, the following is a list of what we see as our peer group. They are centers that are pan-Asian, comprehensive (across disciplines and regions), and based at major research universities. Perhaps the most similar in terms of its newness and limited mission is the University of North Carolina, but even that program is significantly different insofar as (a) it has fewer and less prominent Asia faculty than BU, and (b) it has been created in connection to a significant fund-raising effort that has both created an endowment and driven new hiring. Almost all of the other programs listed grant degrees and offer their own language and area studies programs; moreover, most have received Title VI funding:

- Cornell University (Title VI)
- George Washington University
- Michigan State University (Title VI)
- University of Colorado, Boulder (Title VI)
- University of Pittsburgh (Title VI)
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
- University of Texas, Austin
- University of Washington (Title VI)

2. Faculty

a. Scholarly/research quality

BUCSA has over 70 members; moreover, according to our records, over 100 BU full-time faculty members maintain a significant research and/or teaching interest in Asia. Asia-focused faculty can be found in at least 25 departments and 10 colleges and schools within BU. BU's Asia faculty appear to be highly productive scholars. Asia faculty have received a variety of prestigious awards and other recognition within their disciplines, including grants from the Carnegie Corporation, Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Henry Luce Foundation, Andrew Mellon Foundation, Pew Charitable Trusts, Smith-Richardson Foundation, Japan Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education, among others. However, given the diversity of faculty research interests, it is not possible to provide useful

data on the professional accomplishments of Asia faculty or to identify either refereed or “high quality” publications across such a broad range of disciplines.

b. Educational/pedagogical contributions

BUCSA does not offer its own courses. The popularity of Asia-related courses (see below) and several teaching awards that have recognized Asia faculty (e.g. Metcalf Award for David Eckel) support anecdotal evidence of pedagogical quality.

c. Major professional and public service contributions

We do not have full data on professional and public service contributions of Asia faculty. Highlights of recent years include: Husain Haqqani’s appointment as Pakistani Ambassador to the U.S., Robert Hefner’s election as President of the Association of Asian Studies, Adil Najam’s appointment to the UN Committee for Development Policy, Thomas Barfield’s leadership of the American Institute of Afghanistan Studies, Merry White’s work with Cambodian coffee farmers and as a Japan board member of the Boston Children’s Museum, and Andre de Quadros’ work with the BU Global Health Initiative and the Darpana Academy of India. The International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History (ICEAACH) under Robert Murowchick’s leadership has also been very active in community outreach.

3. Academic Programs

BUCSA does not currently offer its own academic programs or courses. We have submitted a proposal to create a Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies, which has been approved by CAS faculty but is still awaiting university approval. Looking more broadly at Asian studies, there are undergraduate majors and minors in East Asian Studies, Japanese Language and Literature, and Chinese Language and Literature, in addition to the popular East Asia track in the Department of International Relations. The language majors/minors are currently administered through MLCL, while the others are administered through the IR Department.

a. Assessment of undergraduate education

Asia-related courses are extremely popular among BU undergraduates. According to an incomplete BUCSA survey of courses offered in the Fall 2009 semester, 1,085 individual undergraduates were enrolled in Asia-related courses in CAS/GRS; total enrollment in CAS Asia courses at the 500-level and below totaled 1,254. Asia-related courses in CAS served students across the BU community. While the highest enrollment could be found in MLCL courses, other courses in the humanities and social sciences also attract significant numbers of students, particularly in Religion and IR/Political Science. Preliminary analysis of a broader course database that includes non-CAS classes suggests that Asia-related courses account for a combined annual enrollment of about 3,000 (undergraduate and graduate) per year.

The popularity of Asia-related courses in CAS has been accomplished with only about 40 tenure-track faculty members (many of whom teach primarily disciplinary rather than area studies classes) and a corps of mostly part-time language lecturers. The lack of full-time language instructors is particularly worrisome, and we fear that it is impacting BU’s ability to adequately instruct students in the difficult but critically important languages of Asia. Given the importance of language for understanding Asia, as well as the relatively small number of students who enter college with proficiency in Asian languages, this should be a major focus of BU’s efforts to improve undergraduate education on Asia. There are also significant gaps in coverage of Asia-related subjects, particularly with regard to South Asia.

BUCSA also contributes directly to undergraduate education about Asia by sponsoring talks, film series, and other events that dovetail with specific courses.

b. Assessment of doctoral programs/masters programs

There is considerable interest in Asia among both BU doctoral and master's students. One indication is the healthy enrollment in 500- and 700-level courses. Moreover, many graduate students in the social sciences and humanities have chosen to focus their efforts on Asian topics. Using library records, we have identified at 110 PhD dissertations on Asia-related topics since 2000, spread across a variety of departments and schools, including Anthropology, Archaeology, Economics, History, Music, Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, and Theology. Data on master's students is less easily available or comparable, but one indicator of student interest in Asia is that since 2005, 48 Master's Papers (of a total of 211) in the Department of International Relations have been focused on Asian topics.

We expect that these numbers will increase. BUCSA is seeking to increase the visibility and attractiveness of graduate study of Asia by introducing the proposed Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies and by applying Title VI National Resource Center designation and FLAS scholarships. Also, the expansion and increasing prestige of BU's Asia faculty should increase the numbers of Asia-focused graduate applications and matriculants in a variety of disciplines.

c. Other academic programs

BUCSA has proposed a Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies, which has been approved by the CAS faculty. We expect final university approval by the end of the year, allowing us to confer it on graduating MA and PhD students in the next graduation cycle. We intend to start advertising it on our own and in tandem with cognate departments in CAS and schools and colleges (e.g. SMG, SFA, SPH, and COM).

The graduate certificate will be available to graduate students enrolled in any of BU's schools or colleges. It will constitute a formal credential to demonstrate students' knowledge of Asia and should be an attractive recruiting tool for students in a variety of fields. With its requirements of reading proficiency in an Asian language, four Asia-related courses at the graduate level, and an Asia-related capstone project (dissertation, master's thesis, or equivalent), the proposed certificate will be one of the more rigorous graduate certificate programs in the country.

d. Interdisciplinary initiatives

All of BUCSA's activities reflect a recognition of the need for interdisciplinary study of Asia:

- BUCSA sponsors a variety of events to foster discussion and learning about Asia, including:
 - Monthly faculty lunches to facilitate interdisciplinary discussion and build community
 - Conferences and public lectures by scholars, public intellectuals, and practitioners
 - Artistic performances and films
 - Joint events on food culture with the Gastronomy Lecture Series
- Sponsorship of collaborative research projects, such as the project on "Leisure and Social Change in Asia," which engages scholars from AN, HI, STH, and MLCL
- Working with student groups with a focus on Asia, providing them, when appropriate, with financial resources and logistical support for their events and initiatives
- The Graduate Certificate in Asian Studies will improve recruitment for existing degree programs, publicize graduate-level course and research opportunities for students interested in Asia, and encourage interdisciplinary study by graduate students
- BUCSA also works with units across BU, including the library system and ICEAACH, to improve collections (e.g., the 2008 acquisition of a valuable collection of Japanese art history journals now housed in ICEAACH)

e. International/global initiatives

BUCSA is deeply involved in international and global initiatives. The activities of BUCSA and other regional centers and programs will be pivotal in the success of BU's stated strategic goals of making undergraduate and graduate education at BU more global and interdisciplinary. We have worked directly with the Office of International Programs on the Shanghai exchange program and the faculty exchange program with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. BUCSA has also cooperated with the Japanese and Taiwanese governments. It administers an annual Taiwanese Ministry of Education grant that funds course development, Chinese language initiatives, and Chinese-language collections at ICEAACH. In February 2009, it held a Track Two dialogue for US and Japanese academics and Japanese diplomats.

f. Outreach initiatives

Outreach is an important part of BUCSA's mission, but is as yet undeveloped. Individual faculty members as well as ICEAACH have been active in outreach locally and globally; BUCSA hopes to contribute to these efforts as well as to initiate or coordinate efforts. This is not feasible given current staffing and funding. To a considerable extent, success in outreach will be contingent on success of BUCSA's Title VI application; however, BUCSA has begun preliminary work with organizations including the Boston Children's Museum, Primary Source, and the National Consortium for Teaching about Asia. Individual BUCSA faculty members continue to work closely with these organizations.

4. Facilities

The current BUCSA facilities are sufficient for our current activities, but will not be sufficient to accommodate our expected expansion, particularly as we move into outreach. We should have our own seminar room and reading room, shared with the Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations (SMSC). Ideally, we hope to have our own building with a library, classroom and office space, seminar room, and lounge area. This would require the receipt of major gifts from alumni.

5. Other infrastructure

To accomplish its mission, BUCSA must expand its staffing. Currently, administrative functions are carried out by a part-time administrator and the director, with the assistance of two work-study students. If the Title VI application succeeds, we will need a full-time administrator and at least a half-time outreach coordinator (possibly split with SMSC and/or African Studies). In addition, the library system should have at least one Asia bibliographer to ensure that our collections meet the needs of teaching and research. If the Title VI application is not successful in 2010, BUCSA will still need a shift to at least a half-time administrator, which is feasible given current budget parameters. To support the desired expansion of capabilities, BUCSA will continue to pursue grants and gifts.

6. Collaboration with other academic units and institutions

BUCSA works closely with a variety of units in the university:

- We currently share an administrator and office space with SMSC. BUCSA and SMSC have significant geographical and thematic overlap, as well as faculty in common.
- We have worked with ICEAACH to improve collections and plan to partner in providing outreach and supporting other activities.
- We have been working with MLCL to increase the number of full-time language instructors, including through alumni appeals.

- We are also seeking alumni gifts to support faculty development in Asian studies and language pedagogy.
- We have been in discussions with the Writing Program about how to expand freshmen's exposure to Asia. We have included this priority in grant applications as well.
- We have co-sponsored events with units across the university.
- We have also worked with the office of Development and Alumni Relations in providing content for alumni events and targeted fundraising efforts.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten year plan

a. Summary

Internally, we expect that BUCSA will be a major force driving interdisciplinary research and learning. We hope that BUCSA's events will be heavily attended by students, faculty, and the broader community and that we will support the growth of Asian studies across the university. Externally, we want BU to be a major destination for students and scholars with an interest in Asia. We want to be a Title VI National Resource Center for Asian Studies, with a well-respected language and area studies program and significant outreach impact.

b. Specifics

1. Faculty: We hope to see significant growth in faculty to reflect both growing student interest in Asia and the growing importance of the region to many disciplines. Top priorities include:

- South Asian languages (Hindi/Urdu at the very least) will be offered up to an advanced level in addition to our current language offerings.
- The Japanese and Chinese language programs will not be reliant on part-time lecturers.
- Asia—particularly South and Southeast Asia—will be adequately represented in history and literature.
- We will have more scholars of Asia who can handle transnational and interdisciplinary work on key contemporary problems, such as environmental degradation, public health, and non-traditional security, regardless of department.

2. Undergraduate education

- More courses in the areas noted, particularly South Asian languages, literature, history, and the arts, and more Asia content in the Writing Program and divisional studies.
- More students will be involved in advanced Asian language study.

3. Doctoral education

- Scholarship money will be available to support doctoral research in the study of Asia, funded by competitive national and international grants as well as gifts.
- Support for doctoral students will be available to study Asian languages.

4. Masters education (research and professional): Same as for doctoral education.

5. Other academic programs

- Significant use (15-20 graduates per year) of the Graduate Certificate.

6. Interdisciplinary initiatives

- Expansion of support for interdisciplinary research and for outreach.
- Support International Programs in building a set of exchange programs in Asia to allow all students to access a high-quality BU education there.
- Expand cooperation with the Medical Campus (especially School of Public Health and Center for Global Health and Development), SFA, and other schools.

7. Facilities

- This depends on our ability to raise funds. Ideally, we would like to have our own building with office space, classrooms, seminar room, and a library built on existing collections.
- In the absence of a major gift, we would like to share an office suite with SMSC that is central and includes a seminar room and reading room.

8. Other infrastructure

- Sufficient staff to carry out our goals. At the least, this will include a full-time administrator, Asian-language bibliographer, and an outreach coordinator.

9. Collaborations

- Continue to support teaching, faculty research, and professional development.
- Outreach: significant outreach activities, including K-12 teacher training, school visits, matchmaking between the BU community and local schools and community organizations, and making BU a destination for community events.

b. Resources

Many of the goals listed above are beyond BUCSA's control, and their accomplishment will be dependent on the priorities of other departments. However, we strongly support the Asian studies goals of MLCL, HI, IR, and other departments. Meanwhile, BUCSA is pursuing a variety of fundraising avenues, including grants (such as Title VI) and alumni donations.

2. Measures for evaluating progress

With regard to BUCSA's own activities, metrics will include attendance figures for events, publications stemming from joint research projects, attendance and evaluations of outreach activities, and fundraising in the form of grants and gifts. Serious monitoring and benchmarking will not be possible without a full-time administrator. Looking at Asian studies broadly, metrics will include course enrollments, disciplinary and geographic coverage, advanced language study, use of Asia-based exchange programs, and tracking of alumni. This level of evaluation will be required if BUCSA is successful in being designated a Title VI National Resource Center for Asia, but will necessitate a full-time administrator, an external evaluator (according to DOE regulations), and cooperation from the alumni office.

3. Five-year goals

We hope to be an established Title VI National Resource Center for Asia, and to be well on the way to achieving our other goals. BUCSA is currently preparing an application for the Title VI competition. We are

also working with departments regarding faculty priorities and with the Office of Development and Alumni Relations to raise funds from donors. It is, unfortunately, impossible to specify goals for donations or grants, as these are contingent on many things beyond our control. It is also impossible to measure BUCSA's progress by observing faculty hires, insofar as they are carried out by departments.

International Center for East Asian Archaeology and Cultural History (ICEAACH)
Department of Archaeology, Boston University
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

ICEAACH's mission is to foster public awareness and research on the archaeology and rich cultural traditions of East and Southeast Asia, as well as to build bridges between BU and Asia through collaboration and exchange. We are a unique, internationally recognized interdisciplinary hub for our burgeoning field, serving students, scholars, and the general public. As part of the Archaeology Department, ICEAACH supports courses, sponsors talks, and creates training opportunities. We produce field-leading research, maintain a premier specialist library, and provide the ARC/Base Bibliographic Database to an international, multi-disciplinary audience. ICEAACH enhances BU's profile in the local and global community through our emphasis on outreach and academic exchange.

B. The Present

1. Peer group

Since we are a center focusing on East and Southeast Asia that is part of the greater Department of Archaeology, which has a higher-level strategic plan and a separate peer group, we herein define ICEAACH's peers as those institutes *or* university departments *outside of Asia* that have clusters of faculty, students, and other scholars focusing on this same world region and significant, regionally-focused research resources available to them. Our finding in this comparison is that our position as a research center that specializes across Central, East, and Southeast Asia, within a large, leading archaeology degree program that is truly global, and within a large research university with large numbers of Asian Studies faculty, places us in a rather unique position. Faculty at most other universities who work on Asian archaeology are scattered among different departments and do not enjoy a dedicated research center such as ICEAACH and the expansive international network of collaborating colleagues and institutions brought together by our programs and research activities. Research center peers tend to lack close integration with a large archaeology program, course offerings, and students in undergraduate and graduate degree programs. Perhaps none of our peers can match our attention to cultural heritage issues, our emphasis on public outreach and teacher training activities, our open-door policy for access to our Center's resources, and our openness to media consultation and advising.

One significant strength of the research center peers listed below over ICEAACH is that they all enjoy significant financial support through dedicated endowments or through other regular avenues of funding from individual, corporate, and foundation supporters, many of which are located in Hong Kong, Singapore, and China. This kind of long-term financial stability, not just for specific projects, but also for everyday operations and staffing, is something that ICEAACH is striving to achieve. Roughly comparable research centers would include:

- The International Centre for Chinese Heritage and Archaeology (ICCHA), University College, London (UCL) (<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/archaeology/china-archaeology/index.php>). Established and jointly managed since late 2003 by Peking University and UCL, this center's programming includes public and scholarly lecture series, exhibitions and other public awareness programs, the training of Chinese scholars in excavation and conservation techniques, and collaborative projects on heritage management issues as well as archaeological field projects. More broadly, the Center supports the teaching and research of two full-time positions in the University of London dedicated to Chinese archaeology, both positions shared equally between the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS) and UCL's Institute of Archaeology. Generous corporate, foundation, and individual donors, many of which are located in Hong Kong, fund the Center.

- Sainsbury Institute for the Study of Japanese Arts and Cultures (Norwich and London, England) (<http://www.sainsbury-institute.org/>). Established in 1999 with a major gift from Sir Robert and Lady Sainsbury, the SI is “an active source of and conduit for innovative research: positioning, revealing and interpreting the arts and cultures of the Japanese archipelago from the present to the past in regional, European and global contexts.” It maintains close collaborations with SOAS at the University of London, the University of East Anglia, and the British Museum, and is a major supporter of the development of East Asian library resources at SOAS.
- Needham Research Institute (NRI), Cambridge, England (<http://www.nri.org.uk/>), focuses on the study of the history of East Asian science, technology, and medicine, reflecting the interests and expertise of its founder, Joseph Needham. A private institute with close affiliations with Cambridge University and SOAS, NRI is housed in a beautiful research center on the Cambridge campus that provides administrative offices, space for visiting scholars (generally from East Asia), and a superb history of science library. In addition to its many public and scholarly workshops, NRI oversees scholars who produce topical volumes for the renowned series *Science and Civilisation in China* (including Murowchick and his colleagues, who are currently working on the *Non-Ferrous Metallurgy* volume).
- Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, UCLA (<http://www.ioa.ucla.edu/>) is a research center that is engaged in a wide range of archaeological endeavors, including research, publishing, and public outreach. It provides the home for UCLA’s Interdepartmental Archaeology Program and the UCLA/Getty Program in Archaeological and Ethnographic Conservation. Cotsen’s affiliated faculty at UCLA who work on ancient Asian art history and archaeology include seven full-time positions, including China (4), Japan (1), and South/Southeast Asia (2), making it one of the strongest such departments in the country. In addition to its excellent faculty, one of UCLA’s strengths in Asian archaeology has traditionally been its strong financial aid for graduate students in this field.

In addition to UCLA, other university departments that have particular strengths in East and Southeast Asian archaeology include:

- Dept. of Anthropology, University of Hawaii (www.anthropology.hawaii.edu/Programs/The%20four%20subfields/Archaeology/index.html), principally focusing on East and Southeast Asia, and Oceania, with four full-time East/Southeast Asian archaeology faculty and a full roster of undergraduate and graduate courses and many active field projects. It also serves as the home for the peer-reviewed journal, *Asian Perspectives*, which publishes articles and reviews on Asian anthropology, archaeology, and related fields.
- Department of Anthropology, University of Washington (<http://depts.washington.edu/anthweb/index.php>), traditionally strong in Southeast Asian archaeology, and now expanding even more through a new Luce Foundation/ACLS grant to enhance East and Southeast Asian archaeology at UW. Currently five of their 36 Anthropology faculty members specialize in East and Southeast Asian archaeology, human evolution, and related specialties. UW currently devotes a large part of its Luce/ACLS grant to graduate student support.
- Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University (<http://www.princeton.edu/artandarchaeology/grad/>) counts East Asian archaeology as among its many strengths, with three full-time faculty (and two emeritus) focusing on this area. With the exception of the past year, Princeton’s engaging faculty, its top-flight library and museum collection resources in early East Asia, and its guarantee of full financial support for its graduate students are all important factors in its ability to draw top students interested in East Asian archaeology and early art history, who are superbly trained there. Many of the department’s public outreach programs are undertaken by its P.Y. and Kinmay W. Tang Center for East Asian Art (<http://www.princeton.edu/tang/index.xml>)

Other US and Canadian universities with established or expanding academic programs in East and/or Southeast Asian archaeology include Pittsburgh, McGill, Oregon, UC-Berkeley, Toronto, Arizona, Harvard, Washington University in St. Louis, Wisconsin, Stanford, Columbia, Chicago, and Penn.

As BU's program in East and Southeast Asian archaeology continues to expand as part of its four-year (2008-2012) grant from the Henry Luce Foundation for this purpose, it can begin to compete against most of these programs for students. In looking at the great growth in the importance of representation for Asian archaeology and heritage management issues in leading academic departments and research, it becomes clear that for BU to excel in the future and stand on top of the pack in terms of course coverage, library resources, and research opportunities, we will need additional Asian archaeology faculty with active field research programs and with the necessary complementary areas of expertise to properly cover the huge area of East and Southeast Asia. We will also need to be able to offer financial aid to top prospective students who seek to study in BU's archaeology degree programs.

