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PART ONE: EXECUTIVE RESPONSE

A) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REVIEW DOCUMENTS (SELF-STUDY, REVIEWERS’ REPORT, UNIT RESPONSE)

Self-Study

- The self-study describes the transition from the Ancient Mediterranean Studies program into the Ancient Studies program. It articulates that the self-study documents were prepared by program members led by Dr. Darren Mulloy, and that the focus of the self-study is the program moving forward as opposed to focusing on the structure of the former Ancient Mediterranean Studies program. The document responds to previous reviewer recommendations and contextualizes how the salient recommendations of the previous review have been adopted into the current program: it is lean but provides the courses students need to graduate, it no longer requires an ancient languages component, it is not streamed, and it offers a 400-level capstone course. The document asks reviewers to respond to issues of program focus, program clarity and sustainability, additional courses in art and literature, resourcing, and the role of online learning.

- At the time the self-study was written, program-level learning outcomes were under development. The program articulates a list of student goals and experiences aligning with each degree level expectation which will inform its systematic development of learning outcomes.

- Ancient Studies embraces High Impact Practices which mentor students through discovery-based pedagogy which is strongly supported by the Department of History and the Ancient Studies faculty. The removal of prerequisites in the program has allowed students more course options that align with their interests. The structure of the program is outlined in the document and rationale for each year-level is provided which shows considerable thought given to the way in which students progress through the program and what the aims and outcomes are for each year. The cross-cultural focus of the program, which includes the ancient Near East and courses in Ancient China, Africa, and the Americas, differentiates it from other programs in Canada.

- Enrolments across the program have been growing consistently, even when overall Faculty enrolment has declined. The program has managed to focus enrolments in the 100- and 200-level courses and keep the 300 and 400-level courses smaller. Lecturing is augmented by tutorials in junior-level courses and 400-level courses are taught as seminars. The program has developed two online courses already and will be steadily expanding these offerings. The interdisciplinary nature of the program and the fact that it draws courses from other disciplines (such as History and Archaeology) to augment its program requirements. Students are assessed in written and oral form through independent research essays, class discussions, and reading-intensively.

- The self-study notes the program’s reliance on contract academic staff (CAS) to deliver its courses and notes that, with the bevy of program changes, it is essential for students to receive high-quality accurate academic advising. The faculty in the program are actively involved in regular scholarly and service commitments, and their teaching in the program is essential.
• Teaching evaluations in the program are consistent with Faculty and University averages and graduate employment rates are very high and approximately half of graduates have gone on to pursue higher education opportunities.

• While the Ancient Studies program is in its infancy, the self-study concludes that it has considerable potential, and articulates several short term goals including: developing a mission statement for the program, attracting 70 majors next year, developing more online courses, as well as organizing a student club. Barriers include additional teaching resources and scheduling such that Ancient Studies courses don't overlap. Growth in the program will mean additional resources required of both the Chair of History and the Administrative Assistant.

External Reviewers’ Report

Executive Summary

Overall, Ancient Studies is a promising, if under-resourced, program. The program has only recently (i.e., within the past year) been relocated and renamed, from Ancient Mediterranean Studies (AMS) as housed in the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies (AR), to Ancient Studies (AS) as housed in the Department of History (HI). While this move has been a successful and quality-enhancing one for the program, some significant work remains to build the program and to clarify its focus and relationship to other units in the University. The following executive summary and recommendations should be read with this context in mind.

The overarching objectives of the Ancient Studies program, as expressed in the Self-Study and supporting documents, are consistent with Laurier’s mission, vision, and values as well as with the Academic Plan in effect at the time of the authoring of the Self-Study.

Since the recent change from Ancient Mediterranean Studies to Ancient Studies involved a measure of program transformation and reorientation, it is understandable that clearly articulated level outcomes for the program are currently “under development”. At a general level, the learning outcomes and goals as identified in the Self-Study do appear appropriate and aligned with the University’s Degree-Level Expectations.