2. Faculty

As a research Center, ICEAACH has no faculty of its own, but all ICEAACH programs are run by three PhD specialists, two of whom—Robert Murowchick (Assistant Prof.) and David Cohen (Adjunct Assistant Prof.)—are part of the Archaeology Department faculty. However, they are physically based at ICEAACH, and because of this, the center provides the home for East and Southeast Asian archaeology at BU, through their individual research projects and writing, the development of undergraduate and graduate-level courses, advising students and prospective students, the enhancement of scholarly resources (such as the ICEAACH library and related collections (<http://www.bu.edu/asianarc/library.shtml>), and fostering of research and employment opportunities for the department's students. Along with Dr. Jeffrey Kao (ICEAACH Database Manager), they have been very successful over the past ten years in raising grants and donations to support the Center's operations and special projects, obtaining more than \$3 million in grants, cash donations, and in-kind donations (books, journals, and maps for the ICEAACH library), including two major grants from the Luce Foundation (\$750k and \$190k, not including a third Luce grant to the Dept. of Archaeology for \$450k to enhance East and Southeast Asian archaeology); three grants from the Andrew Mellon Foundation for ARC/Base development (\$140k, \$787k, and \$600k), and more than \$600k in donations from individuals.

The scholarly research quality of the Center's faculty/professional staff is excellent. All are active scholars with complementary expertise in geographical, topical, and chronological coverage: Murowchick (Chinese and Southeast Asian archaeology, bronze metallurgy and history of technology, history of archaeology, archaeological heritage management); Cohen (Complex society, state formation, and ethnicity in China; early Japan; Pleistocene-Holocene transition in East Asia; hunter-gatherers and agricultural origins; digital data management in archaeology), and Kao (Chinese archaeology; jade and other lapidary studies; digital data management in archaeology and library sciences). Their field research projects are described at <http://www.bu.edu/asianarc/fieldprojects.html>. Through support from the Mellon Foundation, they are also developing the ARC/Base Project, a comprehensive, multilingual bibliographic database for East Asian archaeology, in collaboration with key institutions across East and Southeast Asia. This is a critical initiative in digital information services for the field of East Asian archaeology, as the field lacks a comprehensive, multilingual bibliographic database. ICEAACH leads a large, international team of collaborating institutions who share responsibilities for inputting bibliographic data from their home regions into the ARC/Base database, which also builds strong collegial relationships between BU and scholars across the entire region, from the Russian Far East to insular Southeast Asia.

These ICEAACH staff scholars are also involved in a number of educational enhancement activities for undergraduate and graduate students. These include workshops on conducting on-line research concerning Asian resources; seminars for graduate students on how to identify and procure funding for research from individual donors, foundations, and other sources; and a workshop on public outreach opportunities for archaeologists. ICEAACH provides up to ten students each year with employment opportunities on the ARC/Base Project and other ICEAACH programs, giving them hands-on experience and responsibilities on a variety of tasks that they will face in their future careers as archaeologists and academics.

Finally, ICEAACH staff members are continually involved in professional and public service contributions. In addition to the ARC/Base Project, these include dozens of public outreach lectures to K-12 teachers and their students, and to museum educators and docents. ICEAACH has provided the editorial home for the *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* since 1999, co-edited by Murowchick and Lothar v. Falkenhausen (UCLA), with David Cohen serving as Managing Editor. Murowchick has also served for six years (2004-2010) as a Trustee on the Governing Board of the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), currently serves on the board of BU's Center for the Study of Asia (BUCSA), and on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Field Archaeology* (Boston, MA), and *East Asia Journal: Studies in Material Culture* (London), and as a proposal reviewer for the NSF, the Luce Foundation, the American Council of Learned Societies, and numerous academic presses.

3. Academic Programs

ICEAACH plays a key role in the development of BU's Asian archaeology and Asian Studies curriculum, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels. A growing roster of East and Southeast Asian archaeology courses, and Asia-related course support through ICEAACH faculty and resources, is currently being added to the Department of Archaeology curriculum, providing new perspectives and new foundational knowledge to BU students concerning this increasingly important area in world archaeology and cultural heritage management. This has been made possible through the \$450,000 East Asian Archaeology institutional enhancement grant (7565-6) from the Henry Luce Foundation, with Murowchick's status changing to FT teaching. Current courses include AR 240 (The Archaeology of Ancient China, which had been taught *pro bono* in the past by Murowchick and Cohen), and two new courses developed under the Luce grant, AR 390/790 (The Archaeology of Southeast Asia), and AR 795 (Politics, Nationalism, and Archaeology). Additional new courses are currently in development, as well as a slate of additional courses in Cohen's specialties that could also be offered with funding. The Luce grant also provides for the teaching of occasional courses by visiting or other non-regular faculty, the first of which may be offered in 2010. While this is a promising start for our program, to be truly competitive with our peers into the future and to lead the field, which we certainly have the potential to do, further regional and topical course offerings covering the entirety of the region would greatly strengthen our standing, but would also require additional faculty contributions.

Our undergraduate and graduate students heavily utilize the rich scholarly resources available at ICEAACH, for their coursework, preparation for qualifying exams, and in research, including fieldwork projects. These resources include the advisory expertise and collegial networks of Murowchick, Cohen, and Kao; our library, map, and image collections; and financial support. ICEAACH connections have placed undergraduate and graduate students in exciting field research opportunities in China, Japan, Mongolia, Singapore, Malaysia, Indonesia, Cambodia, and elsewhere in the region. The major issues we face are the need for more financial support for graduate students as well as the lack of endowed funding to provide long-term stability for key ICEAACH staff positions.

The Center also promotes East Asian archaeology and related topics at BU through guest lectures by Murowchick and/or Cohen in other undergraduate and graduate courses, such as AR100 (Great Discoveries in Archaeology); AR 261 (Heritage of Asia); HI 389 (Premodern China); AR 706 (Archaeology of Complex Societies); and AH 726 (Arts of Japan Colloquium). We are an integral part of the activities, functions, and committees of Department of Archaeology (Cohen does this *pro bono*), and contribute to the Department's presence in the greater community, including the preparation of a multimedia presentation for the annual CAS Majors Expo, and participation in CAS prospective student luncheons and BUCSA events (Murowchick also on Board). Murowchick serves as advisor and thesis reader for BU and external students, most recently including Mr. Chiang Po-yi's M.A. thesis at Australia National University on bronze metallurgy of the Dian culture (southwest China), and Dr. Jay Jie Xu's Ph.D. thesis at Princeton on bronze metallurgy of the Sanxingdui culture of central Sichuan province, China.

BU's graduate opportunities in Asian archaeology now attract a growing number of highly qualified graduate student applicants. The Luce Foundation grant and Presidential Fellowships allow us to provide the significant support necessary to entice the best students to come to BU. The first of these supported PhD students specializing in East Asia arrived in September 2009: Ms. Ilaria Patania from Italy (Presidential Fellowship), and Mr. GUO Zhengdong from China (Luce Foundation Fellowship). While we offer admission to other highly qualified applicants,

the reality is that without BU financial aid, the vast majority—including those whose first choice is BU—decides to go to schools offering aid.

One of ICEAACH's great strengths is its broad array of *international initiatives* with key institutions and scholars in Asia. The success of these ventures is indicated by their rapid expansion, as more and more international institutions and scholars are seeking relationships with ICEAACH. A few of these current programs include:

- Field research projects in China are formally approved collaborations, as mandated by Chinese law. These include the Early Shang Civilization Project (with the Institute of Archaeology, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences); the *Origins of Rice Agriculture in South China* project (with the Hunan Institute of Archaeology, Peking University, and the Weizmann Institute, which has yielded (among other things) the world's earliest pottery. Over the next several years, this project's excavation of an early Neolithic village, could provide exciting field opportunities for BU students); and the *Science and Civilisation in China Non-Ferrous Metallurgy Project* (with the University of Science and Technology Beijing, Qinghua University, the Institute of History and Philology at Academia Sinica [Taipei], and the Needham Research Institute [Cambridge, UK]). Our graduate students' field projects include the Khovd Archaeological Project (Univ. of Pennsylvania, with the National University of Mongolia); and the Banten Archaeological Project (with the National University of Singapore and the Indonesian Institute of Archaeology), with additional field opportunities in Japan.
- Formal collaborative ties with the archaeology program at Kyushu University (Japan) that paves the way for research and exchange opportunities, the first of which took place in December 2009 with Cohen invited to lecture in Japan along with graduate student Veronica Joseph.
- ARC/Base Bibliographic Database Project includes formal collaborative agreements with the Chinese Institute of Archaeology (Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing), Peking University School of Archaeology and Museology, Vietnam Institute of Archaeology (Hanoi), Kyushu University, and the Pacific Institute of Geography (Far Eastern Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vladivostok, Russia), with many others in development, creating a unique network in our field, one that transcends political and linguistic barriers that have traditionally limited research.
- Archaeological Heritage Management collaborations with Heritage Watch (Phnom Penh, Cambodia), ICOM (Int'l Council on Museums)/UNESCO, the US State Dept., and other US and foreign agencies.
- Short-term visits by leading Asian researchers, and longer-term Visiting Scholars to ICEAACH from China, Taiwan, Korea, and Vietnam.
- Lecturers for the *East Asian Archaeology Forum* series, funded by the Humanities Foundation, from China, Mongolia, Korea, Vietnam, New Zealand, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Russia, England, Italy, and Japan
- Editorial home for the *Journal of East Asian Archaeology*, with an international editorial board, and published by Brill (Leiden) (but note problems, below)
- Ongoing book and journal exchange programs with institutions in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Indonesia, Taiwan, China, Philippines, Japan, and Korea.

ICEAACH *outreach initiatives* have been both numerous and highly successful, sometimes also involving the Dept of Archaeology's undergraduate and graduate students. The demand for these programs is high indeed, especially as K-12 public school curriculum guidelines increasingly require the teaching of Asia-related content, and feedback (in the form of formal program evaluations and letters from participants) has been highly enthusiastic. The outreach programs provide up-to-date, scholarly information for a broad public audience, and help to fulfill BU's mission to serve the broader community. A comprehensive listing of ICEAACH outreach initiatives, including the *East Asian Archaeology Forum* public lecture series, are attached as Appendices 1 and 2.

4. Facilities and Infrastructure

The 5th floor offices provided for ICEAACH since 2000 at 650 Beacon Street have served us very well, providing suitable space for staff, library collections, Visiting Scholars, seminar meetings, and for the expanding work of the ARC/Base Project. BU's IT and facilities mgt. support has been excellent, although the building itself faces some serious challenges, including three episodes of flooding since 2000, and a temperamental elevator that for the past year has caused the US Postal Service to refuse to make any mail deliveries to our building, a serious inconvenience for us as well as for the commercial tenants of the building.

While we have been pleased with our space at 650 Beacon in Kenmore Square, our physical distance from the rest of the Department of Archaeology (located in Stone Science Building, at the east end of CAS) has hindered our visibility to students and to visitors, and thereby also has hidden the true breadth of the department's geographical expertise. However, the reality of space in CAS is that the present area occupied by the Archaeology Dept. could not accommodate the space needs of ICEAACH, and we are perfectly happy to remain in Kenmore Square for the foreseeable future. In the long term, it would be beneficial to us and to the Archaeology department if we could all be housed in the same building. Another option would be if BU could eventually build a separate Asian Studies building, an idea that has been discussed in the past in the context of discussions with a potential donor who might be interested in such a plan. This would bring together many of BU's strengths in Asian Studies, including its relevant research centers such as ICEAACH and BU's several substantial Asia-related library collections (and make more efficient the language-capable staffing needs of such a library). Such a development would also dramatically demonstrate both to insiders and outsiders BU's remarkably broad interdisciplinary strengths in Asia Studies.

5. *Interdisciplinary Collaborations*

As described above, ICEAACH is involved in a wide range of interdisciplinary collaborations across the University and with other area institutions, including working closely with BUCSA, and with Asia-related faculty in Anthropology, Art History, and History, and with collaborative programming with the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Children's Museum, and other institutions.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

(1) Faculty Plans and (2) Teaching Curriculum, and Collaboration

With its widely respected programs and resources, ICEAACH contributes to BU's missions to excel in undergraduate and graduate education and to build international and interdisciplinary collaborations. We will continue to work closely with the Archaeology Dept. and with BUCSA to strategize how best to identify the needed areas of expansion for Asian archaeology, and how to realize those expansions and leverage cross-departmental collaborations. With the current Luce grant, we are developing new Asia-related archaeology courses for 2010 and beyond, arranging for visiting faculty, and are working towards the establishment of a certificate program in archaeology that focuses on Asia.

ICEAACH has provided the editorial home for the *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* since 1999, with a Managing Editor at ICEAACH funded for its first four years by part of the original ICEAACH Luce Foundation grant, and has produced five excellent 450-page peer-reviewed volumes. With the expiration of that grant and the emergence of other budgetary priorities at ICEAACH, the journal has languished without having a paid editor who could steward manuscripts through reviews, editing, and publication. The current situation is unsatisfactory, both to us and to its publisher, Brill (Leiden). We need to strategize how to reorganize *JEAA* in a way that will be self-sustaining, either through BU or through a different commercial or academic publisher, with the necessary staff to ensure its future excellence as a critical peer-reviewed journal in our field.

3. Facilities and Infrastructure

While we are very satisfied with our current space, in the short term we need to solve the USPS mail delivery problem to our building. Over the longer-term, as numbers of students increase and ICEAACH library and research resources continue to expand, multi-function additional space on the 5th floor at 650 Beacon would be very helpful. There are two remaining offices on the 5th floor, currently housing the Association of Literary Scholars and Critics (ALSC), that would serve this purpose very well without requiring major renovation or relocation/reconfiguration of the rest of the center, should those offices become available. We would eventually like to achieve better physical integration with Archaeology and/or Asian Studies, which would improve the visibility and impact both of our Center and the breadth of coverage of BU's Archaeology and Asian Studies programs.

4. Summary of New Resources Needed

- Support for an ICEAACH office administrator that is not necessarily linked to specific project funding, to provide long-term stability for the Center's operations.
- Additional FT teaching faculty position in Asian archaeology that would include Center responsibilities and program oversight
- Long-term solution to achieve better integration with Archaeology and/or Asian Studies and address space concerns as student numbers increase and research collections expand

5. Measures for Evaluating Progress

- Quality of the undergraduate and graduate students specializing in Asian archaeology, and utilizing ICEAACH resources and programs
- Funding success for ICEAACH programs and research projects
- Attendance and participation at ICEAACH events
- Local, national, and international interest in collaborating with ICEAACH scholars and their projects and in using ICEAACH research collections
- Positive feedback from outreach event participants
- Numbers of popular media reports, documentaries, etc., appearing with ICEAACH consultations
- Scholarly publications produced with ICEAACH support or use of ICEAACH collections
- Fieldwork and resulting publications supported in part by ICEAACH or by ICEAACH staff

6. Five-year Plan

- ICEAACH will continue to expand our existing programs of teaching, interdisciplinary research, outreach, and the development of scholarly resources and innovative opportunities for students that will help move the University forward, focusing on selective investments that will have the biggest impact on the curriculum, on BU's commitments as a corporate citizen of Boston, and that enhance its role as a global university. We will continue to seek funding from foundations and individual donors to support these expanding operations, and to effectively communicate our programs and resources nationally and internationally.
- Successful launch and expansion of the ARC/Base Project, including achieving self-sustainability through its business plan now being developed with Mellon Foundation-recommended consultant, ChainBridge Group.
 - Reformulation of the peer-reviewed *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* to achieve sustainability and regularity as an important English-language publication outlet for our field, maintaining its top academic quality. This might require configuring it as an occasional papers-type of publication.

**Editorial Institute
Strategic Planning, 2010-2020**

A. Mission Statement

Primary:

The MA provides a valuable bridge between undergraduate studies—which commonly contain no pedagogy directed at the transmission of written works, even in literary disciplines that depend on scrupulous editions—and Ph.D-level work. While it is true that the Ph.D proposals we receive are well conceived (a proposal is required from all applicants to the EI), we would be deprived of some of our most successful doctoral candidates if the MA were no longer offered as a training-ground for Ph.D work.

Secondary:

Alumni since 2000 have published (or are under contract for) the following work derived from their editorial studies:

Masters students:

- Baar, Regina, ed., “Flucht ins Land der Schönheit. Briefwechsel zwischen Georg Gottfried Gervinus und Karl Hegel auf ihrem Weg aus den Konflikten des deutschen Vormärz nach Italien - und zurück” [Correspondence of G. G. Gervinus and K. Hegel]
- Gauger, Annie, ed., *The Annotated Wind in the Willows, by Kenneth Grahame* (W. W. Norton, 2009) – major reviews in *The New York Review of Books*, *New York Times*, *National Review*, *Washington Times*, *Newsweek*, etc.)
- Mazer, Ben, ed. *John Crowe Ransom*, Library of America (forthcoming)
- Packard, Josephine, “A Discography of the Harvard Vociarium,” *Harvard Library Bulletin*, New Series Fall-Winter 2004, Volume 15, Numbers 3 and 4
- Spencer, Matthew, ed., *Elected Friends: Robert Frost & Edward Thomas to One Another* (Hansel Press/Other Press, 2004)

Ph.D students:

- Drummond, Clara, Associate Editor, *The Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning*, 5 vols. The Pickering Masters (Pickering and Chatto, 2009). (General Editor: Sandra Donaldson. Editorial Team: Rita Patteson, Marjorie Stone and Beverly Taylor. Associate Editors: Simon Avery, Cynthia Burgess, Clara Drummond and Barbara Neri. Editorial Associate: Jane Stewart Laux)
- Mazer, Ben, ed., *Frederick Goddard Tuckerman: Poems*, John Harvard Library, (Harvard University Press, forthcoming)
- Share, Don, ed. *Basil Bunting Poems* (forthcoming)

B. The Present

1. Academic Peer Group:

Closest matches to the Editorial Institute program are:

- **University of Washington**'s textual studies certificate program (<http://depts.washington.edu/texts/>), undertaken in conjunction with a Ph.D in another subject such as English: this offers four core courses and requires 2 electives, and results in a Ph.D in e.g. "History and Textual Studies." Major difference from the EI program is its offering no actual editorial experience (the dissertation component is in the principal discipline)
- **University of Virginia** provides two one-semester graduate-level courses (in the English Literature department) that address some aspects of our program: "Textual Criticism and Scholarly Editing," and the practicum "Literary Journal Editing" (<http://www.engl.virginia.edu/courses/graduate/grad101.shtml#SpecialTopics>). While UVA has a Scholar's Lab (<http://www2.lib.virginia.edu/scholarslab/>) that supports the preparation of electronic editions, and the Alderman Library houses the headquarters of NINES (Nineteenth-Century Scholarship Online), offering training in preparing electronic editions, this is not offered as part of a graduate program.
- **University of Toronto**'s Book History and Print Culture MA and Ph.D program similarly includes aspects of editorial studies within two courses that range much more widely: "Book History and Print Culture," and a practicum that may involve an editorial project (http://bookhistory.fis.utoronto.ca/core_course.html#1000).

2. Faculty:

Professor Marilyn Gaull, is the editor of the journal *The Wordsworth Circle* (based at the EI), general editor for Palgrave Lives and Letters series (for which she commissioned 58 volumes in the period, all now published), and a worldwide lecturer in climate history. Through her the EI has links to the history of science and mathematics). In Frances Whistler it has an experienced scholarly publisher and adviser.

2.a.(1)

Editorial work in progress includes:

- the general-editorial preparation for publication of the 11-volume *Stephen Edition* (based at the EI); at the start of the relevant period one year of Mellon Award money (a bit over \$0.5m) remained; it is under contract with Oxford University Press);
- the general-editing of a multi-volume *Samuel Beckett* edition and the textual editing of a multi-volume *Milton Complete Works*.
- the editing of 3 further scholarly editions (*Poems of Philip Larkin*, *James Fitzjames Stephen: On Fiction and Journalism*, and *Poems of T. S. Eliot*, commissioned by Eliot's widow and his publisher).

2.c.(1) There is no great difference between the scores of the three faculty members concerned. The variable between the highest and lowest Overall Course Rating is 0.277;

the variable for Overall Rating of the Instructor is 0.127

3.b.(2) EI508 (taught by Archie Burnett and Frances Whistler) replaced EI504 Textual Scholarship and Philosophy (formerly taught by Ken Haynes when Assistant Director). EI507 (taught by Frances Whistler, formerly Oxford University Press editor) replaced EI505 Textual Scholarship and Modern Technology, for which instruction was bought in: it principally taught SGML markup.

C. Strategic Plan For The Future

1.a. At present, student body is 12 (in Fall 2009 we accepted 1 new MA and 4 new Ph.D students), but growth to this point has partly been enabled by outside funding: first by the Mellon Award, and subsequently by Foundation funding [a 2-year gift to the EI by a family Foundation connected with one of our students] and 2 Bradley Fellowships p.a. for 2 years, which may not be continued. To date we support Ph.D students for their first 2 years only, and occasionally support tuition only, if the student applies too late for other funding. To maintain, let alone grow the student body by at least 25%, as we believe perfectly possible, increased financial aid for students would be needed.

Funding sources for the strategic plan at large might include Bradley and Mellon Foundations (e.g. to promote Visiting Fellowships), and BU Humanities Foundation to assist with conferences.

1.b.(2) Undergraduate take-up would increase if the EI were better advertised within CAS, COM, and BU at large. Undergraduates often say they weren't aware of the existence of the EI but had its classes recommended by fellow students (of course, the problem is compounded by the unavoidable ambiguity of "editing" in common parlance – meaning both the scholarly presentation of documentary works and the act of preparing new writings for publication). Cross-listing is proposed as follows:

EI501, 503, 508: Classics, English, History, Religion, Philosophy, Romance Studies and Modern Languages and Comparative Literature.

EI506, EI507: all Humanities subjects; COM

EI5801: Art History

1.b.(3) Access to COM journalism lab and/or IT/Computer Science to allow desktop and instruction (Quark, InDesign; electronic editing systems)

1.b.(6) The EI is a natural site for small, focused conferences, given its cross-disciplinary program and contacts, and two rooms each able to seat 40+. Proposed interdisciplinary conferences at the EI include:

Outside societies:

STS biennial meeting (last hosted here in 2008); ADE annual meeting.

Forthcoming:

Twain and Tolstoy centennial (August 2010)

Suggested:

1. (With BUSL), conference on the law and ethics of authorship
2. (With History, Archaeology, Environmental and Life Sciences, etc.), a conference on climate history
3. (With CFA, COM, and others) conferences on editing performance (i.e.

drama, ballet, folksong and other oral performance), and on editing visual materials (graphic novels, pictorial collections, historical film footage)

Archie Burnett
January 15, 2010

Institute for the Classical Tradition
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission of the Institute

To further research, teaching, and crossdisciplinary international exchange in the field of the ‘classical tradition’/‘reception studies,’ the most vibrant modern area of expansion among the subdisciplines of Classical Studies. The Institute serves this mission by working as the base of the International Society for the Classical Tradition (ISCT), founded by the Institute in 1991, and the Editorial Office of the Society’s *International Journal of the Classical Tradition (IJCT)* as well as (beginning in 2010) the book series ‘Boston University Studies in the Classical Tradition’ (BUSCT), and, hopefully in the future (beginning in 2010/11), the online *Analytical Bibliography of the Classical Tradition (ABCT)*.

Members of the Institute are: Its Director (Wolfgang Haase, Professor in the Department of Classical Studies) and an Administrative/Editorial Assistant (Ian Halbert, M.A., an alumnus of the B.U. Department of Classical Studies). Part-time coworkers are: the holder of a partial (\$10,000) graduate stipend of the Dept. of Classical Studies and a Work Study student (ca. 15 hours a week, during semesters only).

B. The Present: Description

1. Academic peer groups:

There are no peer programs at other universities directly comparable to the Institute in its present functions. There are only a few related enterprises, even fewer in center or institute form, in any country. In the USA there are, most importantly, the ‘Classical Traditions Initiative’ (<http://www.classics.northwestern.edu/cti/index.html>) at Northwestern University (Evanston, IL) and the ‘Contexts for Classics’ network (<http://www.umich.edu/~cfc/>) at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor, MI); in the UK: the ‘Centre for the Study of the Classical Tradition’ (<http://www.dur.ac.uk/classical.tradition/>) at the University of Durham, the ‘Reception of Classical Texts and Images’ research project (<http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/>) at the Open University (Milton Keynes), and the inter-university ‘Classical Reception Studies Network’ (<http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/crsn/index.shtml>); in Germany: the ‘Archive for Classical Receptions in German Language Literature after 1945’ (<http://www.antikerezeption.fu-berlin.de>) at the Free University Berlin and the ‘Greifswalder Zentrum für Antikerezeption’ (<http://www.uni-protokelle.de/nachrichten/id/56152>) at the University of Greifswald; in the Pacific region the ‘Australasian Classical Reception Studies Network’ (<http://www.acrsn.org/>) based at the University of Sydney, Australia.

These are loosely knit local or regional groups of scholars either coordinating their personal research and/or teaching on subjects of the classical tradition, or more coherent groups working on joint research projects with university support or outside grants. Only the unit at the Open University now also publishes a journal, beginning in the Fall of 2009, titled *Classical Receptions Journal*, appearing in English only and therefore being in effect less international than our *Journal*. Our Institute cooperates with all these centers and groups, which are several years younger. So far our Institute has been unique in the relation between its small size (one senior scholar and one Assistant) and its effects.

2. Beside the Institute Director (Wolfgang Haase, Professor in the Department of Classical Studies) there are no other faculty persons at the Institute.

3.a.-d. Because the Institute has no responsibilities of its own in teaching, there is nothing to report under these points.

3.e. Because the Institute is at present primarily an editorial center – running its own crossdisciplinary journal (the *International Journal of the Classical Tradition [IJCT]*) with its 17th volume in 2010, and being in the

starting phase of its own book series of the same character ('Boston University Studies in the Classical Tradition' [BUSCT]) – interaction with other academic programs primarily concerns helping to bring colleagues' scholarly work to publication: invited or freely offered research articles as well as invited review articles and book reviews, in the future (beginning in 2011) also monographs and books of all kinds.

To some extent special attention is given to junior scholars within the University, in the Department of Classical Studies and other units. In several volumes of the *Journal* invited contributions by junior scholars have appeared, who are either faculty members or alumni of the B.U. Department of Classical Studies. In one volume (12 [2005/06], pp. 507-562) a revised version of the research part (as distinct from an editorial part) has been published of a Ph.D. dissertation written at the Editorial Institute, with the *Journal* Editor (Wolfgang Haase) as second reader.

3.f. On an international/global level, because of the programmatically international publication venues based at the Institute, largely the same applies, as described under point 3.e.

3.g. Outreach initiatives: Because of the crossdisciplinary, international and multilingual character of the Institute's publications (journal and book series) there is on the scholarly level also some outreach effect. The broad recognition of the B.U.-based *Journal* as an early leader in its field and the name of B.U. in the title of the book series work in some way to spread recognition of B.U.

4.-5. Facilities and Other Infrastructure: In both regards the Institute is and will remain fully satisfied with its present conditions.

6. Collaboration with other academic units: In addition to supporting, with the Institute-based outlets, publication needs of colleagues in other units (see above, point 3.e.), there are the occasional guest teaching of the Institute Director at the Editorial Institute and the occasional provision of material and advice to colleagues researching or teaching subjects related to the classical tradition. A regular cooperative relationship is being prepared with colleagues in the Department of Classics of the University of Warwick.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

(The following is largely identical with the Institute's report to the Vice President and Associate Provost for Research, Section 3: The Institute's Future as a Research Center of Excellence.)

1. Ten year plan

With stability of the basic Institute budget from the University restored since 2005/06, the Institute has a chance again in the next five years (2010-2014) to obtain grants for specific projects, to encourage private donations, and to intensify and expand cooperative and exchange relationships with outside scholars and institutions.

The Institute's strategic plans, developed by the Institute Director in consultation with scholars inside and outside the University, are the following:

– The creation and online publication through the Institute website of a more and more indispensable research tool for the multidisciplinary field of the 'classical tradition'/'history of reception,' an annual *Analytical Bibliography of the Classical Tradition (ABCT)*. In the creation of *ABCT* several regional bases at international universities would cooperate, coordinated from the Institute. Exploration of the possibilities has already begun with promising results. For 2010 the first step toward realization will be to gain combined B.U. Humanities Foundation and outside funding for a 1-1 1/2-year proving phase, in which to produce major sample chunks of *ABCT* to serve as a basis for a compelling application to the NEH for major long-term funding. The Institute

Director has received discreet informal encouragement from several NEH program heads to prepare such an application.

– The development, as a regular feature in the Institute’s *International Journal of the Classical Tradition (IJCT)*, of an annual critical research report on classical receptions in the Arabic-Islamic world from the Middle Ages to the present time, reports to be created by variable international groups of scholars, coordinated in cooperation with the *IJCT* Editor (the Institute Director) by Professor Peter Pormann, Arabist and classical scholar at the University of Warwick, UK (already a multiple contributor to *IJCT*, most recently with a major article on the topic: “Classics and Islam: From Homer to al-Qā‘ida,” vol. 16 [2009], pp. 197-233). The subproject should become support-worthy in its own right, esp. from Arab sources.

– The organization/facilitation of scholarly conferences and lectures in the crossdisciplinary field of the classical tradition (as practiced in the 1990s, before an extended budget crisis reduced the activities of the Institute to the core task of editing the *Journal [IJCT]*) in cooperation with the B.U. Department of Classical Studies, the Department of Classics of the University of Warwick, the centers and networks mentioned above (under 3.1), and other scholars, the results largely to be published in the B.U.-based journal (*IJCT*) and book series (BUSCT). – Reasonable efforts will be made to derive direct and indirect benefits for teaching in Classics and related disciplines from the presence of visiting scholars at the University.

Ideally, in 10 years the Institute will still, and for additional reasons, be described as the first and one of the leading centers in the world furthering research, teaching and crossdisciplinary exchange in the flourishing field of the ‘classical tradition’/‘reception studies’ (cf. the words of the Mission Statement, above, point A.)

2.a.-b. Measures for evaluating progress/success will be the ongoing publication of the Institute-based journal (*IJCT*) and book series (BUSCT) and the running, with outside support, of all three additional projects described above under point C.1.

3.a.-c. Five year goals: structurally the same as indicated above under point C.2. a.-b.

3.b. To make it possible to achieve the five year goal, according to the Institute Director’s assessment the College and B.U. would only have to continue their support of the Institute to the present extent. The additional funds needed for future projects (especially ABCT; see above under point C.1.) will have to come from outside sources, then also contributing to general IDC recovery.

3.c. There is an implicit metrics for measuring progress in the description of projects above, under point C.1: e.g., journal volumes (*IJCT*) and book series volumes (BUSCT) published, years covered by the annual *ABCT*.

Institute for Philosophy and Religion (IPR)
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The long-standing historical mission of the IPR is to provide an interdisciplinary forum for the exploration of issues broadly involving philosophy, religion and public life. Its primary functions are currently threefold: (1) organizing and hosting an annual public conference and lecture series on an interdisciplinary topic involving well-known speakers from both within and without BU; (2) providing an interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate seminar that parallels the lecture series; (3) publishing notable papers from the Institute's program in its series *Boston University Studies in Philosophy and Religion*. The Institute's programming reflects the wide set of concerns implied in the conjunction in its title (philosophy *and* religion) but it has also been since its founding a prominent national forum for important academic work in the specific sub-discipline of the philosophy of religion.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

Founded in 1969-70 as the result of a collaboration of three BU academic units—the Departments of Philosophy and Religion and the School of Theology—the IPR's lecture and publication series have explored a wide range of interdisciplinary topics: civility, courage, loneliness, transcendence and the sacred. Most recently, the IPR has explored the questions of reconciliation and just peace (2007-08) and the multidisciplinary issues involved in the concept of narrative (2008-09). Under the present Director (who took over in Fall 2008), the three main aspects of the IPR's activities have all been broadened: (1) the lecture series in each of the past two years has been expanded to include a focal, two-day conference involving a wide group of interdisciplinary participants; (2) the seminar for undergraduate and graduate students, which had been in abeyance for several years, has been reinstated and restructured; and (3) a stronger publishing profile for the series has been explored.

(1) *Academic Peer Group*: Given the interdisciplinary character of the Institute, it is difficult to identify peer institutions of the sort relevant for the assessment of traditional departments. In American higher education, there are a number of *departments* of philosophy and religion (Butler, Colgate, Clemson, Mississippi, North Carolina State, James Madison University, Northeastern) but none of these is founded primarily as an *interdisciplinary institute* devoted to the sort of public and curricular programming hosted by the IPR (and, in fact, many of the departments with a dual disciplinary listing actually have separate faculty and major/minor listings for philosophy and religion). A more relevant point of comparison may be found in several interdisciplinary programs concerned with philosophy, religion and public life, although each of these is quite different in focus and structure. The University of Notre Dame's Center for the Philosophy of Religion <nd.edu/~cprelig/> is perhaps the best-known program in the country exploring connections between philosophy and religion, but it is structured in significantly different ways from ours: it does not sponsor the sort of extensive public lecture series ours does but instead supports a group of fellows who meet in the context of a workshop, with an annual lecture in addition (it is also, as ours is not, a confessionally defined program, with an interest in "specifically Christian and theistic philosophy"). Perhaps closer in spirit to the connections between religion and public life drawn by the IPR (and also not confessionally defined) are the programs at Princeton University's Center for the Study of Religion <princeton.edu/csr/>, which has hosted a wide-ranging set of lectures and workshops on issues at the "crossroads of religion and public life," and Boston College's Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life <<http://www.bc.edu/centers/boisi/>>, which hosts fewer lectures during the year. (Incidentally, we are collaborating with the Boisi Center on the planning of a conference on toleration during 2010-11). Both the Princeton and the Boston College programs also offer affiliated fellowships.

(2) and (3) *Faculty and Academic Programs*: Because the IPR is not a degree-granting program and does not have faculty lines of its own, this section will not be devoted to an assessment of the excellence of research associated with individual affiliated faculty, whose activities are evaluated by their relevant home departments. For the purpose of this strategic planning exercise, the most relevant assessment is of the IPR's research, pedagogical and outreach activities.

Scholarly/Research Quality: The IPR's primary scholarly and research output is its now 27-volume series, *Boston University Studies in Philosophy and Religion*, which has traditionally published expanded and revised versions of the best papers from each year's lecture series, with a coordinating introduction and research bibliography. This series is widely cited in other publications in philosophy and religion, and contains essays by some of the best-known names in their respective fields: Karen Armstrong, Robert Bellah, Wendy Doniger, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Charles Hartshorne, Bernard Lonergan, Jürgen Moltmann, W.V. Quine, Christopher Ricks, Paul Ricoeur, Ninian Smart, Huston Smith, Robert Thurman, and Elie Wiesel. Twenty-five of these volumes were originally published by University of Notre Dame Press, in an arrangement with the IPR's former director, Professor Leroy Rouser. Under the following directorship of Professor David Eckel, the two most recent volumes (26 and 27) have been published by Lexington Press (*Responsibility*) and Continuum (*Deliver Us From Evil*), respectively. The current IPR director is in discussion with Springer Verlag about a revitalized series that will expand our publication offerings and also raise its profile (see C(1)(1) below).

Educational/Pedagogical Contributions: The IPR's seminar for graduates and undergraduates parallels the lecture series and is a genuinely interdisciplinary course offering, with five different cross registrations (CAS PH 456, GRS PH 656, CAS RN 397, GRS RN 697 and STH TT 819). This course had traditionally been a central part of the IPR's programming but had not been offered for several years prior to its revitalization (in Fall 2008) by the present Director. The course has been successful in its iterations both last year and this year (total enrollment: 21 students in Fall 2008 and 29 students + 8 additional auditors in Fall 2009). In evaluations, students regularly cite the interdisciplinarity of the course and the integration of lectures into the seminar syllabus as primary reasons for their taking it.

Interdisciplinary, International/Global and Outreach Initiatives: Founded as an interdisciplinary program, the IPR has maintained a collaborative approach in its programming involving not only the original sponsoring academic units (Philosophy and Religion in CAS/GRS and the School of Theology) but, at one time or another, most of the humanities and social science departments in CAS and other interdisciplinary programs at BU, as well (see (6) below). Faculty from some eleven different BU departments have been involved as participants in this and last year's series. Our audience for lectures (ranging between 65 and 100 persons this past year) draws widely not just from students and faculty at BU but also from the general public (and we regularly incorporate new names each year into our mailing list database). Selected lectures from the series have been audiotaped for broadcast on WBUR and videotaped for access on BUiverse, and our programs have attracted the interest of local and campus media, including the *Boston Globe's* religion blog and *BU Today*. Many of our programs have a global and internationalist interest: last year's conference on reconciliation involved a number of speakers with experience in some of the world's more troubled areas of conflict (Iraq, Northern Ireland, the Middle East); our plans for a conference on toleration in the next academic year will similarly draw on a list of experts on specific global religious and political practices.

(4) and (5) *Facilities and Infrastructure*: The IPR has a modest infrastructure footprint: it is run out of a single office, which is also the director's regular faculty office in the Department of Philosophy (STH 523). Its programming budget comes from the annual CAS/GRS budget, supplemented by competitive grants from the BU Humanities Foundation and from time to time other university sources (this year the Distinguished Teaching Professor's budget has given us a modest grant to assist with an extra conference event); STH has traditionally awarded a graduate fellowship (in the past year \$12,000) to the IPR's part-time (20-hour) graduate assistant. While these are adequate levels of support for current activities, the maintenance of the program's

high quality and any expansion of the programs envisioned in C(1) below would require additional resources and office space.

(6) Collaboration with Other Academic Units and Institutions: As one of the oldest interdisciplinary programs at Boston University, the IPR has maintained a high degree of collaboration with other programs at BU. It has continued to work particularly closely with its triad of founding academic units, the Departments of Religion and Philosophy (CAS/GRS) and the School of Theology (STH), and it has also discussed and/or undertaken joint efforts with interdisciplinary programs such as the Division of Religious and Theological Studies, CURA, the Boston Center for the Philosophy and History of Science, the Elie Wiesel Center for Judaic Studies, the Luce Program in Scripture and the Literary Arts, the Frederick S. Pardee Center for the Study of the Longer-Range Future and the CAS Core Curriculum. Given the wide variety of interdisciplinary topics addressed by its lecture series, the IPR has also over the years drawn for individual lectures and conferences on just about every humanities and social science department within CAS/GRS, as well as programs in the College of Communication, CFA, etc. It has also welcomed collaboration with a number of Boston-area institutions, such as the Boston Theological Institute and Boston College's Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life (which is planning to co-host a conference with the IPR next academic year).

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

(1) Ten-Year Plan

In ten years, the IPR will be fifty. Our overall goal at the fifty-year mark, as at the forty, is to continue to be a primary center for well-planned interdisciplinary programming and publications involving philosophy, religion and public life. In addition to continuing the excellence of our present programs, we envision three areas of expansion:

- (1) Boost the profile of the publication series. The current series, as mentioned, is primarily drawn from the best papers of each year's lectures. This has given us a recognizable format but is limiting in terms of the number of philosophical/religious issues which can be explored and the sort of work that can be published. As part of an expanded proposal to Springer Verlag, we are proposing to begin publication of a series that will include not just "best papers" volumes but solicited monographs from the best writers in the fields of philosophy and religion, broadly construed (including, and especially, interdisciplinary work that illuminates questions of value, truth, reality and meaning, as well as topics in the relevant fields which have a particular intersection with public life—for example, philosophical and religious perspectives on contemporary issues in ethical and political philosophy).
- (2) Begin to offer fellowships to postdoctoral, graduate and perhaps even faculty whose research has connections with the larger mission and specific thematic programs of the IPR. It is worth noting that all three of the peer institutions mentioned above in section B(1) offer fellowships of some sort (as does BU's Center for the Philosophy and History of Science). Having an annual competition for fellows would be a further (and probably quite cost-effective) way to improve the program's visibility.
- (3) Although a wide number of faculty support and participate in the IPR's programs, it is still organizationally dependent on a single director, who plans, organizes, hosts, and fund-raises. A graduate assistant currently helps with details, but the ongoing health of the program and certainly any expansion suggests the need for additional staffing, especially to help with programming. An assistant director with a faculty appointment (who could be hired in conjunction with the faculties of the founding departments) would be helpful to maintain current levels of programming; a part- or full-time staff person would also be helpful, especially if we are to envision expansion of the program in terms of offering fellowships and expanding the monograph series.

Connected with the overall concern for maintaining a high-quality program and the expansion of our profile should be the search for longer-term outside funding. Current fund-raising efforts have had to focus largely on foundations whose interests may have some connection with our year-to-year themes; a more broadly-focused fund-raising project, with perhaps the goal of endowing some or several IPR programs for the long term would make sense, given our plans for expansion.

(2) Measures for Evaluating Progress

The primary measures for us will continue to be event and course attendance and quantitative and qualitative improvement in the lecture series, all of which are and can continue to be monitored by current staff.

(3) Five-Year Goals

For each of the three main goals mentioned above, progress at the five-year mark is envisionable in (1) the quantitative and qualitative improvement in the publication series; (2) the initiation of the first class of IPR fellows; and (3) the hiring of an assistant director and perhaps an additional staff person.