While there is a clear sense within the program of how students are expected to progress over the four years of the degree, program requirements do appear to be a source of confusion for undergraduate students. The issue appears to be based in part on the difficulty of locating Ancient Studies program requirements on the Laurier web site and of knowing with any certainty which courses would count toward the degree.

The lack of prerequisites for AS courses is consistent with the much-needed streamlining of the program as recommended in the previous cyclical review of AMS (and also serves to bring the AS program into line with History Department practices), but may result in differing levels of preparation between students in the program and those taking such courses as electives. On a related matter, and in terms of the preparation of any students (AS majors or not) for upper level study in the program, the apparent discrepancy in requirements between some of the 100-level courses from different departments on the Ancient Studies list will need to be addressed.

As for the future direction of this new program, the Self-Study asks whether the History Department should focus the new AS Program on providing a coherent selection of courses for Majors or be run simply as a potential
area of study for students seeking electives. Since Ancient Studies is an area of growth in the Faculty of Arts at Laurier, it seems that not to develop a coherent program for Majors would be a missed opportunity.

The transfer into History (from Archaeology and Classical Studies) of the two core full-time faculty members of the program, and then the transfer of the program itself, appears to have been a successful experience. However, no formal Ancient Studies (sub)committee exists in what is otherwise a very large History Department. Given the need for the Chair to be advised on and supported in Ancient Studies-related matters by those core faculty members who teach in the program, and the need for those faculty members who provide such service to have their efforts recognized as such, the formation of some sort of dedicated Ancient Studies committee within the History Department appears to be appropriate.

The plans for future online course development also appear promising and could also contribute to increasing student enrollment. The development of online courses could allow the department to offer (and staff, without drawing on intramural stipends) additional Ancient Studies courses, particularly those related to the global focus on the program.

The lack of a Minor in Ancient Studies is a notable absence in the current structure of the program. A well-planned minor could have the effect of building on the elective enrollments at lower course levels to draw in more students in upper level classes.

AS students with a special interest in Greece and Rome may wish to acquire a reading knowledge of Greek and Latin, a key asset if they intend to pursue graduate studies. The Chairs of History and Archaeology, and other concerned parties, may wish to investigate the possibility of creating a Minor in Greek and Latin which could be housed in, or moved to, any department where a Greek or Latin philologist is willing to take over its administration. This seems called for now that the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies does not actually offer a Classics degree any longer.

The History Department should maintain its focus on Ancient Studies in a global context, as it is innovative in the North-American context, and students interested primarily in the Greco-Roman world (probably the majority of AS students) should be encouraged to take courses on ancient Africa, India, China, etc. Approaching the Ancient World globally is likely to provide better conditions for the development of critical thinkers.

The Department should not consider the creation of “courses in literature”, which belong in more traditional Classics or Near-Eastern Studies departments and would not fit well with the Department’s learning outcomes. While AS is meant to be different from Archaeology by focusing more on non-material culture, it should nevertheless use the literary sources to investigate historical problems and issues (such as ancient social inequalities), rather than take the sources themselves as the object of enquiry (as would be the case in a course on Virgil, for example).

Stand-alone “courses in art” would fit oddly with the department’s learning outcomes for similar reasons. In addition, Classical Archaeology (unlike Near-Eastern Archaeology) is traditionally taught in conjunction with art, such as in the Archaeology Department at Laurier, where two “Art and Archaeology” courses already exist: AR214 and AR215.
The specific high impact practices of which we were made aware all relate to courses in the History Department. The commitment to offer tutorials in HI121 and HI131 is commendable. At the upper levels, particular mention should be made of the innovative structure of HI381, in which more traditional pieces of academic writing are complemented by the students’ producing scenes from Greek drama that relate to the topic of the course. Finally, it is clear that the two capstone fourth year courses in the program are exemplary high impact pedagogical endeavours.