International History Institute
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The mission of the International History Institute (IHI) is to promote critical investigation of international history across disciplinary and departmental boundaries as essential to a full understanding of, and active participation in, global affairs. It supports the University's research mission with scholarly conferences leading to publications by IHI Fellows. It supports the University's teaching mission, at both the graduate and undergraduate level, by organizing seminars, lectures, faculty conferences, graduate student workshops, and film talks for students. Secondly, it promotes an outreach mission to the wider community through an open door policy for most of its conferences, seminars, lectures, and films.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group:

The IHI was unique in the United States upon its founding in 1999, and was the first institute in this country to use the term "International History." A peer group has since taken shape. The nearest equivalent is now the Center for International History (CIH) at Columbia University, founded in 2004. One of the CIH's founders, Professor Volker Berghahn of Columbia, was a participant in one of our early conferences. CIH follows our original model of faculty talks, seminars, and graduate student involvement. It also links to the IHI web site on its own site. However, CIH has far greater internal resources available. As a result, it is now slightly ahead of the IHI.

The Center for Cold War Studies and International History at the University of California, Santa Barbara is still emerging as a peer. It grew out of a single research project on the Cold War, only becoming a full-fledged Center in 2002. Although it lists interdisciplinary faculty among its members and asserts an aspiration to cover international history in its new title, it does not in fact promote research outside the narrow frame of the Cold War. It does not have permanent funding.

Similarly, the Mershon Network of International Historians (MNIH) at The Ohio State University is a 2003 offshoot of the Mershon Center on the Cold War. Its focus is exclusively on the 20th century, whereas IHI promotes a wider range and depth of international history. The great advantage of MNIH over IHI is that the former offers five doctoral fellowships through the Mershon Center and Department of History.

Outside the United States, international history is usually located in full departments with many faculty lines, notably the Department of International History at the London School of Economics and the International History/Politics program at the University of Aberystwyth, as well as other, mainly British, universities. These are not true IHI peers as they are full teaching, research, and degree-awarding departments, akin to our Departments of History and International Relations.

2. Faculty

The IHI does not host faculty lines. Director William Keylor holds a joint and tenured appointment as Professor of History and International Relations. Executive Director Cathal Nolan holds a non-tenured appointment as Associate Professor of History. Sixteen other Boston University faculty are affiliated as IHI Senior Fellows. Eight external faculty from Canada, the United States, France, Israel, and the United Kingdom are formally associated with the IHI.

a. Publications (2006 to the present): Keylor

1. Books

Encyclopedia of the Modern World, (2006), editor; and A World of Nations: The International Order Since 1945 (Second Edition, 2008). Book series co-editor, *International History*. Praeger (with Erik Goldstein and Cathal J. Nolan), 1999-2006.

2. Articles

« Le Débarquement et La Bataille de Normandie dans la Mémoire Collective Américaine de 1944 à 2004, » Actes du Colloque (Paris 2006). “The Wind of Change in 1956,” in Carole Fink, et al eds., 1956: European and Global Perspectives (Leipzig 2006). « The Treaty of Versailles, » in Encyclopedia of Europe: 1914-2004 (2006). “The Legacy of Wilsonianism,” Pierre Mélandri and Serge Ricard, Les Etats-Unis entre Uni- et Multilatéralisme de Woodrow Wilson à George W. Bush, (Paris, 2008). “La Tentation de l’Apaisement,” in Hélène Harter et al., eds., Terres Promises (Paris, 2008). «Il libro del secolo (e oltre),” *Contemporanea* (Anno XII, numero 1, gennaio 2009). “Franklin Delano Roosevelt in Europe,” in Gaynor Johnson (ed.), The International Context of the Spanish Civil War (Cambridge 2009).

b. Publications: Nolan

1. Books

Concise Encyclopedia of World War II, 2 vols. Greenwood (2010). Wars of the Age of Louis XIV, 1650-1715, Greenwood 2008. Age of the Wars of Religions, 1000-1650 (2 vols), Greenwood 2006. Editor: Encyclopedia of U.S. Presidents & Foreign Policy, with Carl Hodge. ABC-Clio, 2007. Book Series founder and editor, *Humanistic Perspectives on International Relations*, Praeger, 1999-2006. Book Series co-editor, *International History*. Praeger (with Erik Goldstein and William R. Keylor), 1999-2006.

2. Articles

“Great Powers and International Security,” in William Bain, ed., *Empire of Security* 2nd edition (Routledge, 2009). “Abraham Lincoln (1861-1865),” and “James Buchanan (1857-1861),” in Encyclopedia of U.S. Presidents & Foreign Policy, co-edited with Carl C. Hodge. (ABC-Clio, 2006). “Great Powers and International Security,” in William Bain, ed., *Empire of Security* (Routledge, 2006).

3. Online

Keylor is on the Board of Editors, H-Diplo, H-NET; Nolan is IR-Editor-in Chief for the Oxford University Press online reference; three current and two former BU doctoral students are writing for the project.

3. Scholarly/research quality (subfields)

Diplomatic history; international history; international relations. Top quality, as represented by IHI Fellows’ publications & national and in some cases also international reputations. Compares very favorably with peer institutes, except Columbia

4. Educational/pedagogical contributions:

All IHI events are advertised to and completely open to Boston University students. In addition to the nine Graduate Student Fellows of the IHI, the Institute continually encourages graduate and undergraduate students to attend its functions. Nolan is the adviser to the Undergraduate History Association, and its student members have been incorporated into IHI events. As noted elsewhere, Nolan is the principal adviser to HI

students in the international history track, and Keylor is the principal adviser to IR students with a double major in history. In the course of their advising sessions both notify their advisees about IHI functions and cordially invite them to become involved.

The IHI employs undergraduates as Work Study researchers, not in clerical jobs. It hosted two UROP grant students, and attracts some unpaid student volunteers (two in 2009). It sponsors film talks aimed at undergraduates. IHI has also sponsored graduate conferences jointly with Harvard, Yale, and Columbia universities. Keylor and Nolan each included BU graduate students who were active in the IHI in publications they edited. The IHI also sponsors field trips to history sites in conjunction with the Undergraduate History Association.

Keylor and Nolan each received course development grants to deploy A/V technology in large lecture courses. Keylor advised on a college-level hosted diplomacy game; Nolan photographs battle locales for History of War course; wrote "Crisis in the Balkans" online simulation for University of Dundee (2008). Both have been interviewed on international history subjects in print, radio, and television media, Keylor internationally. Nolan is consulting on series proposal to HI Channel (2009->), and educational website for HBO to accompany broadcast of *The Pacific* (2010).

Both faculty give talks to the Howard Gottlieb Center for interested students, and have delivered the invited annual lecture to students at the College of General Studies. Keylor has spoken to faculty and advanced graduate students at such prestigious venues as The Mémorial Museum, Caen, France; L'Institut des Hautes Etudes Internationales, Geneva; International Congress of Historical Sciences, Sydney; Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; European Studies Research Institute, Salford, United Kingdom; the University of Paris (Sorbonne); The Western Front Association; and Centre de Recherche sur l'Amérique du Nord (Paris). Nolan gave invited lectures to faculty and students at the Japan-America Society; Brigham Young University (London & Utah campuses); U.S. Military Academy at West Point; Marquette University; Providence College; United Nations Association (Vancouver and Toronto); and Consejo Argentino para las Relaciones Internacionales (CARI), Buenos Aires.

5. Awards

Keylor is a recipient of the Arthur G.B. Metcalf Award for Excellence in Teaching and the United Methodist Church Scholar-Teacher Award. He was Boston University representative at the Institute for European Studies' Faculty Seminar, and lectured to the Alexander Crummel Summer Seminars for minority students pursuing careers as teachers. Nolan received an "Outstanding Teaching Award" from the BU Honors Program, and the "Outstanding Teaching Award," Arts and Sciences, in the course of his previous teaching position at Miami University. He participated in Department of History outreach to history teachers at the Boston Latin School (2007).

6. Major professional and public service contributions

Keylor has chaired or served on multiple major University committees, including search committees for Department Chairs, Associate Deans, and Deans (CAS, LAW, SMG, CGS), the Academic Policy Committee of CAS (chair), the Core Curriculum Planning Committee of CAS (chair), and the Trustee Scholar Selection Committee. Externally, he has chaired major French and American book prize committees, including for the American Historical Association and the Society for French Historical Studies. He has served as project evaluator for the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Fellowship Program. He has served as the external evaluator of the New York Consortium for European Studies' (Columbia University and New York University) application for a renewal of its Title VI grant from the Department of Education. Nolan was Director of Undergraduate Studies in the Department of History (2008) and adviser to the largest HI major track. Externally, he is on the International Advisory Board for Academic Freedom, Bar-Ilan University; and Board of Advisers, "New Rules of War" project, Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs. He is also adviser to Global Water Brigades.

7. Academic Programs

Mostly N/A, as the IHI and does not offer courses.

8. Interdisciplinary initiatives

The IHI worked closely with the Departments of History and International Relations over two years to develop an interdisciplinary major “track” in international history. A large number of students double-major in IR and HI. Nolan is the principal adviser in HI for students in the international relations track. Keylor is the principle adviser for IR majors who have a double major in HI. In addition to its cooperation with these two departments, the IHI has co-sponsored events with the Center for International Relations and is currently co-sponsoring with PO a play by the late Professor Howard Zinn at Boston University.

9. International/global initiatives

Guest speakers from the UK, Canada, France, Japan, Armenia, Israel, Saudi Arabia, and a theater troupe from Germany that presented a play on the outbreak of World War One at the Black Box Theater. Co-sponsored conferences with Bar-Ilan University (Israel); King Saud University (Saudi Arabia); currently discussing possible partnership with University of East Anglia (UK). As noted above, Keylor consulted for Mémorial Museum, Caen, France; Nolan advises Global Water Brigades.

10. Outreach initiatives

All IHI events are open to the public. IHI co-sponsors events with local and regional groups: The Boston Armenian-American community; Western Front Association (twice); Carnegie Council; and major research universities. A weakness is advertising: we rely on internal BU and online advertising. Nevertheless, outreach has raised the profile of IHI regionally.

11. Facilities

The IHI has an office in the basement of CAS, which doubles as a faculty office and has space for its Work-Study student. Facilities are adequate. Equipment is starting to age, but is adequate for the next 2-3 years. Any replacements will be made from the operating budget.

12. Other infrastructure

A major problem is obtaining rooms for one-off IHI events (seminars, lectures). Conference facilities at SMG and the Castle are hired as needed, but HI and IR seminar rooms we once utilized are now normally occupied when we need them. We have held events in the Astronomy Department and the College of General Studies, but the absence of a consistently available seminar locale erodes identity and affects attendance. In the past three years, we have been forced to hire rooms from SMG and The Castle, straining our budget and reducing the number of events we can host.

13. Collaboration with other academic units and institutions

Our major strength. Every IHI event is interdisciplinary. Events have drawn participants from the departments of HI, IR, PO, and AH, the Center for International Relations, African-American Studies, the Center for Medieval Studies, the School of Journalism in COM, and SED. The IHI also consistently involves faculty and students from COM and CGS. It is planning a 2-year series on “Empires” in which it hopes to include participants from Religion, Islamic Studies, and Archeology as well as IR, HI, and PO. It has an

ongoing agreement with the Carnegie Council to partly fund faculty seminars at BU that have been open to undergraduate and graduate students. It has cosponsored three conferences with the Robert McCormick Tribune Foundation, and others with Harvard, Yale, Columbia, the CCEIA, Bar-Ilan University (Israel), King Saud University (Saudi Arabia), and faculty at other universities in Canada, the U.S. and UK.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

The IHI has always sponsored at least one major conference per academic year, in addition to smaller research seminars. We could plan two major conferences if sufficient internal funds were available. If not, the IHI will continue to opportunistically raise external funds as in the past. Regardless of any change in funding, the IHI will continue to host the following annual activities:

- § History Film Series
- § Four Faculty Research Seminars (two per semester)
- § Vintage History presentation by external scholar
- § One all-day or two-day research conference
- § Lecture by “Eminent Historian” or “Witness to History” (*semi-annual*)

At the current level of funding the IHI is already maximizing its opportunities. It can maintain its current level, but not expand without additional funds. Given the extraordinary strength of International History and International Relations faculty at BU, and the established regional reputation of the IHI, this would be a significant missed opportunity. With proper funds, the IHI is capable of remaining one of the leading institutes among its peer group, among which it was the pioneer. Its special niche will be its openness to all historical periods, whereas its peers tend to concentrate exclusively on the 20th century or even just the last 50 years. Realistically, however, some of its peers will likely surpass the IHI over the next ten years due to built-in advantages of large and well-funded doctoral programs in HI or IR. That trend would change if HI continues to admit more international history doctoral candidates with adequate funding, as it has already begun to do in recent years, and/or IR develops a Ph.D. program.

The IHI does not need faculty positions, staff positions, or new facilities to succeed. It *does* need restoration of prior cuts to its operating budget and modest increases, especially as it is asked to pay out for continually *rising costs* of hiring BU facilities for its most basic events, and to replace equipment (e.g. photocopier) that is now ten years old.

1. Measures for evaluating progress:

- § External reports by faculty at peer institutes
- § Internal reports by cognate chairs
- § Survey by faculty and former or current graduate student IHI Fellows
- § Judgment against the goals and plans laid out in this memorandum

Judaic Studies
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Boston University Elie Wiesel Center for Judaic Studies, comprised of faculty from many departments, schools, and colleges of Boston University, coordinates and supports all academic programming related to Judaic Studies. Its primary mission is to: provide undergraduate and graduate students of all religious and ethnic backgrounds with a broad based, non-denominational, academically rigorous education in the most important areas of Judaic Studies (including interaction with non-Jewish society); organize and supervise a “Minor Concentration” in Judaic Studies for BU undergraduates; coordinate graduate and undergraduate offerings across the departments and schools of the University; support faculty research in Judaic Studies of all types across the University; and create and support conferences, musical events, lectures, library acquisitions and publications in the area of Judaic Studies for Boston University and the broader Boston Community.

B. The Present Description and Assessment

1. Peer Group – In constructing the relevant Peer Group, it was judged correct not to include universities with Departments of Judaic studies, for example, NYU and Brandeis, as departments by their nature control more resources than an interdisciplinary program such as our possesses. Secondly, it was thought correct to exclude the oldest and best established programs such as those at Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and the University of Pennsylvania as they are all unusually well endowed, have large, very well funded graduate programs, many endowed chairs and world class Judaica libraries.

The peer group that seems most appropriate is:

1. University of Wisconsin: Department of Jewish Studies
2. University of Florida: Center for Jewish Studies
3. Cornell University: Program of Jewish Studies
4. Vanderbilt University: Jewish Studies
5. Emory University: The Tam Institute for Jewish Studies
6. University of Indiana: The Robert A. and Sandra S. Borns Jewish Studies Program
7. Stanford University: Taube Center for Jewish Studies
8. UCLA: UCLA Center for Jewish Studies

All these universities were chosen to be the list of peer institutions because all have J.S. programs that are relatively recent, i.e., created or expanded over the past three decades, have interdisciplinary programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels, are growing their library collections, and do not offer a major in J.S. In evaluating this wide-ranging group of possible peer institutions, it would be reasonable to judge the J.S. programs at Stanford, UCLA and the University of Indiana superior to what presently exists at BU, and those at Vanderbilt, the University of Wisconsin, and Cornell University less good than the program at BU. The reasons for this conclusion are as follows.

Better than BU

- A) Stanford has capitalized on three major advantages. First, and most important of all, the very high visibility of the university immediately added luster to its relatively new program. Second, it raised, with university support, a large endowment for chairs and graduate fellowships very quickly. Third, it has a major university library, with a judaica collection bolstered several decades ago by the acquisition (for \$1,000,000) of the library of the late Prof. Salo Baron (of Columbia University).

- B) UCLA – A major university, its J.S. program expanded along with the university from 1960-2000 when California’s state system was being heavily supported by the State Legislature. Second, it raised a good deal of money, with university support, from the west coast community. Third, it has a major judaica collection – created, in part, through the diligent work of an expert librarian.
- C) University of Indiana – This is a quite remarkable story given the location and student body at Indiana University. It was accomplished through a close partnership between the University and the local Indiana Jewish community that created 6 chairs in J.S. and support for graduate fellowships and the university library.

Less Good than BU

- D) Vanderbilt – This private university, with a well-regarded Divinity School, has made an effort to create a significant J.S. program. It has hired some good people, and has substantial library resources. But, to date, it has not been able to create much momentum, or national visibility.
- E) The University of Wisconsin – This program has been bolstered by a \$10,000,000 endowment left to it by the late Prof. George Mosse. It has some strong people on its faculty, and has strength particularly in Jewish history. But its overall profile is probably less strong and less broad based, e.g., in Rabbis, Medieval studies, than our program.
- F) Cornell University – This is a major university with a broad-based judaica program. However, the “core” group that really teaches J.S. is small and less distinguished than the Cornell faculty as a whole. The J.S. program at Cornell has not been able to gain real traction or grow significantly primarily because the university administration has never really supported it properly

2. Assessment of Faculty

Tenured Faculty

In assessing the quality of the tenured faculty a few things need to be noted.

1. The faculty here listed come from many different departments and schools. For most their connection to Judaic studies is secondary to their other obligations. The J.S. program as such has no specifically dedicated lines.
2. The “core” tenured faculty is mainly clustered in the Religion Department with strong connections with DRTS.
3. The “core” tenured faculty who are not associated with the Department of Religion are in the School of Theology, the Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Literature, the Department of History, the Department of Romance Studies, and the (now extinct) University Professors Program.
4. Given the varying degrees of faculty involvement in the J.S. Program, the assessment of quality here needs to be centered around those 9 senior members held to be core members of the J.S. Program. These include Professors Zank, Levine, Klawans, Lobel, and Katz from Religion, Professor Darr from the School of Theology, Prof. Harrowitz from the Department of Romance Studies, Prof. Gillman from the Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Literature, and Professor Wiesel from the now extinct University Professors Program.

All of these nine senior faculty members have been involved in undergraduate and graduate teaching over the past three years (and more) and all have published significant books and/or articles over this period (and longer).

The total number of books published by core faculty over the past three years by the 9 core faculty is 19. If one includes all faculty connected with the J.S. program the number exceeds 25.

The number of articles published by the core faculty in journals is 53. If one includes all faculty connected with the J.S. program the number exceeds 90.

In addition a number of grants and awards have been won by members of the “core” group.

B.2.b. Scholarly/Research Quality

The main subfields represented in the J. S. Program are:

(a) Bible; (b) Classical Jewish History and Rabbinics; (c) Medieval Jewish Thought; (d) Modern Jewish Thought; (e) Modern Jewish History; (f) Modern Hebrew and Jewish Literature; (g) Holocaust Studies

There has been valuable and distinguished research and publication by relevant faculty members in each of these sub-fields.

B.2.A Research -- The tenured faculty have been active and significant contributors to their chosen fields of research. As for the relative strength of the various subfields relative to each other and our peer institutions, the three areas that are the most well developed are Biblical Studies, thanks to the presence of related faculty in the School of Theology and Department of Religion and the DRTS, Classical Jewish Studies and Rabbinics for the same reasons, Modern Jewish Thought, an area in which we have several senior faculty, and Holocaust Studies where the faculty includes a number of well-known scholars among whom is Prof. Elie Wiesel.

As strong evidence of the academic quality of the faculty involved in the J.S. program it is to be noted that all five of the then junior faculty who have come up for tenure over the past decade have received promotion with tenure. This includes Professors Zank, Lobel, Klawans, Harrowitz and Gillman.

In response to various notes from Dean Saprio regarding the issue of citations, this issue is intentionally being avoided as it is not a true indicator in the area of Judaic studies.

Tenure Track – There is just one tenure-track faculty member in our “core” group, Dr. Simon Rabinovitch. He only joined the History Department this past semester (fall, 2009). Dr. Rabinovitch, who was well trained at Brandeis University and taught at the University of Florida before coming to BU, shows all the signs of becoming a serious contributor to both the J.S. program and the History Department.

B.2.C. and 2.D Educational/Pedagogical Contributions

Almost all the members of the “Core” faculty are good teachers who contribute substantively to both the J.S. program and other programs and departments. As evidence of the high quality of teaching in J.S. courses the following is relevant.

1. The rating of the faculty in course evaluations is consistently high. Using an average of 4.0 as representing “Excellent”, Professors Wiesel, Zank, Lobel, Klawans, Katz, Harrowitz, and Darr among the core faculty, as well as Professor Grodin all have an average score of over 4.0.
2. Teaching Awards: Prof. Michael Zank won a University Teaching Award in 2000 and an Honor Program Teaching Prize in 2006. Prof. Nancy Harrowitz won a CAS Honors Program Teaching Award in 2007.
3. Recently the J. S. program secured a prestigious Posen Grant. This will allow the faculty to offer 3 new courses in J.S., as well as support a variety of related activities.
4. J. S Faculty also contributes meaningfully to other departments and programs through their teaching in these areas, thus broadening the scope and influence of Judaic material.
5. J.S. Faculty makes a contribution to many programs. Among these are:
(a.) The Writing Program; (b) The Core Program; (c) The New University Honors College. In this new program Prof. Zank will teach a course entitled *Moses*.
6. The J.S. program has been innovative vis a vis its courses. For example a grant from the American-Israeli Foundation allowed us to bring Dr. Paula Kabalo from Ben Gurion University, Israel for 2 years to teach highly successful courses Israel Studies sponsored by the History and Religion Departments.