While by all accounts the administrative assistant for the program is extremely capable and efficient at her job, there is some concern that the additional responsibilities related to the Ancient Studies program will add up to too much strain on one individual’s capacity. The undergraduate advisor for the program is also under considerable pressure to handle both queries from History students and what will be a growing number of Ancient Studies-related queries. As such, a second course release for this advisor, which was approved in the staffing plan for this year, appears well justified.

The relatively high proportion of courses in the program (currently approximately 60%) taught by CAS members is a significant concern. That said, the existing contract faculty in Ancient Studies are well-qualified and contribute greatly to the quality of the program.

Both full-time faculty members have proven over the years, by their teaching and research output, that they are highly qualified and will most likely contribute significantly to the growth of the History Department. Nonetheless, the History department can only provide a relatively small proportion of what would be needed to develop and run a robust major in Ancient Studies, with the risk that the proportion would shrink further due to course remission and sabbatical or other leaves in certain years.

While the low numbers of full-time faculty dedicated to Ancient Studies and the promise of the program as noted in this report would certainly merit the awarding of a tenure-track position to the program, it is clear that in the current budgetary climate other options will need to be considered. Continued online course development, which the program is committed to pursuing, is one solution to part of the resource issue, though such development is a slow process and cannot compensate for the entire shortfall in needed stipends. Additional stipends dedicated to Ancient Studies appear to be necessary to maintain program viability and as a foundation for future growth.

List of Recommendations

1. That the program investigates ways to make the program requirements more accessible to students either through the University website or through the development of (or the increased circulation of existing) advising materials or checklists that clearly indicate the courses that count toward the AS degree.

2. That the program explores the possibility of instituting an AS course code, with the intent of using this code to cross-list courses from various departments with offerings on the Ancient Studies List. This would aid in identifying AS courses for current but also potential students in the program, who might otherwise be unaware of the scope of the program and its connection to related fields of study.
3. That, in light of concerns that AS and non-AS students in 300-level courses enter such courses with significantly different levels of background knowledge in Ancient Studies, the program consider instituting a minimal prerequisite or recommended prerequisite of one .5 credit 100-level AS course for the 300-level courses in the program.

4. That the AR and HI members of the AS coordinating committee (as is suggested to be formed in recommendation 5) evaluate whether some general standardization of requirements is necessary across the four 100-level courses offered in the AS curriculum. This recommendation is made without the intent to interfere with the academic freedom of faculty members to decide on how best to design and teach courses in their field of expertise.

5. That the program develops a coordinating or advisory committee, within the existing structure of the History Department, comprised of faculty members with expertise in and a teaching contribution to the program. Given the need for continued collaboration and consultation with the Archaeology and Classical Studies Department (from which the bulk of non-History Ancient Studies courses are drawn), representation from, or at the very least some formalized means of consultation with, this latter department is recommended.

6. That attention be paid, within the context and constraints of the centralized scheduling system, to the scheduling of key courses from the AS list. In order to maximize enrollment, an effort should be made so that courses at the same level in HI and AR are not scheduled at the same time.

7. That the program continues to develop online courses, particularly as they could be used to expand (as opposed to merely duplicate) current course offerings. The program should also explore, in consultation with Online Learning and Continuing Studies, the possibilities for online language instruction, either within the context of the Online Ontario Initiative or through some other form of partnership with similar programs in other institutions.

8. That the program explores the possibility of developing a Minor in Ancient Studies.

9. That the History Department develop future AS courses in light of the strategic plan of the university and its current learning outcomes, at least until some new outcomes are designed which are specific to AS.

10. That the Chairs of History, Archaeology, and possibly Languages and Literatures, work with the Dean of Arts to investigate the possibility of establishing a Minor in Ancient Languages (perhaps on the model of the Minor in Arabic Studies). If this is implemented, it will be essential that Laurier’s collaboration with Waterloo be maintained since Laurier, at present, is able to offer Greek and Latin only at the introductory level and in alternate years. As noted above in recommendation 7, also to be encouraged is a discussion about the feasibility of developing some form of online language instruction (whether multi-institutional or not).

11. That, in the absence of such a Minor in Ancient Languages, students who obtain credit in Greek or Latin language study be allowed to count such credit toward the AS degree.
12. That the focus on Ancient Studies in a global context be maintained, while acknowledging that students who may wish to pursue a more focused Greco-Roman ("classical") program at the graduate level will need additional skills, such as reading fluency in Greek and Latin.

13. That an effort be made to provide additional administrative support to the Senior Administrative Assistant responsible for the program.

14. That in the absence of the ideal situation, in which a tenure track position should be awarded to Ancient Studies, the total number of stipends allocated to Ancient Studies should be reviewed and increased if at all possible. Attention needs to be paid to the possibility of establishing a dedicated set of course stipends for Ancient Studies, in addition to and apart from the History BA allocation.

15. While in this report we have focused primarily on the resources for the program from History, we acknowledge that decisions about staffing also need to take into consideration the extent to which Archaeology is contributing, or can contribute, to the Ancient Studies program and assume that the review of that department, which is currently underway, may help to shed light on this matter. Once this review is complete, it is recommended that representatives from both departments, perhaps with the assistance of the Dean of Arts and/or Associate Dean, Program and Faculty Development, review the list of similarly titled courses and establish whether curricular refinement or a different division of teaching responsibilities for these subject areas is appropriate.

16. That the program and Library work together to investigate the acquisition of appropriate television series and films to support Ancient Studies courses and course development.

17. That the Department of History move quickly to evaluate and restructure at least some of its awards to allow Ancient Studies students access to a broader range of awards and scholarships. Given the multi-department nature of the program, once any restructuring has taken place an effort should be taken to communicate the availability of relevant awards to instructors of courses from other departments on the AS-studies list so that they can advise strong students of potential application opportunities or nominate such students for certain awards themselves.

18. That increased efforts be made to communicate routine departmental business/decisions to CAS members, perhaps by circulating department meeting minutes to them when full-time faculty also receive them.

19. That, in light of the new potential for students to obtain a double honours BA in Archaeology and Ancient Studies, any further curricular development of the AS program should pay special attention to the implications of the program for students seeking this double degree. This new possibility of a double major underscores the need for collaboration and communication between members from AR and HI.

Unit Response

The Unit Response was authored by the Chair of History and provided responses to the recommendations related to each section of the self-study. The unit clarified that the Ancient Studies Minor already exists (Recommendation #8) while acknowledging that reference to it was not articulated in the Self-Study. Generally,
the responses to the reviewers’ recommendations were agreeable, and for each recommendation, the
appropriate respondents indicated whether or not they agreed with and accepted it (Recommendations #1, #5,
#6, #7, #9, #12, #13, #15, #16, #18, #19), or accepted it with provisions (Recommendations #4, #10, #14, #17).
There were recommendations that the unit did not agree with (Recommendations #2, #3) and a thorough
rationale was provided for recommendations which were rejected or accepted with provisions.

The authors of the Final Assessment Report appreciate the thoughtfulness and thoroughness of the Unit
Response, as well as the acknowledgment that not all of the reviewers’ recommendations that had resource
implications may be achievable in the short term.

B) IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAM STRENGTHS

The following departmental strengths are evident from both the self-study and the External Reviewers’ Report:

1. The transition from the Ancient Mediterranean Studies Program, housed in the Archeology and Classical
   Studies Department, to the Ancient Studies Program, housed in the History Department, has been
   successfully achieved, and the revised program’s goals are in alignment with the 2015-2020 Strategic
   Academic Plan.

2. The focus on Ancient Studies in a global context is innovative, and provides students with potential
   perspectives beyond the more standard Greco-Roman field of study.

3. The two fourth-year capstone courses provide excellent examples of high impact pedagogical practice.
   The program continues to work diligently at generating learning outcomes and goals to match the shift
   in its orientation that followed its move to the History Department.

C) OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT AND ENHANCEMENT

1. Program requirements, and which courses count towards an Ancient Studies degree, need to be
   clarified.

2. The distribution of courses between Archeology and Classical Studies, and History, could be usefully
   revisited in order to align them better with the revised location of Ancient Studies.

3. Some course names in the Archeology and Classical Studies Department echo too closely some course
   names in the History Department. The content of these courses should be evaluated in order to see if
duplication is occurring, and if it is this should be addressed either through exclusions or through a
revision of that content. If the content is sufficiently distinct, renaming of one or both should take place.

4. Currently credits obtained for ancient languages do not count towards Ancient Studies degree
   requirements. The History Department has agreed this should change, although not solely in terms of
   Greek or Latin.
D) PRIORITIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS APPROVED FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The External Reviewers are to be commended for their recognition of the budgetary constraints currently faced by Laurier. Nonetheless, two of their recommendations (Recommendations #13 and #14) entail resource allocations that cannot be addressed outside of the wider context of the financial situation in the Faculty of Arts, and in the university as a whole. They are therefore not included in the prioritization list, since they may not be implemented outside of the budget process.

Of the 19 recommendations listed in the Reviewers’ Report, the following should be prioritized:

Recommendation #1: That the program investigates ways to make the program requirements more accessible to students. The Department has already begun this process, and should continue to develop strategies that advance the clarity of program requirements for students.

Recommendations #5, #15, and #19: #5: That the program develops a co-ordinating or advisory committee. Given the need for continued collaboration and consultation with the Archeology and Classical Studies Department (from which the bulk of non-History Ancient Studies courses are drawn), representation from, or at the very least some formalized means of consultation with, this latter department is recommended. #15 – [T]hat representatives from both departments, perhaps with the assistance of the Dean of Arts and/or Associate Dean, Program and Faculty Development, review the list of similarly title courses and establish whether curricular refinement or a different division of teaching responsibilities for these subject areas is appropriate. #19 That in light of the new potential for students to obtain a double honours BA in Archeology and Ancient Studies, any further curricular development of the AS program should pay special attention to the implications of the program for students seeking this double degree. This new possibility of a double major underscores the need for collaboration and communication between members from AR and HI. These three recommendations are related. An advisory committee for Ancient Studies that includes members from Archeology and Classical Studies should be created to advance communication and co-operation between these two academic units in order to aid in the discussion of more efficient methods of course delivery, and also to coordinate curriculum development.

Recommendation #7: That the program continues to develop online courses, particularly as they could be used to expand (as opposed to merely duplicate) current course offerings. The Department, as it notes, is committed to online learning, and should continue to develop distance courses as part of the university’s overall online strategy in relation to its Strategic Academic Plan.

Recommendation #6: That attention be paid, within the context and constraints of the centralized scheduling system, to the scheduling of key courses from the AS list. There is flexibility built into the centralized scheduling system, and the Department notes that it is being more strategic in its timetabling assignments for the 2016-2017 academic year. This type of strategic assignment of time slots is important for student success, and should be maintained going forward.

Recommendation #9: That the History Department develop future AS courses in light of the strategic plan of the university and its current learning outcomes, at least until some new outcomes are designated which are specific to AS. New course development is important to program renewal and the retention of student interest, but must be undertaken with the understanding that additional resources are unlikely to be...
forthcoming, and therefore additions to the curriculum must be at least partially offset by the removal of courses that are no long relevant or supported by available faculty.

Recommendation #11: That, in the absence of [a] Minor in Ancient Languages, students who obtain credit in Greek or Latin study be allowed to count such credits towards the AS degree. The Department agrees that this is a reasonable recommendation, but notes that given its global focus, credits in ancient languages should be awarded beyond Greek and Latin. We concur that credits need not necessarily be restricted to these languages.