Professor Michael Grodin of the BU Medical School Faculty has introduced a course in *Jewish Medical Ethics*. His student evaluations for this course were outstanding. In addition he has created the ambitious *Project on Medicine and the Holocaust* with the support of the J.S. program. This is a unique, internationally recognized program.

Also, in connection with existing courses faculty have interestingly employed new technologies to enhance their teaching and interaction with students.

7. The J.S. Program has – financially and otherwise – assisted both faculty and students undertaking research and /or attending academic conferences.

3. A Academic Programs

The J. S. Program works with departments in organizing undergraduate courses in J.S. In the process it attempts to create an undergraduate curriculum that exposes students seeking an introduction to various, and broadly defined, areas of J. S. In doing so it provides an in-depth methodologically sophisticated exposure to Judaic texts, sources, languages, history, literature and culture.

In general the quality of the courses offered at both the introductory and more advanced level is high. New courses have recently been added and older ones revised in light of ongoing research and scholarship. The enrollment pattern for J. S. courses is mixed. Some receive higher enrollments, a number do not.

We have no reliable, quantitative data on what students in J.S. do after graduation.

It is relevant to note that the students enrolling in J. S. courses are diverse. Students of all ethnic groups, of both genders, of different religions and no religion take our courses and find them interesting and rewarding. The J.S. program offers, working with the Department of Religion, a “Minor Concentration”. There is no major in J.S. There have been 13 J.S. minors over the past 10 years. The J.S. minor is only one aspect of the significant and multifaceted contributions of Judaic Studies Faculty. Our faculty contributes to undergraduate education in many departments and programs.

3.B Doctoral Program

1. The J.S. Program offers a PhD. The program is relatively small, but those students who do come to the program receive a good, individually tailored, program that meets their interests.
2. The graduate faculty is quite strong, diverse, and well trained. Because of the small number of graduate students there is no separate graduate program.
3. Thanks to its links with DRTS and other departments as well as the School of Theology, the J.S. program is able to do more than it could on its own were it an isolated academic program.
4. The faculty also contributes directly to many comparative projects in a variety of areas.
5. The impact of the J.S. program is substantively felt in the teaching that J.S. faculty do in connection with graduate students and other graduate programs, e.g., History, Islamic Studies, DRTS, and the School of Theology. Graduate students from many other programs, departments and schools draw substantially on the faculty in the J.S. program for both classes and advice.
6. The J.S. program at BU presents prospective students with a difficulty – it is an attractive option in certain areas of Judaic study, but it is unable to provide funding for almost all of those students who apply for admission. For this reason, i.e., the matter of financial support, we are not competitive in bringing students to BU in large numbers.
7. As a result of our severe lack of fellowships, the program has had relatively few students. Over the past decade or so it had had (including students studying with Prof. Wiesel in the University Professors Program) 10 students.
8. With one exception all the doctoral students in the J.S. Program over the past ten years have either received their PhD or are still on a satisfactory trajectory towards receiving their degree.
9. Of the 4 students who received their degrees, one is teaching at a university in Saudi Arabia (his home country). Two are working in Jewish communal organizations. One is doing archival work. Five are still at work on their degrees. All those who finished their degrees did so within 7 years. The one person who did not finish her degree subsequently finished her PhD at Harvard where she received a full Fellowship. She is now teaching at the University of Michigan.
10. Our students have been of both genders – of 10 PhD students 3 are men and 7 are women – and come from several religious backgrounds. They have come from America, Saudi Arabia, England and China. In addition one present DRTS student working partly in J.S. is from Israel.
An additional note: The key issue for the J.S. program is the issue of fellowships. If these were available in greater number all aspects of our PhD program would improve and be competitive with other quality graduate programs in J.S.

3.C Masters Program

There have been 3 students who received an M.A. over the past decade. Two were foreign students of high quality. One returned to a PhD program in Germany and the second received a fellowship in the PhD program at Rice University, while the third is now attending Rabbinical School.

3.E. Interdisciplinary Initiatives

The J. S. Faculty and the J.S. Program participate in, and support, a number of interdisciplinary initiatives on campus. These include:

The undergraduate Writing Program; The Core Curriculum Program; and The New University Honors Program. It has also supported conferences and lectures in other programs and departments, e.g., Modern Languages and Comparative Literature, the Law School, DRTS, and the Religion Department

All these efforts have helped the J.S program gain more visibility on campus. And they have enriched the J.S. Program through cross-fertilization.

The negative aspect of this involvement is the loss of teaching resources which are already quite limited.

3.F International and Global Interactions

The J.S. program contributes to such activity in at least three ways:

1. It encourages students, at both the undergraduate and graduate level, to go on foreign study and language training in Israel and supports such study directly when the need arises.
2. The faculty of the J.S. program is active participants in conferences, seminars and government activities held abroad.
3. The J.S. program supported the 2 year visit of Prof. Paula Kabalo to teach Israel studies. This is a crucial area of the world under-represented in the curriculum of Boston University. The J.S. program is deeply interested in creating more teaching and related activity regarding Israel's history, politics, and culture on campus.

3.G. Outreach Initiatives

1. Just about all of the J.S. programs, lectures and conferences are open to the wider public. Over the past decade this J.S. program has sponsored more than 60 such lectures and 6 major international conferences.
2. In addition, our faculty has been advisors to T.V. programs and other media activities outside the university.
3. The three public lectures that Prof. Elie Wiesel has been giving for the past 33 years draw thousands from all quarters of the university community and are a highlight of the life of the BU community each year.
4. The J.S. program has been a major financial supporter of the Mugar Library, working to create a functional Judaica collection for the benefit of the entire BU community.

3.H. Facilities

1. The physical facilities at the Elie Wiesel Center, 147 Bay State Road, are generally excellent. They meet the needs of the J.S. program.
2. The support staff serving the J.S. program is just adequate. It is, however, stretched to the limits by all the activity connected with the program but for the moment it can manage.

3.B.6 Collaboration with other Academic Units and Institutions

1. The J.S. Program, given its interdisciplinary nature, regularly, and on an on-going basis, collaborates with many other academic departments, centers, schools and colleges at Boston University. It will continue to do so. Especially important are its collaborative connections with the Religion Department, the Department of Modern Languages and Comparative Literature, the History Department, the Department of Romance Studies and DRTS. It also has important faculty members drawn from the Law School and the School of Public Health.

B. Plans for the Future

Our goal is that the J.S. program will be even stronger than it is now and among the best programs in the country.

1b.1. It is our goal to have more faculty.

1.b.2 We plan to have more undergraduate students. In order to accomplish this, the J.S. program will continue to engage in a curricular self-study, and reorganize, (this re-organization will include

developing opportunities for students to “concentrate” in J.S. in existing departments), and will continue to revise and upgrade its website. The Posen Grant won by the J.S. program will provide impetus for new courses, new directions in curriculum, and new interdisciplinary and interdepartmental linkages.

1b.3 We plan to continue exploring how we can: A) broaden the scope of our courses; B) create “clusters” in various areas of study; C) introduce a regular graduate-faculty seminar; D) encourage the admission of graduate students in departments other than Religion and the School of Theology, i.e., DRTS; E) encourage the granting of graduate fellowships and other forms of support to graduate students in all relevant departments; and F) increase conversation and meetings among the J.S. faculty to discuss and evaluate the development of the program.

1.b.4 The J.S. program will continue to discuss creating a Holocaust Studies minor.

1.b.5 The J.S. program will continue to seek increased communication with other academic programs on campus both at the graduate and undergraduate level.

1.b.6 The J.S. program will continue to explore and expand, where possible, interdisciplinary initiatives.

C.1. Additional Resources – To expand the J.S. Program, especially in connection with “core” faculty and graduate students, requires additional funding. Here it is essential to be clear: the J.S. Program is not asking for additional funding from existing University budgets. However, it is asking for the meaningful support of the University Administration in fund-raising efforts directed outside the University. This support, to date, has not been provided at the level necessary.

C.2 Measures for Evaluating Progress – The success of the efforts made by the J.S. Program will be measurable in five ways: 1) increased undergraduate enrollments; 2) an increased numbers of graduate students; 3) completion and implementation of the structural and curricular changes being undertaken; 4) completion of the updating of the J.S. website; 5) fundraising (if the University administration is supportive).

C.3 The Five Year Goals – All the initiatives mentioned in section C1 and C2 will be started immediately. Thus in five years it should be possible, using the metrics set out in C2, to see what progress we have made.

Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

The Institute for the Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations is committed to the advancement of scholarship on the Muslim world and coordinates the efforts of faculty and programs at Boston University on this topic. Its scope is worldwide – from the Americas, to Europe, the Middle East, South, and Southeast Asia – and cross disciplinary – including anthropology, sociology, history, religion, politics, literature, language, and the arts. Its focus on Muslim majority societies is complemented by programs on the role of non-Muslim minorities with the Islamic world and Muslim minorities in non-Muslim societies. Striving to serve as a center of excellence, the Institute establishes links with other institutions nationally and internationally, and organizes efforts of departments and faculty in CAS by providing research resources and curricular opportunities to students.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

- UCLA - Center for Near East Studies: UCLA's Center for Near East Study is geographically limited, but remains one of the largest Title VI national resource centers. Its particular strength lies in its outreach, M.A., and Ph.D. programs.
- UC Berkeley - Center for Middle Eastern Studies: UC Berkeley's Center for Middle Eastern Studies is a Title VI center with high annual enrollments, significant course offerings, a strong faculty base and a long-standing tradition of instruction in Middle Eastern Studies. The Center, however, is geographically limited to the Middle East.
- Syracuse University - Middle Eastern Studies: The Muslim Studies Program at Syracuse University has one of the larger faculty bases in the country and has developed academic minors. However, the moderate amount of course offerings are limited to the Middle East.
- University of Pennsylvania - Middle East Center: The Middle East Center at the University of Pennsylvania has a large faculty base and significant programmatic and event offerings. The Center's regional focus does not expand beyond the Middle East.
- Tufts University - The Fares Center for Eastern Mediterranean Studies: The Fares Center at Tufts has a strong connection to the reputable Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy and is well funded. Focusing only on the Eastern Mediterranean, the Center has a geographically limited concentration.
- UNC, Duke, North Carolina State - Carolina Center for the Study of the Middle East and Muslim Civilizations: The Carolina Center encompasses a broad ideological and geographic spectrum and supports a range of Muslim Studies. It is probably the closest center to SMSC in ideology. However, it is weak in resources and is not centralized at one institution.

Despite the absence of federal funding, SMSC has in number and quality a faculty equal to the best of our competitors. We also have a strong language program, an asset that few universities without Title VI centers have. On the negative side, almost all of our competitors have larger graduate programs and better funding for them. Their library resources are also more robust. These are areas in which Boston University needs to invest to become a top ranked institution in this field.

2. Faculty

SMSC has 36 faculty affiliates in 11 departments in CAS. This makes SMSC one of the largest groups involved in studying Islam in the United States and the geographic range and diversity of disciplines

found in the faculty associates in SMSC is unparalleled elsewhere. Very few U.S. institutions cover so wide a range.

SMSC acts primarily as a facilitating body, seeking to assist departments in hiring of quality faculty and the development of relevant curricula. It also acts as a coordinating body to link together for mutually beneficial projects. The Institute does not hire faculty directly, but instead relies on departmental appointments. Additionally, issues of pedagogy remain the prerogative of individual departments and disciplines. However the Institute has played a facilitating role in achieving new faculty appointments and weighing in on tenure decisions in Art History, History, Language and Literature, Anthropology and International relations, among others. While some of these appointments could have proceeded without the Institute's help, it played a decisive role where departments were at first hesitant because a single appointment in their departments could be seen as marginal. By demonstrating that the appointment or tenure fit into a much larger program that was a benefit to the College and the University as a whole the Institute was able to achieve results that would not have occurred in its absence

SMSC faculty associates are also top practitioners of their fields, earning numerous awards and distinctions as well as making major contributions inside and outside the university. The following is a sampling of faculty achievements since 2006.

- *Professor Kecia Ali* (CAS Religion): Co-Chair Study of Islam Section, American Academy of Religion, 2009-12.
- *Professor Thomas Barfield* (CAS Anthropology): President, American Institute of Afghanistan Studies, 2005-12; Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship, 2006-07.
- *André de Quadros* (CFA School of Music): Carpe Vitam Foundation Travel Award for Work in Arab Countries; Director, Arab Choral Initiative.
- *Professor Emine Fetvacı* (CAS Art History): Peter Paul Development Professorship, 2008-11; Margaret B. Sevcenko Prize by the Historians of Islamic Art Association, 2007.
- *Professor Hussain Haqqani* (CAS International Relations): Appointed Pakistani Ambassador to the United States, 2008.
- *Professor Frank Korom* (CAS Religion): American Institute of Sri Lankan Studies Grant, 2009-11; American Academy of Religion Research Award, 2007-08; John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship, 2006-07.
- *Professor Margaret Litvin* (CAS MLCL): Peter Paul Development Professorship, 2009-12.
- *Professor Augustus R. Norton* (CAS International Relations): Visiting Professor of Politics, University of Oxford; Advisor, Iraq Study Group (Baker-Hamilton Commission).
- *Professor Sunil Sharma* (CFA MLCL): Aga Khan Fellow, Harvard University, 2008-09.
- *Professor Nancy Smith-Hefner* (CAS Anthropology): Sarah Blaffer Hardy Fellow, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study (Harvard), 2009-10.
- *Professor Jenny White* (CAS Anthropology): Fulbright-Hays Senior Research Fellowship 2008; American Research Institute in Turkey Research Grant 2007; President, Middle East Section, American Anthropological Association: 2004-06; President, Turkish Studies Association, 2004-06; Board of Governors, Institute of Turkish Studies 2006-09, 2009-12.
- *Professor Diana Wylie* (CAS History): National Endowment for the Humanities Distinguished Teaching Professor (for the Core Curriculum), 2008-11.

SMSC does appoint visiting professors and fellows and has established a procedure for receiving inquiries, reviewing applications and issuing visiting appointments. In the past three years, SMSC has welcomed Beatrice Manz (Tufts), Sadiq Reza (New York School of Law), and Olga Davidson (Ilex Foundation). Each visiting scholar has helped to further the Institute's mission by assisting students, teaching new courses, and giving guest lectures.

3. Academic Programs

a. Undergraduate Education:

In response to student requests, SMSC designed two interdisciplinary minors, one rooted in social science courses (Muslim Societies) and a second based on humanities courses (Muslim Cultures). Students who complete this minor will be uniquely positioned with a better understanding of the cultures of the Muslim world in a time when misconceptions have been widely proliferated and will prepare post-baccalaureate students for careers in anthropology, archeology, history, art, and literature. In doing so, Boston University can continue to produce globally-minded students capable of understanding and addressing problems in the world today. These minors went into effect in Summer I 2008 and have had a combined enrollment of 16. The minors are reviewed annually by Prof. Betty Anderson, and will undergo revisions in Spring 2010. These revisions are aimed at increasing enrollment in the Muslim Cultures minor and ensuring faculty/course continuity. SMSC uses its network to promote courses in departments to undergraduates. Since the inception of the Institute in 2006, the average student enrollment in Muslim Studies courses has increased 65%. Making students aware of these options while increasing opportunities will remain a core part of the Institute's mission.

b. Doctoral Programs:

At current, SMSC does not have a doctoral program, but providing material and academic support to affiliated students is a component of the Institute's mission. SMSC does make selections for two doctoral fellowships in Anthropology and Religion. Each fellowship is a one-year fellowship, renewable for a second year. Seeking additional funding for longer terms is a weakness that will be addressed in coming years. Additionally, SMSC provides opportunities to doctoral students in Muslim Studies by providing funding for students to present at conferences and initiating a lecture series for SMSC doctoral students to present their research to the Muslim Studies community. SMSC has identified 24 current graduate and doctoral students from a diverse range of backgrounds, spread over several departments.

c. Masters Programs:

At current, SMSC does not have a masters program, although it is in the process of developing one (see *C. Strategic Plan for the Future*). Graduate students affiliated with the Institute are provided with the same services as doctoral students. Further development of services for masters students will be a key goal of the Institute.

d. Other Academic Programs:

SMSC currently supports numerous other programs at the university that further the study of the Muslim world. This includes promotion and development of study abroad opportunities with International Programs. SMSC approached IP about the creation of the Rabat, Morocco program in 2007, lobbied for its creation, assisted in curricular development, and promoted it to students. Since its first semester in Spring 2009, 28 undergraduate students have taken part in this opportunity. Due to the program's success, a summer, intensive Arabic program is slated to begin in Rabat in Summer 2010. SMSC also assisted IP in the selection of students for the new student exchange with the American University of Beirut.

One of the primary responsibilities listed in the Institute's charter is the development of on-campus and public fora through events, conferences and workshops for both the BU and greater community. Since the Institute's inception, SMSC has sponsored over 30 events at the University, including a regular Lecture Series, a Doctoral Candidate Seminar Series, a Cultural Series, graduate student workshops, faculty workshops, and a conference on Abrahamic mysticism. All of these events were carried out with limited resources, but meet an increasing demand at the University. For the AY 2009-10, event attendance is up 40%, with a particular increase in undergraduate attendance.

e. Interdisciplinary Initiatives:

The Institute was founded as an interdisciplinary center, chartered to coordinate the university's considerable strengths in Muslim Studies across many disciplines. As such, SMSC works with 11 departments within CAS to develop programs such as the academic degrees and events mentioned above. SMSC regularly provides cognate comment and advice for departments seeking to create courses and other academic programs dealing with the Muslim world. Most recently, SMSC provided

cognate comment and suggestions for the recently approved Arabic minor in MLCL, which will begin in Spring 2010. There is high demand for such programs, as can be witnessed in the Arabic minor's student petition, which had over 200 signatures.

f. International/Global Initiatives:

SMSC provides administrative support to the American Institute of Afghanistan Studies. AIAS is a private, non-profit organization run by scholars with the aim of promoting and encouraging the systematic study of the culture, society, land, languages, health, peoples and history of Afghanistan. It is especially concerned with increasing the numbers of scholars in the United States who have expertise in Afghanistan, and to assist in the rebuilding of academic institutions and the advanced study of Afghanistan by Afghan scholars. In this effort, AIAS maintains an academic center in Kabul, which has been made available to international scholars, including several BU graduate students. AIAS has also launched several major international conferences, dealing with important issues such as regional relationships with Pakistan and Central Asia and matters of governance within Afghanistan. Afghanistan is a country of major importance currently, and SMSC will continue its important partnership with AIAS.

g. Outreach Initiatives:

An acute interest in the study of Muslim societies and cultures has developed in the wake of ongoing world events. In the interest of fostering a better understanding of Muslim societies and preserving their diverse heritage, the Institute has made itself available as a knowledge base to the community. In the past few years, SMSC has made several outreach efforts, including promotion of the Arabic Community Mentoring Program at Charlestown High School, discussion of projects with the Ilex Foundation (which promotes the humanistic traditions of the Near East), co-sponsorship of the Campagna-Kerven Annual Lecture on Modern Turkey, hosting a conference on mysticism with Vital Pictures (in support of a future WGBH documentary), preparing a lecture on Afghanistan for Falmouth Academy high school students, providing resources for the South Asian Consortium, planning a events with the Boston Forum on the Middle East (BC & Tufts), and joining the boards of several major Middle East Studies associations. The Institute's long term plans call for increasing outreach efforts in the coming years.

4. Facilities

The Institute is currently located at 745 Commonwealth Ave. on the sixth floor in space previously administered by UNI. The Institute maintains three offices: the administrator's office, the office allocated to BUCSA, and an office for visiting fellows. SMSC has been informed that CAS intends to move SMSC to 232 Bay State Road. For the long-term viability and growth of the Institute, permanent space and additional offices are needed. Several SMSC faculty associates have requested office space with the center. A permanent seminar room would allow the Institute to hold more events and lectures. These concerns will be expressed with CAS as part of the relocation process.

5. Other Infrastructure

In terms of staff, SMSC has one administrator, which shares administrative duties with AIAS and BUCSA. For the moment, this arrangement is adequate. SMSC also hires 1-2 work-study students per semester to assist in administrative duties. The staff is critical to the Institute's mission, as it provides most of the coordinating services necessary for its interdisciplinary mission.

6. Collaborations with Other Academic Units and Institutions

In addition to some of the collaborations/interdisciplinary efforts already mentioned above, the Institute is actively working with the BU Center for the Study of Asia on its Title VI application to make a National Resource Center (NRC) for pan-Asia. This is a major preparatory initiative that will help to

strengthen BU's programs in Asia (and in turn Muslim Studies). It will also provide valuable experience in preparation of an additional Title VI application in Turco-Persia under Muslim Studies in a future cycle. SMSC is providing administrative support and course/faculty data for Muslim Studies.