Recommendation #18: That increased efforts be made to communicate routine departmental business/decisions to CAS members. Improved connections with CAS members are always to be encouraged, and the Department was acknowledged in the External Report as creating an inclusive setting for all instructors. It will continue to explore ways of maintaining and advancing these connections.

E) PERSONNEL ISSUES (CONFIDENTIAL AND IF APPLICABLE)

Not applicable.

SIGNATURES

Richard Nemesvari

Kathryn Carter

Deborah MacLatchy
## PART TWO: IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation to be Implemented</th>
<th>Responsibility for Implementation</th>
<th>Anticipated Completion Date</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #1: That the program investigates ways to make the program requirements more accessible to students either through the University website or through the development of (or the increased circulation of existing) advising materials or checklists that clearly indicate the courses that count toward the AS degree.</td>
<td>Chair and Department</td>
<td>September, 2017</td>
<td>It may be possible to achieve this recommendation sooner, but in any case the clarifications requested should be in place by the 2017-2018 Academic Calendar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations #5, #15, #19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #5: That the program develops a coordinating or advisory committee, within the existing structure of the History Department, comprised of faculty members with expertise in and a teaching contribution to the program. Given the need for continued collaboration and consultation with the Archaeology and Classical Studies Department (from which the bulk of non-History Ancient Studies courses are drawn), representation from, or at the very least some formalized means of consultation with, this latter department is recommended. Recommendation #15: While in this report we have focused primarily on the resources for the program from History, we acknowledge that decisions about staffing also need to take into consideration the extent to which Archaeology is contributing, or can contribute, to the Ancient Studies program and assume that the review of</td>
<td>Chairs of History and Archeology, Departments of History and Archeology</td>
<td>January, 2017</td>
<td>The advisory committee should be established in the Fall of 2016, and discussions of relevant issues between History and Archeology should be ongoing. The Dean’s Office is willing to participate in those discussions if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that department, which is currently underway, may help
to shed light on this matter. Once this review is complete,
it is recommended that representatives from both
departments, perhaps with the assistance of the Dean of
Arts and/or Associate Dean, Program and Faculty
Development, review the list of similarly titled courses and
establish whether curricular refinement or a different
division of teaching responsibilities for these subject areas
is appropriate.

Recommendation #19: That, in light of the new potential
for students to obtain a double honours BA in
Archaeology and Ancient Studies, any further curricular
development of the AS program should pay special
attention to the implications of the program for students
seeking this double degree. This new possibility of a
double major underscores the need for collaboration and
communication between members from AR and HI.

| Recommendation #7: That the program continues to
develop online courses, particularly as they could be used
to expand (as opposed to merely duplicate) current course
offerings. The program should also explore, in
consultation with Online Learning and Continuing
Studies, the possibilities for online language instruction,
either within the context of the Online Ontario Initiative
or through some other form of partnership with similar
programs in other institutions. | Chair and Department | Ongoing | The Department should continue to develop online
resources strategically, and in relation to the university’s
Strategic Academic Plan.

| Recommendation #6: That attention be paid, within the
context and constraints of the centralized scheduling
system, to the scheduling of key courses from the AS list.
In order to maximize enrollment, an effort should be made
so that courses at the same level in HI and AR are not
scheduled at the same time. | Chair | Ongoing | Strategic timetabling is achievable with the centralized
scheduling model. |
| Recommendation #9: That the History Department develop future AS courses in light of the strategic plan of the university and its current learning outcomes, at least until some new outcomes are designed which are specific to AS. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Chair and Department | Ongoing | The addition of new courses should take place with the context of a continuing curriculum planning process. |

| Recommendation #11: That, in the absence of such a Minor in Ancient Languages, students who obtain credit in Greek or Latin language study be allowed to count such credit toward the AS degree. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Chair and Department | January, 2017 | |

| Recommendation #18: That increased efforts be made to communicate routine departmental business/decisions to CAS members, perhaps by circulating department meeting minutes to them when full-time faculty also receive them. |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Chair | January, 2017 | |