Externally, in addition to AIAS, SMSC has applied for membership in several overseas research organizations: the American Institute of Afghanistan Studies (AIAS), American Institute of Iranian Studies (AIIRs), the American Research Center in Egypt (ARCE), and the American Institute of Maghrebi Studies (AIMS). SMSC appoints BU faculty members to represent BU on the boards of those organizations. Additionally, SMSC faculty and students are given exclusive access to the resources of these institutions. SMSC plans to apply for membership in the Middle East Studies Association (MESA) in the coming fiscal year.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten Year Plan

Given that SMSC is still a new institution, it aims to spend the next ten years expanding its efforts inside and outside the university. The largest initiative during this period will be a Title VI application which will establish SMSC as a Title VI National Resource Center for studying the Muslim world, particularly in establishing a new region in Turco-Persia, a region of study in which BU already has significant strengths. This will be a sizable effort, with additional resources being required. To strengthen its application, SMSC aims to expand resources in the following:

- **Faculty:** SMSC will continue to lobby departments to hire additional faculty with knowledge and expertise in the Muslim World. SMSC will continue to provide additional interdisciplinary opportunities to new and existing faculty.
- **Undergraduate Education:** SMSC will continue to promote its undergraduate minors, advertise and lobby International Programs for the expansion of study abroad opportunities, and will target certain segments of the undergraduate population to increase enrollments in undergraduate courses.
- **Graduate Education:** SMSC will create a two-year, interdisciplinary MA program with an integrated study abroad component. The program will focus on building language and cultural competency, with on the intent of making students better prepared for placement in international organizations and government agencies. The program will generate IDC revenue for the institute.
- **Doctoral Education:** SMSC will seek opportunities to expand fellowships available to doctoral and graduate students at the university. The Institute will continue to provide travel assistance funding as well as the fellowships in Religion and Anthropology. SMSC will approach foundations to secure new fellowships.
- **Other Academic Programs:** SMSC will continue to bring intellectually stimulating events, workshops and conferences to the University. Using newly collected data (particularly for undergraduates interested in Muslim Studies), SMSC will try to target core interest groups to raise event attendance. SMSC will also attempt to improve networking between the Institute and student groups to broaden the types of events the Institute will sponsor.
- **Interdisciplinary Initiatives:** SMSC will continue to build complementary linkages with departments in CAS and will reach out to create new links to other schools at Boston University.
- **Facilities:** To successfully expand, SMSC will require permanent space on the Charles River Campus. SMSC has been notified of the possible move to 232 Bay State Road with BUCSA, likely at the end of AY 2010. SMSC will be reviewing the new location next month.

2. Measures for Evaluating Progress

The primary indicator for internal progress in SMSC initiatives will be enrollment data. Collection of this data will allow SMSC to track overall interest in courses and the success of other academic programs such as the undergraduate minors and the study abroad programs. Enrollment tracking will also be important for the Title VI application. In the fall 2009 semester, SMSC began tracking this data for the first time, tracing it back to 2001, before the institute's inception. Attendance at events and symposia will be another key indicator of SMSC progress. With events being a major component of the SMSC mission, this data will be important in evaluating the success of events and will assist SMSC staff in the preparation of future events. This data will also be important in the Title VI application.

SMSC currently has the resources to collect and evaluate this data. However, additional staff resources may be required for the Title VI application process, as the reformatting of this information for the application has proven to be a time consuming process. Additionally, resources from GRS will prove critical in advertising the Muslim Studies MA program, an initiative considered vital to the institute's future.

External progress is more difficult to measure in part because there are no generally accepted evaluation criteria and other institutions provide little data with which to compare us. Although it would require some extra staff help we think there are three good measures: 1) faculty productivity as compared with select group of peers where we can generate the data ourselves; 2) public impact in national media by appearance or citation; 3) tracking breakdown of graduate applications to BU program in our areas; 4) graduate placement.

3. Five-Year Goals

By year five, the Institute's new two-year MA program in Muslim Studies will be underway. This program is currently under development through a subcommittee being chaired by Prof. Betty Anderson (CAS History). The subcommittee is currently finalizing an ID 500-level course that will serve as the interdisciplinary gateway to the program. SMSC has also been in consultation with International Programs to use existing exchange agreements with universities abroad to provide an intensive language training and cultural immersion experience (a full semester plus a summer term). In the coming semesters, SMSC will work with respective departments to build additional graduate-level course offerings by either creating cross-listings with existing undergraduate courses or by developing entirely new graduate courses. This effort will be necessary to provide enough course options to create a truly interdisciplinary degree. Cooperation between CAS (and the relevant curriculum committees), International Programs, Modern Languages and Comparative Literatures, and other key departments will be necessary for this effort. Most of the necessary resources are already available, but will require additional internal coordination. SMSC hopes to have the program approved and in operation by AY 2011-12. The development of this program will be a key component to the Institute's Title VI application plans.

SMSC is confident that it will be in a strong position for a Title VI NRC/FLAS application during the next funding cycle, scheduled for 2013-14. Many of the resources that will be required for an application defining the region Turco-Persia are already in place. This would include the acquisition of the Islamic Book Collections at HGARC (particularly the Menges, Jettmar, Madhi, Jewett, and Frye collections) in 2003; SMSC's relationship with ARIT, AIAS, and AIrS; strong enrollments and offerings of courses in the Muslim world (over 70); the strength of faculty associates; SMSC's series, events, and conferences, and existing interdisciplinary programs. The addition of the Muslim Studies MA will fill a current gap in graduate education. Using experience gathered from the BUCSA Title VI application process, SMSC has already initiated a data collection program to record information required for the application. However, due to the intensity of the application process, additional administrative support and resources will be required from CAS. Also, continued support from departments in maintaining faculty and course resources will be required.

Center for Remote Sensing
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. Executive Summary

The Center for Remote Sensing (CRS) was established in 1986 as part of the Graduate School of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS). From the outset, the Center was not considered a self-standing operation, but a research facility for use by the faculty, staff and students of the Departments of Archaeology, Geography and Environment, and Earth Sciences.

Since its establishment, the Center has been managed by its Director (Dr. Farouk El-Baz) and Administrative Assistant (at present, Jennifer Stacy). This basic personnel structure is supported by BU. The operating budget of the CRS has been maintained at the same level since 1986 (\$30K per year). Sponsored research programs support expenses and research personnel.

Researchers supported by outside funding are encouraged to participate in teaching of courses in the sponsoring departments. These specialized courses are offered depending on need at both the graduate and undergraduate levels.

In addition to teaching courses at both levels and conducting sponsored research, Center personnel undertake training programs. These programs are basically directed at the utilization of satellite image data to specific investigations such as: setting of archaeological sites, location of groundwater concentration sites in arid lands, and the creation of databases using geographic information systems (GIS). These training programs are also supported by outside funding.

The infrastructure of the Center is composed of advanced computers, high capacity servers, large printers and some basic hand-held remote sensing instruments. All these are procured with sponsored research funds. The latter started with a Keck Foundation grant of \$1.3 million to initiate the Center in 1986. Another \$400K grant from NASA in 1997, which was utilized for purchase of computers, accompanied the designation of the CRS as a “Center of Excellence in Remote Sensing;” one of only 60 such organizations in the U.S.

Furthermore, Dr. El-Baz holds the position of Research Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the BU College of Engineering. This allows research collaboration with faculty members in the Photonics Center. Other research professors at the CRS also conduct joint research with the Center for Adaptive Systems, Center for Ecology and Conservation Biology and the African Studies Center.

Among the major strengths of the CRS is the international focus of research programs. Much of the research has been done in the arid lands of North Africa and the Arabian Peninsula as well as Ethiopia and southern Spain. Several vegetation studies have been conducted in Turkey and China. This has led to our collaboration in scientific research projects with numerous institutions worldwide.

Future plans of the Center include continuance of the research, teaching and training mission. New initiatives include applications of remote sensing to mapping of environmental change, and identification of additional water resources. In addition, leading research is conducted in instrument development (such as Lidar) and satellite data product (algorithm) validation. The metrics of success relate to the number of sponsored research projects, which is three or more per year.

B. Present: Description and Assessment

1. Academic Peer Group

Within CAS, the academic peer group is the other centers of research, particularly those that are interdisciplinary in nature. In the U.S. universities in general, there are over 300 centers of remote sensing that utilize satellite image data. Those that apply satellite image data to topographic mapping of the Earth as well as other planetary bodies are ahead of us. However, we are by far the leader in applying advanced remote sensing and GIS methodologies to forest canopy studies, geomorphology of deserts, and the development of specific remote sensing instruments (such as Lidar) and the validation of the acquired data.

2. Faculty

Research personnel at the CRS are of high-caliber with internationally acknowledged status. The majority of publications are in renowned, peer-reviewed, professional journals. When one of the CRS research faculty announces a course in one of the departments, it becomes very popular because students know well that they will acquire practical, hands-on knowledge.

4. Academic Programs

The CRS does not offer academic programs. Students from the three sponsoring departments conduct their research (leading to both M.A. and Ph.D. degrees) at the Center. However, the degree-granting academic programs are part of the three departments..

5. and 6. Facilities and Infrastructure

The Center for Remote Sensing and Department of Geography and Environment at Boston University (BU) are well equipped to conduct classes, training programs, and scientific research in remote sensing and GIS. Facilities include a network of 76 UNIX-based workstations plus disk and associated GIS, remote sensing and statistical modeling software.

The Center for Remote Sensing is equipped with 45 Sun Microsystems and 31 BU Linux workstations and servers. BU is unique among universities in its creation of a custom Linux distribution based on Red Hat Enterprise OS to meet BU's unique needs. The Center also recently brought on line two 24 terabyte Sun Fire 4500 servers to store the large amount of data received from NASA satellites each day. Over 70 terabytes of total disk storage is available for storing image files and map sets used in the Center's applications software. In addition to the UNIX-based machines, there are numerous PCs and Macintoshes.

Related equipment includes a Matrix QCR camera, a 24-bit color Tektronics printer, one Tektronics phaser 360 high resolution color printer, several LexMark B/W color printers, an HP 750C ink jet plotter, and two digitizing tables. Photo interpretation equipment includes a six-foot stereoscope for large, space-borne images, as well as many smaller stereoscopes for three-dimensional viewing of aerial photographs.

Ground sensors at the Center include an electromagnetic conductivity meter, ground penetrating radar, a multispectral camera, a proton magnetometer, and a spectral radiometer. These equipment are used in the field to ascertain and/or add to the data obtained from the imaging satellites.

The Center's software resources include the Image Processing Workbench (IPW) and PCI1s EASI/Xpace along with all programming tools. Geographic information systems (GIS) software includes ARC/INFO, GRASS, Mathematica, and the "SPLUS" statistical package.

More generally, BU's computing facilities also include a central UNIX timesharing system, a high-speed campus network, training facilities, the Personal Computing Support Center, a sophisticated scientific computing and visualization laboratory, and a massively parallel 32,000 processor Connection Machine CM5.

7. Collaboration

As stated earlier, the CRS is not a self-standing unit, but a research facility for use by faculty, staff and students of the Department of Archaeology, Geography and Environment, and Earth Sciences. The CRS has conducted joint work with the following research centers at BU:

- Center for Energy and Environmental Studies (now part of the Department of Geography and Environment)
- Center for Space Physics
- Center for Archaeological Research
- African Studies Center

- Pardee Center for the Study of Longer-Range Future
- Center for Ecology and Conservation Biology
- Center for Adaptive Systems

C. The Future

1. Ten-Year Plan

The ultimate goal of the 10-year plan of the CRS is to be among the top ten centers in the field in the U.S. This can be accomplished as we emphasize our major strengths. It is envisioned that we will be able to secure a permanent position for one research professor in each of the fields of our expertise including applications of remote sensing to:

- Remote sensing instrument development
- Image analysis algorithms and product validation
- Geology: Identification of sites of groundwater concentration
- Archaeology: Investigations of the context of archaeological sites
- Environment: Change detection with emphasis on vegetation and climate change

At present, only the Director's position is supported on a full-time basis. Two senior research professors are working at CRS, pending research program support. Efforts will continue to seek the necessary financial support for the professionals to conduct the research in the above listed research fields, which are deemed essential for the 21st century.

The stated positions are for researchers who, in addition to the research programs, are given opportunities to teach graduate and/or undergraduate courses in any of the three sponsoring departments of Archaeology, Geography and Environment, and Earth Sciences.

As to facilities and infrastructure, the sponsored research program will continue to be required to finance the necessary expansion as per the requirements in the stated research fields.

2. Metrics

The measure of success will be the acquisition of at least three sponsored-research projects per year. A companion metric is the publication of at least three professional papers in leading peer-reviewed professional journals per year.

3. Five-Year Goal

The 10-year plan envisions the addition of a total of four research faculty positions, one in each of the fields of expertise listed above. Accordingly, the five-year plan aims to establish two full-time research positions in two of these fields.

In preparation for this initiative, Prof. Alan Strahler of the Department of Geography and Environment has accepted to serve as Deputy Director of the Center for Remote Sensing. Prof. Strahler is an internationally recognized authority in remote sensing. He has pioneered research on instrument development, such as Lidar. He has also supervised numerous graduate students who are themselves lead researchers in the field, such as Prof. Curtis Woodcock of the Department of Geography and Environment. The work on instrument development and product validation is expected to lead ultimately to a better understanding of land cover changes and their effects on the environment.

Division of Religious and Theological Studies (DRTS)
Strategic Plan, 2010-2020

A. DRTS Mission Statement

The Division of Religious and Theological Studies (DRTS) is Boston University's home for academic graduate study of religion and theology. Our mission is to train scholars of religion who will distinguish themselves through research, teaching, and service. DRTS provides a framework for students to engage in advanced study of various religious traditions and phenomena, and to acquire skills in cognate academic disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. Our curriculum instills methodological rigor and comparative breadth, while allowing students to deepen their knowledge of chosen subjects. DRTS graduates are therefore well prepared to serve as scholars and teachers at universities, liberal arts colleges and seminaries, or to assume other professional roles that contribute to critical discourse and public understanding of religion.

B. Present

1. DRTS Faculty Membership:

The faculty of the Division come primarily from BU's Department of Religion and School of Theology, while additional affiliated faculty come from departments and programs across the university. The DRTS is, therefore, the largest unit within BU devoted to the academic study of religion. While diverse in approaches, methods, and fields of expertise, our faculty members are united in commitment to the highest academic standards, the values of interdisciplinary engagement, freedom of inquiry, and civility in academic discourse. DRTS faculty members also share a common belief in the vital importance of religious and theological studies for understanding our world.

2. Vitality:

The DRTS is a program with an illustrious past and a very promising future. In the past three years alone, the DRTS has entirely re-worked its curriculum, streamlined its administrative procedures, devised a new process for evaluating applicants, and established better practices for faculty deliberation and governance. While always exhibiting signs of academic strength, the DRTS also experienced disputes over the last decade, some of which reflected the differences between the missions of a religion department and a school of theology. Now, however, the DRTS can confidently boast of having established a new foundation for continued collaboration and even increased academic excellence.

The DRTS's structure—combining resources of a religion department and a school of theology—was once the norm. Yet there are relatively few graduate programs remaining in the country where a strong department of religion and a strong divinity school have continued to maintain—let alone, as we have, reinforce—their cooperation. Notably, some institutions with strong Divinity Schools lack fully independent departments of religion (e.g., Harvard, Chicago). On the other hand, Brown University has strengthened its religion department but no longer has a divinity school. Union Theological Seminary in New York City—long affiliated with Columbia University's strong Religion Department—is now merely a shell of the mighty institution it once was. Relations among divinity schools and departments of religion at other elite American universities that have historically had both (e.g., Duke, Yale) are reportedly quite tense. Even where unity continues to exist *de jure*, disagreement and competition frequently reign *de facto*.

To be sure, such separations are not inexplicable. Divinity schools are committed above all to the study, promotion (and even reform) of Christianity, with the primary purpose of training professional ministers and teachers for Christian communities (few non-Christian seminaries are affiliated in significant ways with

major universities). Departments of religion do not share these denominational or professional commitments. So while overlapping in their interest in religious and theological studies, departments of religion and schools of theology are not easily unified in the totality of their missions. The best divinity schools, however, expose their students to the religions of the world and seek to attract faculty committed to the highest academic standards. Successful religion departments recognize that some of their best students—undergraduates in particular—come to the study of religion out of deep personal commitment and with plans for future careers as religious professionals. Moreover a number of important sub-disciplines—including Hebrew Bible, New Testament, History of Christianity, Philosophy of Religion, and Comparative Theology—remain central to the curricula of departments of religion and schools of theology. So the interests, curricula, and student populations of religion departments and schools of theology will inevitably overlap. As long as universities value interdisciplinary study and interscholastic cooperation (while also looking to avoid wasteful institutional redundancies) cooperative endeavors like the DRTS will continue to play an important role in administering the graduate study of religion. And even undergraduates stand to benefit from such cooperation, for schools of theology in general (and STH in particular) can enhance undergraduate curricula in distinct ways (e.g., by offering courses biblical Hebrew, Greek and cognate languages like Aramaic and Egyptian). Indeed, other than highlighting the non-overlapping aspects of their related but not identical missions, it is difficult to believe that the disintegration of cooperative graduate programs like the DRTS—clearly, a past trend at other institutions—serves the greater needs of the study of religion or these institutions. As in any cooperative endeavor, matters of disagreement will have to be negotiated. The DRTS—like practically any large program in this university—can expect to face important and difficult decisions in the coming years. We can reasonably expect that some disagreements among the faculty will reflect the differences between the missions of a religion department and a school of theology. Having resisted the trend of division, we believe that the DRTS’s current structure and curriculum model the best kind of negotiated cooperation between a religion department and a school of theology. We would not be surprised if, in the coming decade, other institutions seek to emulate our structure and/or curriculum as they seek to avoid or even undo rifts of their own.

3. Measures of Excellence: Faculty

As a cooperative entity—bringing together faculty from RN, STH, and other institutes and programs across the university—the DRTS has no faculty lines of its own. All faculty have a primary appointment elsewhere in the university. DRTS Faculty are evaluated for excellence (as well as for hiring, tenure, and promotion) within their own departments, and measured by tools appropriate to their disciplines and schools. The impressive academic achievements of the DRTS faculty can be seen, primarily, by examining the academic achievements of RN and STH. This document will focus on measuring the vitality and strengths of the DRTS as related to its core mission: the training of advanced graduate students in religious studies.

4. Measures of Excellence: Outcomes

Even in a difficult economic climate, recent graduates of the DRTS are finding jobs. We have information on 26 of the 31 students who have received PhD’s since Fall 2006. Of these, 21 are working in academic institutions, and at least 7 have tenure track jobs; 5 graduates are working in other professional capacities directly related to their degrees. Arguably, three years is not enough time to measure accurately the employment outcomes of DRTS graduates. Current economic weakness is compounding the already-weak academic job market. Moreover, many of our recent PhD’s are navigating the pressures of spousal employment and child-rearing. We therefore believe that it may quite reasonably take a number of our graduates as long as five years to find themselves in positions they would boast about. Indeed, many members of our own faculty did not occupy their desired tenure track job within three years of receiving their PhD’s.

A second important measure for evaluating our graduates and our program itself is time-to-completion measures. Historically, time-to-degree measures were not something the DRTS could boast about: from 2003 to 2007 the cumulative average is just under ten years, as is the average for four out of five of those years. We are pleased that more recent statistics (from 2009 and 2008) demonstrate modest improvement:

- 2008-2009 PhD graduates: 8 PhD's; Avg. Time to degree: 8.875 years
- 2007-2008 PhD graduates: 11 PhD's; Avg. Time to degree: 8.545 years

We reasonably expect these numbers to continue to improve for the following reasons: (1) we have raised the quality of our admissions across the board; (2) we have been working hard to guide our longer-standing students through the program, and as that backlog decreases, the drag on the completion numbers will similarly decrease; (3) the single program within the DRTS with, historically, the longest time-to-completion statistics (the Counseling, Psychology, and Religion Program—CPAR) will no longer be admitting students within the DRTS.

5. Measures of Excellence: Student Quality

With the implementation of new admissions procedures meant to ensure the academic excellence of all incoming students, student quality measures of incoming DRTS classes (GPA and GRE scores) have increased in the last few years. At the same time, last year's incoming class (5 students) smaller than anticipated, and somewhat imbalanced over the four tracks (1 each in tracks I and II, 3 students in track IV). We will also continue to monitor the quality of student excellence by keeping track of publications and conference presentations by current students. For the 2008-2009 academic year, our students published 3 academic articles and/or book chapters, 5 book reviews, 5 popular articles and 1 book. Our students also delivered 41 presentations at academic conferences.

6. Measures of Excellence: Teaching and Advising of Students

The DRTS has not yet put into place measures of its own for evaluating teaching and advising across the unit, though faculty participate in CAS and STH procedures for evaluating courses. While a unified DRTS course evaluation process is a desideratum, we do not wish to interfere with the important school-wide procedures already in place. On a trial basis, DRTS students will be polled about their experiences with teaching and advising this year in coordination with the student annual report process.

7. Measures of Excellence: Teaching by Students

DRTS students have been active in their contributions to the teaching mission of CAS. Virtually all of our students assist in teaching CAS RN courses (as Teaching Fellows or Teaching Assistants) in their second, third, and fourth years, and some help out in STH courses as well. Advanced DRTS students have taught in MET and the Writing Program as well (on average, two DRTS students each semester have taught in the writing program for the past three years). In Fall 2008, the DRTS reconstituted its mandatory seminar for students assisting with CAS courses. Sessions are held monthly, and discussions concern the range of issues facing graduate students as they begin to encounter undergraduates in this professional capacity. In Spring 2009, RN instituted a system for collecting evaluations of DRTS students working in CAS courses. In a few years, we should have meaningful data which, we hope, will document the improvement in our students' teaching.

8. Measures of Excellence: Rankings and Peer Institutions

At the present time, there are no meaningful rankings of graduate programs in religion. Even the 1993/1995 NRC rankings are flawed and outdated—and BU did not sufficiently participate in this project to secure a ranking commensurate with our quality. Based on our experience, training, and impressions of recent graduates, the faculty of the DRTS identified the following institutions as boasting the most well-respected graduate programs in religion: Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Chicago, UNC Chapel Hill, and Columbia. We believe that BU rests comfortably within the next tier, which includes Emory, Duke, Vanderbilt, Syracuse, BC,

UCSB, Claremont, Indiana, Brown, and Toronto. (Notably, BU's closest peer—NYU—does not have a PhD program in religion, though it does boast important related programs, including the Skirball Center for Hebrew and Judaic Studies, which grants MA's and PhD's.)

Among these programs, BU's DRTS displays a number of distinctive features that could make it particularly attractive to graduate students. First, many potential students will find the cooperation between RN and STH attractive—after all, students who graduate with a degree in “Religious and Theological Studies” from BU can meaningfully compete for jobs at universities, liberal arts colleges and seminaries (indeed, our graduates have found jobs at all three types of institutions). Second, BU's newly designed curriculum offers students broad methodological and comparative training. Even among the best programs, only a few (e.g., Harvard, Columbia, Chicago) can boast a “core curriculum” of required courses comparable to ours. Many graduate programs in religion focus on depth at the expense of comparative breadth; but students with broad comparative knowledge will compete better for entry-level teaching positions. Third, the DRTS faculty is notable for having a rather high percentage of faculty whose work is known for methodological rigor and comparative interests. More traditional religion departments and seminaries are known for having collections of experts focused on distinct fields. Our faculty are, more often than not, trained in multiple fields.

Beyond these, the DRTS boasts a number of other distinct assets. Although not the primary steward of any particular space at BU, DRTS faculty can conveniently make use of proprietary teaching rooms maintained by STH in 745 Commonwealth Ave and by RN and EWCJS in 145/147 BSR. The facilities available for our use are, therefore, adequate for our mission and indeed are a particular point of attraction for prospective students. The participation of STH offers DRTS membership in the Boston Theological Institute (<http://www.bostontheological.org/>; BTI). Through the BTI, DRTS students have access to courses and libraries at all the local theological programs (e.g., Andover Newton Theological Seminar, Boston College, and, notably, Harvard Divinity School, which does not have other consortium agreements with BU). These schools complement a number of our strengths, including Ancient Christianity, History of Christianity, and Asian Studies. Finally, DRTS's flexible membership—while causing confusion in some matters (see above on DRTS faculty)—is an asset we have yet to utilize fully. By offering membership in the DRTS to interested and qualified faculty across the university, we believe we can, at one and the same time, strengthen our own program while also serving as a model for interdisciplinary cooperation within the university as a whole. Toward this end two new members have been welcomed to the DRTS this past semester—Prof. Linda Barnes of the Medical School, and Prof. Michael Grodin of the School of Public Health.

9. Measures of Excellence: Clusters of Distinct Strength

The DRTS faculty includes particularly strong clusters focused around particular areas of current and potential strength. Indeed, each of the four newly-structured “Tracks” within the DRTS (see <http://www.bu.edu/drts/academics/index.html>) highlight areas of faculty strength that distinguish the DRTS from other programs in the country.

One recently renewed cluster of strength is our program in Ancient Christianity (ensconced in Track I, “Texts and Traditions”): with the hiring of Professor David Frankfurter, to join Professors Knust, Walters, and Klawans, and with some dedicated five-year fellowships left to offer, the faculty assembled to work with students in this area can stand to compete for top applicants with the very best programs in this country. A second area of current strength is the cluster of faculty assembled around Track II (Religious Thought). With experts in Philosophy of Religion and Comparative Religious Thought—along with specialists in the religious philosophy of Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Judaism, and the religions of East Asia—BU's DRTS offers graduate students a wealth of resources at the nexus of religion, philosophy and theology. Another area of strength is the cluster of faculty assembled around Track III (Religion and Society): this program is tailor-made for students who wish to study the contemporary religious world through social-scientific methods (including sociology and anthropology). DRTS's “Track IV” (Religion and Science) is rather distinct among graduate programs in religion in bringing scholars of religious and theological studies together with medical researchers and scientists. This program has consistently attracted some extremely talented applicants in recent years (because this field is an emerging one, it will be important to monitor the outcomes carefully). Other

significant clusters of faculty provide strong resources in the following areas: History of Christianity, comparative religious thought, Islamic Studies, religion and gender, religion and health, Jewish Studies, and Hebrew Bible. A notable emerging area of strength concerns South Asia: with the recent hiring of two assistant professors working in this area (Hudson and Purohit) to join professors Eckel and Korom, BU's DRTS finds itself with what we believe to be the largest concentration of South Asia scholars in any religion program in the country. In the not-so-distant future, the DRTS stands to become a real player in this particular area as well.

10. Student Diversity:

Of the 74 students in the DRTS, 43 are male and 31 are female. By any measure, the DRTS's student body is rather diverse, including students from Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Italy, Israel, Korea, Romania, and Turkey. We also understand that our students exhibit broad diversity in their religious commitments. We have not polled our students about their racial identities or religious backgrounds, and therefore we are unable to provide statistics on the matter (though we would be willing to implement any specific process suggested or mandated by the university).

C. Future

1. Plans and Goals for the Future:

Because of its focused mission, the DRTS's future goals can be stated quite succinctly. First, we hope to play an increasingly important role in the training of teachers and scholars of religion. Although we cannot reasonably hope to break into the highest rankings across the board, we could, quite reasonably, aspire for a reputation as a top supplier of PhD's in select areas of specialization such as: History of Christianity (including Ancient Christianity); Comparative Religious Thought, South Asia, Religion and Science. We also aspire to maintain a solid reputation within the top twenty programs across the board. Secondly, our goal is to effectively unite the faculty across the university dedicated toward our primary goal. In so doing, we hope to become the broadest nexus within the university for the academic study of religion. The DRTS structure can then better serve as a unifying force to help publicize and highlight the religion-related activities of various departments and centers whose missions overlap with ours, even while the others focus on particular religions, cultures, geographic regions, or timeframes (e.g., CURA, Institute for Philosophy and Religion, EWCJS, Center for the Study of Asia, Institute for Study of Muslim Societies and Civilizations) as well as those centers and programs that include a. A third goal will be to study the feasibility and desirability of developing a terminal MA program. Conceivably, we could leverage our resources and curriculum to boost enrollment of tuition-paying students in our MA program. What it is unclear, however, is whether or not the experience of our doctoral students would be enhanced by presence of terminal MA students.

Because our curriculum, faculty, and facilities are in place, our current needs are modest, and, we believe, attainable. Our present faculty resources and administrative structure can easily support a graduate program of some 70 to 75 students—our current size (down from well over 100 just a few years ago). We believe that we can maintain a program of this size, with roughly seven or eight incoming students per year, and time-to-degree averages within the 7-yr range. Our current financial aid resources (1 Deans Fellowship, a shared Muslim Society Fellowship and other assorted sources of aid) do not, however, suffice to support the highest quality program of this size. We plan to increase our financial aid resources in three ways. First, we believe that our program is relatively under-funded in relation to its place in GRS. Second, the DRTS will also continue to seek increased financial aid resources from other schools whose faculty participate in our programs. Third, we will continue our efforts to work with outside granting agencies to seek dedicated fellowships in particular areas (DRTS recently secured outside funding for one Religion and Science student; three fellowships remain in the Ancient Christianity grant secured some years ago). We look forward to working on all these with the new full-time Dean of GRS.

As for the DRTS's future role as a nexus for the study of religion in Boston University, it remains to emphasize that the DRTS as currently structured has no fixed discretionary budget whatsoever. Whatever the DRTS currently does beyond financial aid and a very modest graduate allocation, it does with financial contributions from STH or RN. Even a modest programming budget—perhaps 1/5 of what is allotted to CAS departments—could allow the DRTS to play a greater role, organizing, sponsoring and advertising lectures, seminars, colloquia and other intellectually stimulating programs in religious and theological studies. We believe that a modest investment in a DRTS programming budget would prove extremely valuable to BU students and faculty.

Membership in the DRTS has, historically, been offered to all members of RN, most members of STH, and any other GRS faculty so interested. Once offered, membership has been deemed permanent. It is not entirely clear, therefore, who among our currently-listed faculty are fully interested in maintaining membership. Having worked on updating its curriculum and procedures for admission, one of the next tasks facing the DRTS (as identified already in the 2009 annual report) will be updating its membership listing, and clarifying roles played by “Core” and “Affiliated” faculty. We will then be able more readily to advertise to prospective students which faculty are eager to play leading and supporting roles in the education of graduate students.

2. Measures of Future Success:

We believe that our future success in our primary goal (graduate education) can best be measured in three ways: (1) improved time to degree measures, (2) improved employment outcomes, and (3) dissertation-related publications by DRTS graduates.

- a. We hope to bring our time-to-degree average closer to the 7-year range. This would continue the trend already in evidence. (Indeed, for each of the last two years, our completion statistics are thrown off by one or two outliers; the majority of our students are already completing the program in 7 years or less.) We believe we can further improve our time-to-degree averages by continuing our efforts to better monitor student progress and advising, and by further improving our admissions processes, so that we better identify the students who will thrive in our program.
- b. Employment outcomes can be improved both by increasing the percentage of our graduates finding desirable jobs, and by increasing the quality of those jobs, especially by placing our graduates, when possible, at better-ranked institutions. We will also be working to evaluate relative placement outcomes among our perceived clusters of strength, in order to determine whether our self-perception of quality matches external perceptions, as measured in placement.
- c. The DRTS has only recently begun to keep careful track of publications by its current students and recent graduates. Our aspiration, however, is that every PhD granted by the DRTS will lead directly—and rather quickly (within three years)—to peer-reviewed publications (journal articles or monographs, as appropriate). We believe that by working with our advanced students toward this goal we will help them demonstrate the value of their intellectual contributions to their fields as well as the value of the education and training they received in the DRTS.

Humanities Foundation
Strategic Planning, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

Our mission is to promote and enhance the work of humanities scholars at Boston University. We currently pursue this goal by granting fellowships to junior and senior faculty; by supporting interdisciplinary conferences, exhibitions, lecture series, and performances, often involving distinguished visitors; by funding library acquisitions that facilitate research in the humanities; by supporting faculty publications through subventions; and by awarding prizes to undergraduates and graduate students who have distinguished themselves in the study of humanities disciplines.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment

1. Identification of Academic Peer Group

Established in 1981 following the award of a \$1 million NEH Challenge Grant to the College of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School, the Foundation has a part-time faculty Director and one full-time staff Administrator; it is governed by a faculty Executive Committee appointed by the Dean of CAS. Although BUHF is older than most Humanities Centers, Institutes, or Foundations, it has nonetheless lagged behind many more recently founded centers in terms of its program, grants, visibility, and space. Peer group for this comparison, with URLs and brief highlights.

a. Stronger:

- Stanford: <http://shc.stanford.edu/>. Awards 25 Fellowships annually; annual budget of over \$3 million; staff of 12; has its own building, with 100-seat lecture hall and private office for each Fellow.
- Michigan: <http://www.lsa.umich.edu/humin/>. Awards 8 Faculty Fellowships and 6 graduate student fellowships, all for a full year (equivalent to 28 of our semester-long fellowships). Annual budget of \$1.5 million; staff of four; has offices for faculty and graduate Fellows, strong relationships with art, music, drama. Compare similar institutes in flagship-campus state universities: UNC (staff of fourteen!), Wisconsin (50 years old, very strong), U Washington (staff of eight, budget of \$1.2 million).
- Vanderbilt: http://www.vanderbilt.edu/rpw_center/. Nine current faculty fellows; housed in beautiful historic building; annual themes.
- NYU: <http://www.humanitiesinitiative.org/>. Probably the most comparable to BUHF. Gives 8 faculty fellowships, with two-course relief; requires residency for the year, weekly seminar meetings.

b. Weaker:

- Harvard: <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~humcentr/>. Currently has one faculty fellow and six post-doctoral fellows. Not much funding; better space than ours; highly visible program.
- Dartmouth: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~lhc/>. Gives three “non-residential fellowships” of \$5,000 and three “residential fellowships” of \$1,000 to support faculty research

The sole revenue stream for BUHF is the income from its endowment, which had grown substantially before the recent downturn. Market value as of 30 June 2008 was over \$20 million; value as of 30 June 2009 was \$14.5 million; recovery continues. Thanks to the policy of conservative interest payouts on a 20-quarter trailing average of endowment value, our annual budget remains stable at about \$650,000. Not visible in this budget but critical to our operation is the willingness of CAS (and other colleges) to provide full salary and benefits for faculty who win our fellowships, while we provide modest funds to the affected departments to cover lost teaching. Similar policies apply at most other institutes and centers. Compared to the stronger

institutes, BUHF is somewhat less well-funded. All of those institutes have endowment, but most of them receive some direct support from their universities, such as funding for staff salaries. BUHF is further disadvantaged by having functioned for decades as a low-overhead bank account for research, funding fellowships and projects but generating no program of its own. The fact that we have always been called a Foundation, rather than a Center or Institute, reflects this policy, which puts us out of step with almost all other organizations of our kind. In keeping with this “Foundation” mentality, the BUHF has not historically asked very much of its Fellows, who currently attend a monthly seminar at which one or two of them present work in progress, but who have no other obligations to the Foundation. Our peer institutions, by contrast, build stronger interdisciplinary communities for their Fellows, providing them with office space and staff services, but in return expecting them to participate vigorously in ongoing programs while in residence. Weekly seminars are typical of such programs. Many of our peer institutions have long-term visiting fellows, who are in residence for a semester or a year; some have programs for postdoctoral fellows.

2. Faculty quality

The BU faculty who hold our semester-long fellowships are chosen by the Executive Committee in a rigorous selection process strongly driven by the quality of their careers and of their specific proposals. The publications of these Fellows will already have been included in the faculty assessment sections of the reports from their several departments. Many junior faculty members have found the semester of support from BUHF absolutely critical in terms of finishing research qualifying them for tenure; since 2005, senior faculty have increased their productivity because of release time we provide. To that extent, we serve to improve faculty quality. Yet the quality of our faculty fellows is also a function of the quality of each year’s applicant pool, which is in turn a function of the quality of hiring and promotion in humanities departments. Thanks to a new way of estimating the cost to the Foundation of providing monies to departments in lieu of lost teaching, we are now awarding more fellowships; past practice typically left too much money unspent at the end of each academic year. The current Director believes that the present “hit rates” are appropriate: this year we funded about half of the senior faculty who applied to us, and we expect to fund more than half of the junior faculty applicants. This success rate compares very favorably to national competitions (the NEH hit rate, for example, is now 11%), but still leaves some worthy projects unfunded.

3. Academic Programs

a. Interdisciplinary initiatives

Promoting interdisciplinary discourse is a central part of our mission. We ask both junior and senior faculty who apply for our fellowships to tell us how their projects will contribute to their specific fields, and to “ongoing discussions in the humanities more generally.” The tenure and promotion process, however, with its strong emphasis on disciplinary peer review, discourages most junior faculty, and some senior faculty, from moving beyond the boundaries of their disciplines. In the choices it has made in the last two cycles of the selection process, the Executive Committee has sent a strong message to senior faculty that work of interest to only one discipline is less likely to receive our support than work addressing a wider audience. There are more aggressive models for promoting interdisciplinary work: the University of California Humanities Research Institute, which serves the entire California system, grants all of its fellowships to faculty working in groups. Emulating their practice would be disruptive in this institution, but the present Director believes that we should explore granting fellowships to groups of two or possibly three faculty members who choose to apply together.

In choosing which “humanities enhancement projects” to fund, the Executive Committee has also privileged proposals involving more than one department. Some of the programs we fund, such as the Institute for Philosophy and Religion, provide sustained, well-organized opportunities for faculty and students in different fields to engage each other’s work. Others, such as conferences, are one-time events whose long-term impact is more difficult to assess, though the conference honoring the late Eve

Sedgwick, held last fall, was an excellent example of an event combining the interests of many BU units, drawing in distinguished participants from other universities, and significantly enhancing the reputation of the University. For a list of sponsors and participants, see <http://www.bu.edu/honoringeve/sponsors/>.

Because the longstanding practice of BUHF has been to fund programmatic initiatives originating with the faculty, our ability to promote interdisciplinary discourse is a function of the number and quality of the proposals we receive. Because departments lack funds for their own disciplinary study groups, lecture series, etc., we are often asked to support programs without significant interdisciplinary content, and while we accord those a lower priority, we continue to fund many of them. The present Director believes that we should move toward generating more of our own programs, and that the programs we generate should be strongly interdisciplinary. Modest innovations along these lines, undertaken during the last three semesters, have not yet generated much enthusiasm. The Executive Committee announced an annual theme, “Judgments of Value,” for AY 2009–10, and some applicants tailored their proposals to that theme; a study group open to all faculty, announced as a way to promote a discussion of that broad theme, has attracted a small group of interested people, but only a modest level of activity. It will take time and energy for our colleagues to stop regarding us as a bank account and begin to think of us as a center for conversation and stimulation. Changing our name to “BU Humanities Center” would be a good step.

b. International/global initiatives

Among the many visitors we sponsor each year, a significant number come from abroad. During AY 2008–09, for example, events funded by BUHF hosted 32 foreign visitors from 15 different countries. Although such visitors incur greater travel costs than domestic scholars, and although visa restrictions make it very difficult to pay them honoraria, we have nonetheless encouraged humanities units to make proposals to us involving foreign scholars. In keeping with our interest in community-building, we have traditionally been more willing to support bringing foreign nationals to Boston than sending our own faculty abroad. The Executive Committee has also encouraged BU faculty to devise programs in which a foreign colleague has a presence here for more than one lecture or seminar. A two-week residency, for example, often provides more opportunities for in-depth dialogue than a shorter stay. The present Director believes that we might receive more and better proposals of this kind if we were to announce a specific grant program supporting global initiatives in the humanities.

c. Outreach initiatives: Many of the programs we sponsor provide excellent outreach within the academic profession. Thanks to BUHF funding, faculty at BU are able to host meetings of scholarly organizations, regionally and nationally, bringing important colleagues here and enhancing the University’s reputation. Locally organized conferences and lecture series are also valuable for making visitors from other universities aware of the quality of work done here.

We have also sought to encourage programs attractive to the wider community. A new series of lunches for alumni, “Arts, Culture, and Ideas,” planned and executed by the Foundation and the CAS Alumni Relations office, has sold out its last two programs, both featuring Fellows of the Foundation; more are planned for this spring. Recent programs of community outreach that we have funded at the request of BU faculty include a yearly conference for teachers of Latin, organized by the Department of Classical Studies, the annual BU Theatre Marathon, and such discrete events as the international conference on the composer Olivier Messiaen, which involved the Boston Symphony Orchestra, or the “Drawing Towards Home” exhibition, which involved local societies for architectural preservation. There are a few humanities centers, notably the one at the University of Texas, whose programs are almost exclusively dedicated to outreach into the non-academic community. While we do not propose to slant our whole program in that direction, we could do much more.

4. Facilities

Our most serious disadvantage, when we compare ourselves to leading humanities institutes, is our lack of space. CAS 107 gives us an office for the Director, an office for the one full-time staff person, a workstation for a receptionist (partly staffed by undergraduate work-study students), and a conference room that can hold our nine-member Executive Committee (not very comfortably), but not our 14-member Fellows Seminar, which has to meet elsewhere. We will not be able to make significant progress toward building a more visible program and a more vibrant resident community without acquiring significantly larger space. An adequate space would include a seminar room seating 30, small offices for 20 Fellows, a lunchroom, staff offices, computers, and networked printers. Desirable, though not as necessary, would be a lecture hall and performance space. While there is some prospect of our being able to occupy more space once the new CAS building is constructed, we would welcome an opportunity to develop a proposal to put before either a donor interested in donating a house in the area to the University, or a donor capable of funding our acquiring or constructing a building. The present Director, who has fundraising experience, hopes that the Development Office will be willing to work with him on this initiative.

5. Other infrastructure:

If we are successful in acquiring a building in which each year's Fellows can have office space, we will need to supply them with telephones, computers, and some staff support. Our needs in this area are not expensive, as humanities scholars can normally work productively with a standard computer. The next logical staff position to create would bear the title Fellows' Coordinator; that person would attend to the needs of resident and Visiting Fellows, organizing such services as daily delivery of books from the library.

6. Collaboration with other academic units and institutions

We collaborate on a daily basis with the departments in CAS officially classified as humanities—religion, philosophy, classics, art history, English, Romance Studies, MLCL, music, classical studies—and with interdisciplinary programs with strong humanities components, such as AMNES, African-American Studies, and Women's Studies. We have cordial relationships with many departments in the social sciences, especially history, archaeology, anthropology, and political science; faculty members from those departments have frequently won our fellowships. We also enjoy productive relationships with many parts of the College of Fine Arts, and have granted several recent fellowships to faculty members from the Music division of CFA.

Outside BU, we have recently joined the National Humanities Alliance, which lobbies on behalf of humanities funding at the federal level, and the Consortium of Humanities Centers and Institutes, to which hundreds of similar centers belong. Both associations have already begun to bear fruit for us.

C. Strategic Plan for the Future

1. Ten-year plan

Ten years from now the renamed Boston University Humanities Center should be among the top 35 such centers. This goal can be accomplished without any additional budgetary support from CAS or the central administration. It will require imaginative leadership, creative use of existing funds, and the opportunity to raise more endowment.

2. 10-year goals by category:

a. Faculty

Maintain approximately the present number of junior and senior faculty fellowships. Strengthen community by providing office space and research services. Make Fellows' Seminar a more regular event. Begin new programmatic initiatives as enabled by the raising of new endowment and determined by the Executive Committee.

b. Interdisciplinary initiatives

Create stronger incentives for interdisciplinary cooperation, including awarding fellowships to faculty with collaborative projects. Strengthen existing interdisciplinary programs. Find an appropriate balance between funding projects developed by entrepreneurial faculty members and inventing projects originating with the Center's Executive Committee and administration. Make sure to have some programs open to all faculty without a selection process, providing opportunities to present and discuss work in progress with colleagues.

c. Facilities

Acquire greatly expanded space, as described above.

d. Other infrastructure.

Add staff as needed.

e. Collaborations

Give departments a stronger sense of ownership in creating policies and programs that benefit the maximum number of colleagues. Work closely with other humanities centers through the CHRCI. Double the number of programs aimed at non-academic audiences.

3. Resources needed to accomplish these goals:

The success of the peer institutions listed above, almost all of which have active and generous alumni boards, suggests that a vibrant, accessible humanities center with strong outreach programs can be a magnet for attracting alumni support. Rather than requesting additional budgetary support, we respectfully request a hunting license, an opportunity to develop, in the context of the upcoming campaign, a fundraising program aimed at increasing the existing endowment by \$10 million and acquiring a building. The current Director is eager to undertake this task.

4. Measures for evaluating progress

Endowment growth; size and quality of applicant pools; attendance at events and programs we sponsor. All data can be collected by current staff.

5. Five-year goals

Within five years, we should have increased the endowment by \$5 million in new gifts, pledges, or bequest intentions. This will enable progress toward the programmatic initiatives listed above. We should change our name, as proposed above, to signal our intention to generate more of our own programs and to include more of our colleagues in our activities.

In order to achieve this goal, the Director, aided by members of the Executive Committee and other leading humanities faculty, will need to devote significant time to development activities. We will need support from the CAS and BU development offices, who can help us identify possible prospects, plan opportunities for them to attend BUHF events, and allow us to develop fruitful relationships with them.

Boston Playwrights' Theatre at Boston University
Strategic Planning, 2010-2020

A. Mission Statement

1. Public Mission Statement

Boston Playwrights' Theatre is a home for new works for the stage, and we measure our success first by a generous dedication to our playwrights' visions. In tandem with our professional theatre season is our Graduate Program where we prepare our writers for a life in the professional theatre and for their future academic environments. We encourage and promote our students' works in New England and throughout the nation by workshopping and producing their plays and by fostering future collaborations with directors, actors, and designers from Boston University and the surrounding areas.

2. Vision Statement

Boston Playwrights' Theatre at Boston University will be the single most important resource for all things connected to the creation and production of new plays in New England by 2020.

B. The Present: Description and Assessment – Divided into Programs

Our present impact may be quantified in terms of three key areas: Academic, Artistic and Outreach. (1) Academic: the success (productions, publications and academic recognitions) of the alumni/playwrights of our graduate program; (2) Artistic: the artistic achievement of our Season of New Plays (culled from our current students' works and from alumni of our playwriting program) and other play development programs (as judged in peer and critical review); and (3) Outreach: the depth and breadth of our community outreach programs. (See individual programs below for specific criteria.)

1. Academic Program Faculty

Upon the retirement of Boston Playwrights' Theatre Founder Derek Walcott in January 2008, it was our Dean's wish that we fill the positions with professional playwrights who have demonstrated a history of teaching excellence and who are in the midst of their promising playwriting careers - who will have an eye to the development of Boston Playwrights' Theatre as a program of Boston University. Ronan Noone and Melinda Lopez have demonstrated two years of bringing exactly these criteria to the classroom. In the past three years, we've produced plays by both of these playwrights, and their national accolades have continued to grow. Both are beloved and respected by our graduate students, and both have given valuable input into our strategic planning processes. Richard Schotter and Kate Snodgrass continue to bring their valuable insight as playwrights and teachers to the classroom. Richard travels from his Creative Writing program in New York to teach short plays and libretto writing. Boston Playwrights' Theatre has been shepherded in its growth by the artistic acumen of Kate Snodgrass – from a studio theatre to a nationally recognized professional theatre for new works, Boston Playwrights' Theatre and close to 200 students over the last 20 years have grown from Kate's critical and supportive voice and from her unflinching artistic integrity. She is a valuable resource to the New England theatre community, as well, where she fosters new works with the help of BPT's outreach programs.

While nearly every academic program may look in their faculty for someone with the visibility of a Derek Walcott, we believe the interaction with the student is of greater consequence, and so: the retaining of and continuing to attract the level of professor we currently support will be one of the key indicators of the

success of our academic program. All of our student evaluations for our faculty are well above a 4.0 on average, and we will continue to assure our students of a rich and supportive environment.

2. MFA Program

We teach playwriting to a select group of graduate students every year in our one-year program, and we offer an Introduction to Playwriting course in both the fall and spring semesters to our undergraduate population. Our graduate level courses—EN509 and EN510—allow undergraduates to enroll in and learn from the graduate writers and Creative Writing professors. We hope that, by encouraging the younger writers, they will decide to enter our MFA program in order to gain the professional and production experience necessary to continue writing for the stage. In our two graduate playwriting workshops with Melinda Lopez and Ronan Noone, we bring in professional actors and some BFA students and professors from the CFA Theatre Department to assist in the reading of these new plays. It's a wonderful learning experience for all concerned.

Our current 32-credit graduate program is continually proven successful by our alumni awards/productions. However, in order to remain competitive on a national level (see our “F. Peer Institutions” list at the end of this document) with other MFA Playwriting programs, we are exploring ways of expanding our academic offerings in collaboration with the College of Fine Arts Theatre Department. Discussions to this end are ongoing, but one potential and favored solution is a two- or three-year program to be fulfilled by 60 credits of study. Class offerings would expand to include more “workshop” courses in adaptation, autobiography, for example, and “production” courses in design, directing, dramaturgy, and/or acting. Our MFA as it stands now sees 30-35 applications for admission to the 4-8 graduate slots per year. Three indicators of the success of our academic program will be a) an increase in the number of competitive applications per year, b) playwriting alumni leaving our program with a greater breadth of knowledge and with professional success within their reach (that is, connections to the professional and academic worlds), and c) writers graduating with a coterie of willing collaborators for their future plays along with an experienced production background.

3. Non-Academic Programs – Complimenting our Academic Program with Artistic and Outreach Programs

a. Season of New Plays

Presently we produce three to four professional (Actors' Equity Association) shows per year (3 fall/1 spring); 2 out of the 4 of these shows are collaborations with local theatre companies. Nearly every show is a production of a work by our alumni. We have begun to include non-alumni in our production season so that our current students may enjoy learning from outside professional writers and BPT collaborators; this also helps us develop our audience / subscriber base. However, most of our productions will always be by our Boston University alumni. Indicators of the success of this program include: donor and commercial support, critical and peer attention, future development of the plays beyond our auspices, ticket revenue, and a growing subscriber base.

b. New Noises: Massachusetts Young Playwrights' Project

Twelve high school classes in Massachusetts are mentored in the writing of short plays, ending with two days of celebration by production/rehearsals in early April at BPT--funded in part by the Humanities Foundation of Boston University and in collaboration with the Boston Children's Theatre. Indicators of the success of this program include number of interested schools, quality of festival plays for two-day celebration as determined by artistic director and by outside funders / collaborators.

c. Ground Floor Professional Reading Series

Every April/May, four to eight students leaving our graduate workshops showcase their year's work in a play reading before a small, invited audience. To enlarge these readings into a festival, this year we

are expanding the program to include six playwrights (non-alumni) from New England. Our students will take their place among their playwriting peers. Indicators include audience numbers, playwrights interested in showcasing their work with our graduates, and the quality of work as determined by artistic director and peer review.

d. Boston Theater Marathon

Every May, we produce/organize 50 ten-minute plays in ten hours, culled from over 400 entries from all over New England. Recently we've expanded the event to include three readings of new works sponsored by Boston Center for the Arts (BCA) resident theatre companies; plus a panel of dramaturgs and/or playwrights to publicize playwriting challenges is held on the Friday evening before the festival weekend. All of the net proceeds from these events benefit the Theatre Community Benevolent Fund (a non-profit charitable organization existing to help theatre artists and companies in need). Indicators include audience sizes, outside funders, potential city interest (already shown by the Mayor's Office), competitiveness of plays submitted, press, and quality of productions as determined by artistic director.

e. Sister City Playwright Exchange

Bi-annually we send a playwright from our Program to another theatre company in another city for a reading or production of his/her work. That company sends us a playwright so s/he may experience a reading and rehearsals/workshops of one of his/her plays. This exchange allows our writers to meet companies, like ours, who specialize in new works across the nation. Indicators of the success of this program would be play development and production or other artistic personnel exchange between cities.

f. Black Box Fellowships

Year round, Boston Playwrights' Theatre is also a venue for new plays. In order to support the development of new plays in Boston, Boston Playwrights' Theatre at Boston University subsidizes our spaces for small theatre companies in order to remove the bigger risks from new play production—that is, the bottom line necessary to cover rent. Currently, we support nearly a dozen productions per year, a dozen readings and other playwriting events, as well as auxiliary groups meeting (actors' groups, Actors' Equity meetings, StageSource producer auditions) in our space at 949 Commonwealth Avenue. Indicators of the success of this program: artistic success and audience interest in visiting theatres, income from visiting theatres, demand for space by local groups, number of new plays developed with the help of our space.

4. Facilities

The facilities of Boston Playwrights' Theatre at 949 Commonwealth Avenue are not adequate for its current uses. Critical issues include:

- Lack of lobby space or of an entryway that is conducive to public use.
- Lack of appropriate restroom facilities
- Lack of storage space
- Lack of hard ceilings in five of the most-used rooms at the address (offices, green room, dressing rooms)
- Rain seepage and mouse entry in the building.

Corrective measures will need to be taken to adapt gracefully to our programs in the next 10 years. An indicator of the success of correcting these problems will be a funding source dedicated to capital improvement of at least \$100,000 to make a substantial difference.

5. Staff

The current staff of Boston Playwrights' Theatre (Artistic and Managing Directors, Production Manager and Marketing Coordinator) are supported by a number workstudies and interns – most putting in no more than ten hours each per week. While not an optimal size of senior staff, the configuration works well enough for the current size of our programs. An indicator of the growth of our staff would be a constant surplus in our year end revenue – though this most likely will not be enough to support an additional staff member in ten years. Additional funding will need to be identified.

6. Diversity

We have always considered our graduate playwriting students to be a diverse group of writers, and, of course, the numbers of these applications wanes and flows from year to year because the students are judged on their ability to write dramatic action, to draw rich characters, and to explore a theatrical vision. Over the last five years, we have applied for two Martin Luther King grants (one student enrolled in NYU, the other in Julliard); of the 28 students who attended our program in the last five years (14 women, 14 men), five were of color. And, of course, our Assistant Professor Melinda Lopez is Cuban.

C. Ten-Year Goals - key differences underlined

By 2020, Boston Playwrights' Theatre will be considered New England's key new play and playwright educational, production and outreach organization.

1. Academic Program

a. Faculty

As the retirement of a couple members of our faculty near, BPT will be poised to make decisions on a wide-range of applicants looking to be part of such a recognized teaching faculty.

b. MFA Program

The MFA degree program, now, hopefully, in collaboration with the CFA Theatre Department and the Creative Writing Department at CAS, will be known as the most rigorous and successful traditional Playwriting degree in the Northeast.

c. Season of New Plays

In 2020, Boston Playwrights' Theatre will have a five-show professional season of new plays – three shows in the Fall, two in the Spring. See below under "Ground Floor" for additional productions.

d. New Noises: Massachusetts Young Playwrights' Project

The New Noises program will have doubled in size from its current capacity: twenty-four schools visited by mentors culminating in a four-day festival at Boston Playwrights' Theatre (or at another, larger venue).

e. Ground Floor Professional Reading Series

The Ground Floor Program will expand to include at least four (non-equity and/or equity) productions in collaboration with the CFA Theatre Department and their BCAP professional acting company. Additionally, the program may be split into Ground Floor Productions and Ground Floor Readings to accommodate the 20-30 readings of new plays planned for 2020 – all of them free to the public and a benefit to the playwrights.

f. Boston Theater Marathon, Sister City Playwright Exchange, and Boston International Fringe Festival

While the current format will be retained for the BTM (50 ten-minute plays in ten hours), this will be the culmination or jewel in the crown of a much bigger event meant to involve much more than aficionados of new plays. Increasing our festival play readings to eight, and with the BTM running simultaneously in two theatres at the BCA, we will encourage and extend our reach to a month of new plays produced all over the city in smaller and larger venues by various theatre companies. We will – in 2020 -- be one of the forerunners of Boston’s first International Fringe Festival. The festival will encounter and encourage plays from all over the world – bringing companies, actors, directors, and, most importantly, playwrights to the region (possibly in connection with Sister City Playwright Exchange) and, meanwhile, putting Boston first as the center of new plays in America.

g. Black Box Fellowships

We will continue to provide space at a highly subsidized rate. With our recognition as a place of the best new work in the region, and with our collaboration with the CFA Theatre Department extending to more productions of our playwrights’ works, we believe our space will be at a premium. However, rather than charging for it, we would use our position to bring the best new plays into our space while creating the best development opportunities for alumni, local, and New England playwrights. Our own professional and Ground Floor seasons will take place at BPT but still allow for the best new plays by the better small new-play companies to thrive.

h. Facilities

We will be in process of a major update to our facilities at 949 Commonwealth Avenue – or, depending on Boston University’s timeline for dormitory growth in our area of campus – moving to more appropriate facilities on campus to fulfill our mission.

i. Staff

Two new staff positions will be necessary to handle the amount of growth we forecast: a) Producing Artistic Associate to support the Artistic Director in the daily maintenance of the many programs; b) Development Associate to focus on funding sources for the many programs.

j. Advisory Board

Our ambitious plans will require greater knowledge and support from our community, both within Boston University and within the professional theatre community. Currently, our associations and networking with individuals are effective, but informal.

2. *Five Year Metrics (to determine if Ten-Year plan is on track), indicators underlined.*

a. Academic Program

Our applicant pool has grown to at least 70 applicants per year for the 4-6 spaces in our program. The MFA program is now a collaborative MFA between the CFA and CAS, featuring 60 credits required for matriculation. Additional funding for the program will have been approved from Boston University for the improved two-year program. We’ve created a steering committee of teachers and nationally known playwrights to address the development of our academic programs.

b. Season of New Plays

We’ve secured funding to professionally produce four shows per year without question. The funding is a mix of increased ticket revenue and commercial and philanthropic contributions along with Boston University’s financial support. About \$60,000 in additional funding must be identified to continue to produce at the level we do now.

c. New Noises: Massachusetts Young Playwrights' Project

We will be collaborating with 18 high schools by this time for a three-day festival. This requires additional funding of at least \$3,000 - \$6,000. In addition, our more ambitious plans for the program should be complete by this time with our collaborators, The Boston Children's Theatre – including funding sources, school scholarship possibilities and even consideration of international connections.

d. Ground Floor Professional Reading Series

The visibility of this program will need to be such that our houses are 3/4s full for the run of the play readings, and four academic (non-equity) productions – these last drawn from our MFA program's continuing students—will be produced in collaboration with the CFA Department of Theatre. Additional funding necessary for four productions and additional readings: \$45,000.

e. Boston Theater Marathon

The 50 plays will continue to be produced in the form they are today. Four new play readings will be sponsored by BCA resident companies, and one day will be devoted to a panel of dramaturges and/or playwrights to publicize playwriting challenges. Attendance will need to be nearly sold-out for these programs to show growth potential by this time. There may need to be an additional \$10,000 for advertising and tending this program. In addition, a goal of \$20,000 in funding for the BTM will make it the charity success we envision.

f. Sister City Playwright Exchange

Annually, we'll send a playwright from our Program to another theatre company in another city for a reading or a production of his/her work. The success of this networking will be demonstrated by at least three full-productions (one every other year) born of these collaborations.

g. Boston International Fringe Festival

We create a steering committee to begin discussions of what shape such a festival would have, how it would work with our Boston Theater Marathon, Sister City Exchange and other new play initiatives. Also, of key importance to us will be the assurance that new plays will remain at the center of any future festival.

h. Black Box Fellowships

We will have re-branded our facilities to support our visiting theatres and groups while avoiding confusion with our own productions and readings. The number of fellowships will decrease in five years since our space will be taken by at least five more productions under our auspices.

i. Facilities

We will have a good idea of Boston University plans for our space in order to make the best decision on the expansion, modification or relocation of our facilities. This may be made possible by the development of a Advisory board (see below.)

j. Staff

We will have a Development Associate added to our staff of four; this person will research a multitude of funding possibilities and will be an experienced grant writer. With the help of this new staff member, we will continue to seek out funding opportunities for our programs and our productions with the possibilities of donor earmarked projects, etc.

k. Board

We will have chosen 8-10 Boston University interested parties and theatre professionals from the Boston theater community to give us feedback and to aid in the continuation of our programs and

productions. In addition, an advisory board will help us in securing certain funding grants now barred to us because of our lack of a board's advice.

3. Peer Institutions

The following are a list of peer institutions. We lose potential applicants to these schools annually. With a) 28 more credits of theatre seminars and workshops added to our already scholarly 32-credit MFA program, b) our collaboration with the BFA acting students, the MFA directing students, and the talented design students in the CFA in productions of our students' works, and c) a fuller financial aid package to offer our most talented writers, our future MFA will rival and then surpass each of these institutions' degrees.

- Brown University: 3-year MFA playwriting program; 3-4 graduates per year; attached to the professional Trinity Repertory Theatre; may offer 3 years full tuition with stipend and health benefits, a 1st-year fellowship and teaching or research assistantships.
- Carnegie Mellon University: 2-year MFA dramatic writing program; 4-6 graduates per year; attached to professional Philip Chosky Theatre; financial aid unknown.
- Julliard School: 1 to 2-year MFA playwriting program (may be selected to continue into the second year); 4 graduates per year, 26 credits); attached to the Julliard School of Acting; tuition free 1st year with stipend.
- New York University (Tisch School for the Arts): 3-year MFA dramatic writing w/emphasis in playwriting program; 2 graduates per year; attached to professional Playwrights' Horizons—1st Look at New Plays; financial aid unknown.
- Rutgers University: 3-year MFA playwriting program; 3 graduates per year; attached to professional Rutgers Theater Company & The Jameson Project; financial aid unknown.

Yale University: 3-year MFA playwriting program; 3-4 graduates per year; attached to professional Yale Repertory Theatre; may offer financial aid on a case-by-case basis.